

BOGARD--WARLICK DEBATE

INVOLVING ISSUES BETWEEN
BAPTISTS and CHRISTIANS



BEN M. BOGARD, Baptist
JOE S. WARLICK, Christian



Published By
LAMBERT BOOK HOUSE
Box 4007
Shreveport, Louisiana 71104
TLC

This page has been left intentionally blank

Bogard--Warlick Debate

FIRST PROPOSITION.

The Scriptures teach that the sinner is so depraved that in his conviction and conversion the Holy Spirit exercises a power or influence, distinct from and in addition to the written word.

BEN M. BOGARD Affirms

JOE S. WARLICK Denies

* * *

MR. BOGARD'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The terms of the proposition I define as follows: By the Scriptures I mean the Old and New Testaments. By "teach" I mean the Bible either says so in plain words or such words are used as to convey the idea. By "sinner" I mean a natural, unredeemed man. By "depraved" I mean the natural disposition to do wrong. By "conviction and conversion" I mean present salvation. By "Holy Spirit" I mean the third person in the Trinity. By "exercises" I mean to employ activity. By "power or influence" I mean energy or potency tending to produce an effect. By "distinct from" I mean clear, plain, unconfused. By "in addition to" I mean something more. By "the written word" I mean the words of the Bible whether written or spoken.

I take it that the terms of the proposition are now so defined that there can be no mistake concerning their meaning and it only remains for me to prove by the Scriptures that the proposition is true.

Eph. 2:3, "Among whom we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of the flesh fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath even as others."

Since we are by nature children of wrath if we can find what the meaning of "nature" is, we have the matter settled. Webster says that "nature" means personal character or natural disposition. Then according to Paul we were by personal character and natural disposition the children of wrath. "Nature" is translated from a Greek word (Phusis) which means "That which we get from our parents" (See Linddell & Scott).

That this depravity involves the entire or total man, is seen in the following passages:

Eccl. 8:11, "The hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil."

What is meant by "heart?" Webster says that "heart" means the seat of the affections and passions; emotions; will; spirit; energy; power; resolution; secret thoughts; conscience." Now, if this is true, then it follows that all the thinking, acting, energetic and spirit parts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil. Fully

means entirely, completely, totally. Hence all the intelligent part of man is by nature on the wrong side of every moral thing. That is what is meant by "total depravity."

Rom. 8:7-8: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject unto the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh can not please God."

If they who are in the flesh can not please God it follows that there is nothing in a man by nature to please God with. God is always pleased with anything that is good. If there is nothing in a natural man to please God, it follows that the natural man has no good in him, else God would be pleased with it. What is meant by "flesh" in this passage? It does not mean our bodies, for if that was true no man on earth could please God, since all are in their bodies. Paul explains by saying that a child of God is "not in the flesh" (See verse 9). So he did not mean "body" when he said "flesh." It follows that he meant **The Natural Man**. The natural man can not please God. If that is so, then it follows that there is no good in a man by nature. The utter absence of good—or what is commonly called total depravity, that is to say, the total or entire man depraved, not the total or entire man as bad as he can be; but the total or entire man bad.

Other passages, which unmistakably teach the same idea, are as follows: Rom. 5:12; Rom. 7:18; Jer. 17:9; Ps. 51:4-5; Ps. 58:3-8; Job 14:1-4; II Cor. 5:14, and numerous other passages, but these will suffice. I will not quote these passages as the space allowed, according to the agreement with Mr. Warlick, will not permit a discussion of them. I trust that the reader will turn to the passages and read them for himself.

The condition of man by nature is so bad that in his conviction and conversion there must be Divine power or energy exerted or he can never be saved.

Jer. 13:22-23: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard change his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil."

It would be utterly impossible for the Ethiopian to change his skin or the leopard to change his spots. If it is ever done it must be by Divine power. You can convince the Ethiopian by preaching that he needs to have his skin changed, but preaching can not change his skin, neither can he change it himself after he is convinced that he needs it. God only can do that. I believe that the written word is used to convince the sinner that he needs salvation and then when he is convinced he must come in contact with the Holy Spirit to be saved. There is no dispute between Mr. Warlick and myself about the need of preaching. All that he may say in favor of preaching the Word I shall endorse. Both of us believe the Written Word is used in the conviction and conversion of the sinner. But we differ on what the Spirit does in the conviction of the sinner. I maintain that the Spirit does a work in addition to the word. I maintain that the Spirit comes into actual contact with the sinner in his conversion. I believe the Holy Spirit is actually present, as much present as I am present in this room.

when the sinner is converted. Mr. Warlick believes that the Spirit is not Himself present, but his influence is altogether confined to the written word. I maintain that he does have an influence in and through His word, but that He also exercises a personal influence in addition to that which is exerted in the word. Now to the Bible for proof:

I Thess. 1:5: "Our Gospel came not unto you in word only but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost."

This is almost the exact wording of my proposition. There is the word and also the Holy Ghost.

I Cor. 3:3: "Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not on tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart."

We are Christ's epistles. That is the epistles which Christ wrote. What pen did Christ use? He used the apostles, "ministered by us." What was written upon? The heart. What was the ink? The Holy Spirit. Jesus was the writer, the apostle was the pen, the hearts of the people was the paper, and the Holy Spirit was the ink. Just as ink comes into actual contact with the paper so the Holy Spirit comes into actual contact with the human heart in the conviction and conversion of the sinner.

The fact that we are commanded to pray for Divine power and blessing, in addition to the word, proves that there is something besides the word used in the conviction and conversion of the sinner.

II Thess. 3:1: "Brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified, even as it is with you."

Why pray? Did not Paul have the word? Was he not an inspired man? Was he not an orator? Was he wanting in any of these things? Certainly not. Then what did he want prayer for? Evidently not for the word, for he had that; evidently, not for inspiration, for he had that; evidently, not for oratory, for he had that. What, then, did he want prayer for? He wanted the special power of the Holy Ghost to accompany his preaching so that sinners might be saved. Other passages where prayer is commanded are: Col. 4:2-3; Rom. 10:1; I Tim. 2:1-4. What mean these passages if we already have in the word all the power we need?

Acts 14:27: "And when he had gathered the church together, he rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles."

With what does a man believe? With the heart. (See Rom. 10:10) If then God opened the door of faith to the Gentiles, He evidently opened their hearts that they might receive the word. Something in addition to the word, you see. Just as we see in the case of Lydia:

Acts 16:14: "Lydia, a seller of purple, whose heart the Lord opened that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. Her heart was not opened by preaching but by the Lord that she might attend to the preaching."

Thus my proposition is proved by Scriptures, and many more could be quoted on the same line. But my space is filled.

MR. WARLICK'S FIRST NEGATIVE.

This is to be a written debate, and one wholly independent of any oral touches, so I see no use for the address to the "Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen" employed by my opponent in his opening. I recognize also, as Mr. Bogard seems to do, that we shall be short on space, and so I shall as he has done, enter at once into the subject now before us as stated in the proposition.

The fact that I am in the negative on this question, shows that I do not believe the proposition, and in four articles, including this one, I shall say and show why I do not believe it.

I am very well pleased with the definition of the terms of the proposition, as given by the affirmative, as far as he goes; but I should be pleased for him to give us the meaning of the word "so" as a modifier of the word "depraved." How much depraved is "so depraved?" Does the affirmative in this case mean what the creeds mean by the term "Total Depravity?" If he means what they mean, and what their authors teach on the subject, will he tell how much worse the devil himself is than this? If a man be "Totally Depraved," then he can be no more depraved, and therefore can be no better than the devil, who can not be more than totally depraved. I shall leave this just here, until Mr. Bogard makes himself clear on the point. Don't forget to tell us how much "So" means.

Noticing further my friend's definition, I beg to remind him in advance of the argument that since he admits the Holy Spirit and the Word of God are not to be "confused," and since the prefix "con" means "to go together," he will not be permitted hereafter to say that the Holy Spirit operates in connection with the word of God, or that it works by means of the word, for he has defined this position clear out of his material. He says they are not to be "con"—that they are not to go together. I think it will be interesting to see what the gentleman will do with the position he and his people have of late years been trying to take on the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion, with the definition here used.

The gentleman's first reference in favor of his idea of "Hereditary Depravity," does not only not prove what he cites it to prove, but it even denies his doctrine, when you quote the apostle in full. Paul says at the time these people were children of wrath they walked according to the course of this world. Eph. 2:1 to 4. The word nature here used (Greek Phusis) does not mean an inherent quality as Mr. Bogard thinks. It means "Habit, Practice, Custom." It is so defined in the Lexicons. Dr. Thayer says the word in this passage means a mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature." Dr. Groves says the word means "habit or custom." Mr. Bogard loses this, his first point. I hardly think when Paul said "Nature itself teaches us that it is a shame for a man

to have long hair," he meant by the word nature "that which we get from our parents."

If the hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil, what is the condition of the hearts of those who are not of the sons of men? I think Mr. Bogard will say that the regenerated man is as much depraved after regeneration as he was before, and so this passage serves him no purpose on this point.

If the carnal mind, of Rom. 8:7-8, means the unregenerate mind as my opponent thinks, then there is no chance for it to ever be saved, for it is not subject to God's law, and can not be. Paul does not say that it may be made subject to God's law under certain conditions, and influences, but that it can not be made subject, therefore can not be saved. Moreover, in his first letter to the Corinthians, he said, they were yet carnal, and that they walked as men. If carnal means unregenerate, then the Corinthians were yet unregenerated, when Paul wrote his letter to them, although he said they had been called and sanctified.

The truth is, my friend does not seem to understand what the carnal mind is, and since he is in the lead now, I shall not tell him what it is, but will leave him to discover for himself. Of one thing we may be sure, however, and that is, that it is not the sinner in the sense Mr. Bogard thinks. I should like to ask my friend though, whether he thinks as he seems to teach in his argument here, that every thought of the unsaved man is sinful? Also if he believes the heart of every girl, who is opposed to adultery and fornication is prompted by Satan in her estimate of wrong? Is the girl who keeps herself pure, a hypocrite? Does every girl and boy, too, for that matter, in a state of nature, want to do evil? Be plain here, please.

Now my opponent gives us some references, and says they teach what he is trying to prove, and he asks that the reader turn to the passages and read them. I simply deny that either of them, or all of them together, teach what he is arguing, or that any passage in all the book of God teaches the doctrine. I expect it would be better for him to recite his verses, and make his argument on the verses, and then we will be after his argument. All of the Scriptures are on my side of this question. I shall not deny the Bible, but will take pleasure in showing that his proposition on every passage is wrong, woefully and fatally wrong.

Before Mr. Bogard has made his position clear on the nature of man, he comes to the second part of his proposition, and proceeds with his very difficult and impossible task of trying to prove a direct work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of the sinner. My friend is not willing for me to state what I believe in regard to the work of the Holy Spirit in the conviction and the conversion of sinners, so he proposes to state it for me; and as usual, misstates the position entirely. I have learned that some men are not good at stating what others teach on religious matters and so I shall excuse Mr. Bogard from trying to say what I think about this matter. I believe, and teach always and everywhere, that the Holy Spirit operates on every heart in conversion, but the "Di-

rect work" of the Spirit on the heart is what I most stoutly deny, and ask my friend to prove. There is no difference between us, as to what the Spirit does? Mr. Bogard states a false issue here. The difference is as to how He does, what He does, in convicting and converting the sinner. Mr. Bogard thinks it is direct, immediate, that it is not in anyway connected with means, not even with the word of God, for he cuts this idea out when in his definition of terms he says "Unconfused."

My friend seems to think that since the Ethiopian can not change his skin, nor the leopard his spots, neither can those who are accustomed (not those born evil) to do evil do good; that there must be a direct work on the heart of the sinner to convert him. Of course he assumes here, the very thing he should have tried to prove. I should like to know if he thinks that when the skin of the Ethiopian was changed to black, God performed a miracle? Did it require superadded power to operative law to make the skin of the Ethiopian black? If not, why does he think it requires miracle working power to change it back to what it was when it came from Adam? What would the gentleman say to an infidel here?

The Gospel did not go to the Thessalonians in "word only." This shows that the Gospel is not word only, but is power. Paul so declares in Rom. 1:16. This is not what the gentleman wants, there is too much power in the gospel here referred to for Mr. Bogard's proposition. What he wants is a passage which shows that the Gospel has no power in it. That it could not come with power to anyone, and that therefore there is a need for the direct work on the sinner's heart, not connected in anyway with the gospel. 1 Thess. 1:5 is my text not his.

In 2 Cor. 3:3, where Paul says that the writing, by the Spirit, on the hearts of the people, was ministered by the Apostles, he denies flatly what Mr. Bogard quotes him to prove. Mr. Bogard needs a Scripture which says that the writing was done independent of the ministry of the Apostles. Not "confused" with what they taught. The two can not go together, remember. You say this in defining your terms. Though it be true that the Spirit did the writing, and that He did it on the hearts of the people, it will be observed that He used the Apostles as agents, by and through whom to write; and so this is my passage, not my opponent's.

When Paul asked the brethren to pray for him, that the word of God might accomplish his desires, he made the wrong request for my friend. He should have asked them to pray for God to send down His Holy Ghost, for the purpose of converting in Mr. Bogard's direct way, and not confuse, or in any way connect it, with the preaching of the word. Paul in this matter stands with me, not with Mr. Bogard. God opened the door of faith to the Gentiles like he did to the Jews. Peter says the latter case was just like the former, and in both cases the faith came by the word which fell from his lips, and not by direct impact like my friend thinks. Read Acts 15:7-9.

Lydia's case is altogether on my side. Her heart was opened.

we both allow, but we are not agreed as to how it was done. As Mr. Bogard says, the heart is that with which we understand, and Paul says the eyes of the understanding is enlightened. Christ told Paul on his way to Damascus (Acts 26) that He would open the eyes of the Gentiles; that is, He would open their understanding or hearts, through his preaching, and not by direct impact. So Lydia's case, like all the rest, belongs to me in this contention.

When David, in Psalms 19:7 said, "The law of the Lord is **perfect** converting the soul" I think he knew that Mr. Bogard was mistaken when he imagined an immediate work for this purpose, and when Paul said (Rom. 1:16), "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the **Power** of God unto salvation," I think he knew that Mr. Bogard was not correct in the case. When Christ in John 17:20 prayed only for those who should believe on Him "through the words of the Apostles," I am sure He did not have in mind Mr. Bogard's doctrine on the subject. Now, I shall close this article with a request to the gentleman to find one passage that hints at his idea of how the Spirit operates in converting sinners. It will not be enough to find one which shows that the Spirit actually operates, this we admit. Find one for us which shows how it operates, and which teaches, **motely or remotely**, that the operation is by direct or immediate touch, "**unconfused with means.**"

MR. BOGARD'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen, Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Mr. Warlick prefers to not use the formality of addressing the moderators, etc., but as I have agreed to as nearly as possible reproduce our oral debate which was held at Malone, Texas, in December, I shall continue to do that. Mr. Warlick possibly thinks he needs all his space to cover up the truth as I am presenting it, but as I am not so pressed, I shall give attention to formalities and thus make the debate as interesting as possible.

Mr. Warlick seems to be under the impression that he is debating with a Hardshell Baptist, that is one who denies the use of means in the conviction and conversion of the sinner. In this he is mistaken. One of the chief causes of the division in 1832 was this very question, the Hardshells denying the use of means and the Missionary Baptists affirming the use of means. Whether he wants to or not Mr. Warlick must meet the arguments of a Missionary Baptist instead of a Hardshell, and while I sympathize with him in his task of trying to answer a Missionary Baptist with the negative arguments he is accustomed to use in opposition to Hardshells, it is not my fault; but rather my fortune. I can not help the trouble he is in. I can only advise him to either acknowledge he can't meet a Missionary Baptist on this question or else make some arguments which fit.

The whole trouble with Mr. Warlick is that he does not own a dictionary. He says "con" means "to go together" and if two things go together they are necessarily "confused." When I defined what I meant by the "distinct" work of the Spirit, I said I meant the work of the Spirit was "clear, plain, unconfused." Because I used the word "unconfused" he thinks he has found something. He declares I shall not be allowed to say that the Spirit works with the word for I have said the work of the Spirit is "unconfused" with the word. Webster says that "confuse" means to jumble, render indistinct, to mix or blend things so they can not be distinguished." Two things can work together without being so blended that they can not be distinguished one from the other. The Holy Spirit works with the Word of God in such a way as not to be confused with the Word. The word is used in the conviction of the sinner and the Spirit also works in the conviction of the sinner so that the one is not "jumbled" or rendered indistinct by the other. Two horses may pull together yet be perfectly distinct one from the other. The two horses bring power to bear on the load but they are not confused because they are joined together. The Holy Spirit and the Word are not "confused" but they are "conjoined" and that in such a way that they remain distinct.

With this objection, offered by my friend, answered, what more is there for me to do? He seemed to base his whole contention

on this one objection. The truth is Mr. Warlick and his brethren do not believe that the Holy Spirit Himself is present at all when a man is convicted, any more than a man is present when a letter is read from him. The influence of the man who wrote the letter is confined to his written words—the man himself is not present. So the Spirit is in the word (according to Mr. Warlick) and not himself there at all when a man is convicted and converted. I believe that the word is there and also the Spirit in person and the personal work of the Spirit is just as distinct and certain as is the influence of the word. This has been abundantly proved by passages I introduced in my first speech.

What do I mean by "so" when I say a sinner is "so" depraved. I explained fully what I meant in the first speech. It means that he is beyond the reach of human power to save him and that he must have Divine power to save him. What do I mean by "total depravity?" I said very plainly, that it means that the entire or total man is depraved. He asked how much worse the devil is than a man who is totally depraved? He is a great deal worse than a totally depraved man because the word "total," as used in this connection, does not refer to the degree of badness in the man but it refers to the man in all his faculties. All that it takes to constitute man is depraved—that is to say bad, but not as bad as bad can be. The total or entire man is bad is what we meant and have always meant by total depravity.

Another hard question he asks is if a girl or boy is so bad that all their nature is inclined to do wrong? Yes, sir. The book says, "The hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil" (Eccl. 8:11). I am sorry Mr. Warlick does not believe this. Then he asks if all girls are inclined to commit adultery? The object of this question is not to fairly discuss the question, but to create prejudice against the truth, but I will answer it. Mr. Warlick's trouble is that he fails to distinguish between the evil nature itself and the expression or manifestation of that evil nature. The depravity is there and that inclines the entire being toward sin, but one person will give expression to that evil nature in one way and another person will do the same in another direction. One shows his depraved nature by stealing and another by lying and another by adultery, yet all these outward acts express the one and the self-same thing, viz.: depravity. Because one does not commit all the crimes in the catalogue of bad things does not argue that he is not depraved in mind, soul and body.

When Paul said we are "all by nature the children of wrath," Mr. Warlick thinks this means that we are all by custom or habit the children of wrath. The Greek word ("phusis") means "that which we get from our parents" (See Liddell & Scott). It has a secondary meaning and that Mr. Warlick gives. But words are never to be used in their secondary meaning unless the connection demands it and this certainly is not the case with Paul's language. The word never means "habit or custom" unless the habit or custom has become so fixed that it becomes a part of our nature. If the word

merely means habit or custom, how is it that all without exception get into such a habit? Rom. 3:9-12. "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin." How does it happen if the word under discussion only means "habit" that the entire human race has formed the habit? All the Jews and all the Gentiles were under sin and that includes the whole human race. As like begets like it follows that depraved parents have begotten depraved children and thus "all are by nature the children of wrath" as the Bible plainly says.

Mr. Warlick asks: "If the hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil," what about the hearts of those who are not the sons of men. I will answer his question. I can't see the reference.

On Romans 8:7-8, Mr. Warlick dodges my point. That passage says: So then they that are in the flesh can not please God." I ask him if God would not be pleased with anything good? If there is nothing in the man by nature to please God, then there must be no good in the man to please God with. Let Mr. Warlick come to the point and not dodge. "Flesh" in this passage can not mean the body for then it would be impossible for even a child of God to please God for they are in their bodies. It therefore means by "flesh", the natural man. Verse 9, says the Christian is "not in the flesh but in the Spirit." This shows conclusively that it is the unsaved man who is referred to as the one who can not please God, and again I ask: Would not God be pleased with anything that is good? Then if there is any good in an unregenerated man would not God be pleased with that good? But since God is not pleased with anything in an ungenerated man, does it not follow that there is no good in him? That is what we mean by total depravity—the utter absence of good.

Mr. Warlick thinks the Ethiopian's skin could be changed by operative law. What law? The idea is absurd. Nothing but miraculous power could change the negro's skin. Everybody knows this. But this is the illustration the Lord used to show the sinner's condition. If the illustration means anything it means that it will take direct and distinct power to change the sinner from nature to grace.

1 Thess. 1:5, has three things mentioned. The word, the power, and the Holy Ghost. Not just the bare word. Not just the word and the power that resides in the word, but in addition to all this there is the Holy Ghost. That is what my proposition says and Mr. Warlick can not refute it. 1 Cor. 3:3, mentions three things. The writer, who is the Lord himself. The pen, who is the apostle himself. The ink, which is the Spirit Himself. Here is instrumentality, but the instrumentality was used to cause the ink to come into actual contact with the paper. Since, as Mr. Warlick and I agree, the ink represents the Holy Spirit, then as certainly as the ink comes into actual contact with the paper so the Spirit comes into actual contact with the human heart when a sinner is convict-

ed and converted. If he were arguing with a Hardshell he could show that there were instrumentality and means and thus knock out the Hardshell. But he is nonplused in my case for I assert as strongly as he does that means are used. The Hardshells are right about there being an actual contact of the Spirit with the human heart, and Mr. Warlick is right about means being used, and the Missionary Baptists are right in taking the whole truth and asserting both the use of means and also personal and actual contact of the Spirit on the heart of the sinner in his conversion.

Mr. Warlick failed to tell us what the Lord gives in answer to prayer. Paul asked that prayer be made for him that the word of the Lord might have free course. What would the Lord do if he answer that prayer? Paul already had all that was in the word. If all the power is in the word what was it Paul wanted? Was he praying for the Lord to do anything in addition to the word? If so my proposition is proved. If not, what was he wanting prayer for? Let Mr. Warlick answer.

Just how Lydia's case can be on his side is more than I can see since the Lord opened her heart not by the word but in order that she attend to the things spoken by Paul. True, Paul was an instrument that God used in opening the hearts of the people but the Spirit was there in person conjoined to the word for the same purpose. The Gospel is God's power, but he is there in the person of the Spirit to exercise that power.

This answers all that Mr. Warlick said and besides doing this new matter is put to him for consideration. Let him meet the issue and not dodge.

One or two advance arguments: In Ezra 8:22, we read: "The hand of God is upon all them that seek him." Is not this direct personal contact? In John 3:3-8, we are told that a man must be born of the Spirit. Are we not in personal contact with that of which we are born?

MR. WARLICK'S SECOND NEGATIVE.

My friend uses all his space in addressing the Moderators, and in an effort to reconstruct his first affirmative. I did not suppose he would acknowledge so quickly, his recognition of a failure in his first trial, and of the fact that I had so completely upset his first effort. I should like to know who the moderators are in this written debate and I should also like to know how much of the Malone debate he thinks we shall be able to get into this abbreviated discussion. Well, if I had no more truth in my positions than he has in his, I suppose I too, would want to use as much space for filling as I could.

My friend says, I think I am debating with the "Hardshells." Well, when a Missionary Baptist is run off his base, as he always is in a debate on this question, he will try to stand on the Hardshell platform; and so we are compelled to answer the Hardshells when discussing the matter with a Missionary.

Missionary Baptists say with Paul, when debating with the Hardshell, that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, but when they come to meet us on Paul's statement, they say it is not, but that there must be a direct or immediate work of the Holy Ghost; that the gospel is a dead letter, with no power in it, and that unless God comes into the heart by direct touch, the sinner can't be saved. Hence they pray for God to send converting power down from Heaven, to convert the dead sinner, and save his soul. Mr. Bogard would like to dodge this position, but he must stand by it, or else acknowledge that he has been wrong in the matter, all the time, and that we have the truth on the subject; or, he must not complain at my running him back to Hardshell ground.

I beg to say to Mr. Bogard, that I have a number of dictionaries. I have ten Unabridged, Greek-English Lexicons, in my library, and all these I shall use more or less in this discussion. I may say, that not one of the ten I have, and not one of others I have freely consulted, supports Mr. Bogard's definitions as used in this debate. No sort of an effort to get rid of the fact that the gentleman has defined the Word of God clear out of his doctrine, when he says, that he means by "Distinct" in his proposition "Not confused." The prefix "con," means that the word, and Spirit do not go together. That is what "con" means and everybody knows it. The two horses pulling at the same load are not "confused," says my friend. Just so—neither is there any of the power of one horse in the other. What the farmer would call the "near " horse has none of the "off-horse" in him, and the off-horse has none of the lead-horse residing in him and the wagon tongue is between them. Now as per Mr. Bogard's illustration, I suppose we are to understand that there is no truth in his Holy Ghost, and no Holy Ghost in his truth, and that when he preaches what he calls the word,

there is no Holy Spirit in what he says, and that when what he supposes is the Holy Ghost comes into the heart of the sinner, there is no truth at all in it, any more than one of the two horses is contained in the other. This illustration may do for his doctrine, but it will not do for what I preach, for I preach the Truth, which was itself inspired by the Holy Ghost. Peter says the apostles preached it with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven. Christ said to his disciples that it would be the Holy Ghost speaking in them. The Truth is, the Holy Spirit operates on the hearts of the sinners through the truth, and not by direct impact at all. I wish Mr. Bogard would find just one case of conversion in which the work of the Holy Spirit was direct or immediate. If his life depended upon it, he could not find the case. Mr. Bogard misrepresents me again. He says in one breath that I do not think the Holy Spirit is present in converting the sinner, and then says in the next, that I do think he is there in the word. Well, Peter thought as I think, when he said the apostles preached the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven. In this case the Holy Spirit was in the word, but Mr. Bogard thinks he was not there at all, or if He were, He did not know it for He had to come in later and do His work in an immediate way. God is great at experimenting, according to my friend and his people.

Mr. Bogard's effort to dodge the fact that in the words, "Total Depravity" the word "Total" modifies "depravity" and not the man, is amusing. Why the children will laugh at his grammar. Why not come up to it Mr. Bogard, and admit that which we all know is true, and that is that if the sinner be totally depraved, he is as mean as the devil, and that any system which saves the sinner will save the devil. Depravity means corruption, and total means the entire sum or amount. If the doctrine of "Hereditary total depravity" is true, then there is nothing in man but depravity, and if you remove that you remove the whole man, the entire man, and so you would have nothing left to be saved. Thus salvation is impossible if my friend's doctrine be true. On this matter Mr. Bogard takes two positions. He says the word, flesh, in Paul's statement in Romans means depravity, and that since like will beget like, he declares that the children of the depraved people will be depraved in consequence. He then declares that this depravity is removed from the saved person, who, he says is not in the flesh, and yet his children will be depraved the same as those of the man who is not regenerated. I should like for him to tell us, where the depravity of the children of saved folks comes from. If we inherit sin from Adam, why may we not also inherit righteousness from righteous parents? Will Mr. Bogard tell us why? Remember, he says the Christian is not in the flesh, that is, not in depravity. How then can his children be unclean and not holy?

My friend's trial at dodging the force of his argument in his former article, which is his real doctrine, serves him no purpose here, saying as he does, that I am only trying to darken counsel, if I charge him with teaching that all girls, many and most of whom for that

matter, are pure in their thoughts, are equal to adulteresses. Let him take it all back, or else stand by his guns. If his doctrine on hereditary total depravity be true, every girl is in heart an adulteress, and every man a thief. I do not blame my friend for trying to screen himself here.

There is no such thing as a secondary meaning to the word nature in the Greek, like Mr. Bogard imagines, with no Lexicon to consult on the subject before him, when he makes his statement. If such were true, it would still remain a fact, that the secondary meaning was the sense in which Paul used the word in Eph. 2, where he says "we were all by nature the children of wrath—when we walked according to the course of this world." I hardly think we were born walking. Habit, custom or practice, is the idea here. Again I ask my friend whether we inherit from our parents nature not to have long hair? Paul says, nature teaches that it is a shame for a man to have long hair.

If Mr. Bogard's idea of the sinner not being able to please God, because he is in the flesh were true, then it would be displeasing to God for the girl to keep her life clean. If she should do it, at all times refraining from evil thoughts, words and deeds, God would be displeased with her, I suppose He would think her a hypocrite. Pshaw, Mr. Bogard cease saying such things.

I still insist, that if it requires miraculous interposition to change the skin of the Ethiopian, then it required as much to make him black. But Mr. Bogard does not tell us what he would say in reply to the Infidels on the unity of the races. Will he tell us in his next?

Mr. Bogard says in 1 Thess 1:5, there are three things mentioned: The Word, the power and the Holy Ghost. He says the power is in the word, but that the Holy Ghost is something distinct from both. Why does he say that the word and the power are together, but the Holy Ghost is distinct, Will he answer? The truth is, there is not a passage in the New Testament more out of harmony with my friend's position than this one. Whatever the Holy Ghost did in converting the Thessalonians, He did it through the word which the apostle preached. This does not mean distinct, I know.

Mr. Bogard quibbles again, by asking what Paul meant when he requested his friends to pray for him, that the Word of God might have free course, etc. Well whatever Paul might have meant, of one thing we may be sure, he did not mean for them to pray for the Holy Ghost to come down in a distinct, direct way, and save the people, for he knew the word would contain that power and for this reason he said he was not ashamed of the message, as it was the power of God unto salvation.

When we pray for our daily bread, I hardly think we expect the prayer to be answered by God sending the bread down from Heaven already cooked, and labeled with plain address to us.

In the last four lines of my friend's copy, he introduces what he calls arguments; but in fact he refers to just two verses of Scripture, and makes no argument at all. Ezekiel 8:22: "The hand of God is upon all them that seek him." He guesses that this

means the direct work of the Holy Ghost in conversion. I deny it, and call for the proof. The hand of God is over all his works, but I hardly think He will, by miraculous touch, bring all things into purity of composition. He quotes the Savior's language in John 3:8, where we are said to be born again, and then He assumes that this just has to mean the direct work of the Holy Ghost in conversion. Is such an idea hinted at in the passage? I say not, and call upon Mr. Bogard to show the hint. Peter says the birth itself is by the word, 1 Peter 1:22, 25.

Again I wish to beg Mr. Bogard to bring forward the text of Scripture, found in all the Book of God, which clearly teaches the direct work of the Holy Ghost on the hearts of sinners to convert them? Where is the passage? I shall insist upon it. Where is the verse? It will not do to show that the Holy Spirit operates. This we allow, but give us the passage which even "squints" at your idea of the matter, Mr. Bogard. One—not many—not two—but one.

Instead of the Bible teaching the direct work of the Holy Ghost in the conviction and conversion of sinners, it contradicts the doctrine and shows it to be false, absolutely false.

1 Cor. 4:15, "Though ye have ten thousand tutors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus, I have begotten you through the Gospel." I am sorry Mr. Bogard does not believe this, but it is so anyhow. James says, Jas. 1:18, "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth." I believe James, so I deny my friend's doctrine. Again, Jas. 1:21, "Receive with meekness the engrafted word which is able to save your souls." Mr Bogard thinks James is wrong on this, but I stand with James. David, in Psalms 19:7 says: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." My friend says David you were a good singer perhaps, but you did not know of the direct work of the Holy Spirit which God always uses to convert the soul. Paul says, Romans 8:1, 3: "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, has made me free from the law of sin and death." Mr. Bogard says, right there is where Paul and I differ, but in this case, I believe I shall remain with Paul. By preaching this law of life to Lydia, her heart was opened through this medium, and not by direct touch. But I close, again calling for the passage which teaches the direct work of the Holy Ghost in convicting and converting sinners! I beg my friend to find it for us.

MR. BOGARD'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Mr. Warlick says I use much of my space to address the moderators and in reply will say that friend Warlick uses more space telling why he does not address the moderators. I do not blame him for wanting to make the written debate different from the spoken one. I was so well pleased with the oral debate that I am anxious to reproduce the exact words so far as it is possible.

He still contends that there is no difference between the Missionary Baptists and the Hardshells on this question. But there is and he ought to know it. Missionary Baptist believe in the use of means, one of the means being the word of God, and the Hardshells do not so believe. When I accept the word of God as a means, however, I do not rule out the spirit. Both the word and the spirit work in the conviction and the conversion of the sinner. They do not become confused, however, so that you can not tell the one from the other, as Mr. Warlick believes. Mr. Warlick thinks that since "con" means together that there cannot be a "con" unless it is "confused." I gave him the word "conjoined" as expressing the Baptist idea and he was silent on that. I do not blame him as there is no dodging that. The Spirit and the word are distinct, that is, not so mixed and jumbled that you can't tell one from the other, i. e., confused, yet while not confused, they are "conjoined." In other words, the preaching of the word influences the sinner and in addition to that he is influenced by the Holy Spirit.

If Mr. Warlick has so many lexicons (and I do not dispute that he has them) let him quote them and show us just what they do say on the words under discussion. His "hear say" does not go in a debate. I have quoted verbatim from Liddell & Scott, the greatest lexicon on earth, as all concede. Mr. Warlick says he has ten lexicons, but does not quote even one. If you have lexicons, Mr. Warlick, I advise you to use them. In denying my definitions he says among other silly things that "the prefix 'con' means that the word and Spirit do not go together." Then when I say they are "conjoined" it would mean they can not go together. If the gentleman will get a common school dictionary and learn the difference between "confused" and "conjoined" he will learn the truth on this subject. The Spirit and the word are conjoined in conviction and conversion, but not so jumbled or mixed as to be confused. They remain two distinct things, the Spirit and the word, not the word with a small mixture of the essence of the Spirit in it, but the two are at work, one in addition to the other.

I used the illustration of the two horses pulling together to show the distinction between the words "conjoined" and "confused." Mr. Warlick wants to make the figure go on all fours and thus twist something into favoring his position. For his benefit I will change the figure so that the reader may see what I mean whether

Mr. Warlick wants to see or not. The steam and the locomotive work together in pulling the train. Yet they are distinct the one from the other. The steam does not pull the train, neither does the locomotive pull the train, but they pull the train jointly, they are conjoined, but not confused. The steam is distinct from and in addition to the locomotive. But the locomotive would not pull a pound without the additional steam. So the word has power in it, like the locomotive, but that power would not be exerted if it were not for the steam. But the steam is distinct from and in addition to the locomotive. Even so the word of God has power in it, but that power would never be exerted except the Spirit come in connection with it. The Gospel is God's power unto salvation, as my opponent says, but that power would never be exerted unless the Spirit uses it.

My opponent says I misrepresented him when I said he did not believe that the Spirit is present at all and then contradicted myself by saying that he believed the Spirit is in the word. I see no contradiction. He only believes that the Spirit is in the word as a man is in a letter he may write. The man himself is not there, but his influence is. So he thinks concerning the Spirit. He is in the word in no different sense than the man is in the letter. He himself is not there, only his influence is, the influence of words is there. Such a doctrine rules out the personal presence of the Spirit in conversion.

Mr. Warlick continues to say that "total depravity" means that a man is as bad as the devil. I have told him plainly that Baptists do not so teach. If he will consult any authorities among Baptists he will find his mistake. I have before me as I write Strong's "Systematic Theology," a standard work among Baptists. On page 342 he defines what Baptists mean by "total depravity." It means, says Strong: "Disordered and corrupted in every faculty." I also have before me as I write Boyce's "Systematic Theology" and he defines "total depravity" to mean: "Depraved in every part of his nature." Pendleton in his "Christian Doctrines" says it means "the absence of good." Dr. Boyce explains in a foot note on page 214, that "a glass of water with one drop of poison in it is totally poisoned. But it may become far worse than it is by an increase of the poison." Another explanation Boyce gives on the same page is: "Nor is one so wicked as it is possible for him to be. The doctrine of total depravity does not carry with it this idea. It only teaches that there is depravity in every part of man's nature. The entire or total nature is affected by the depravity." There is no need of further definitions. This will suffice to show that when Mr. Warlick and his people are accusing Baptists of teaching that "total depravity" means that man is by nature as bad as the devil, they accuse wrongly. Then when they jump in and demolish their man of straw they have not touched our position. They can not meet our position, but they do meet their own perversion of our position.

The passages I have quoted abundantly prove the doctrine of total depravity. Paul said plainly: "They that are in the flesh

can not please God." (Rom. 8:8). No use to dodge. If there is any good in a man by nature God would be pleased with that. But since such a man (the natural man) can not please God, it follows that there is an utter absence of good, else God could be pleased with the good in him. The utter absence of good is what Baptists mean by total depravity. So Mr. Warlick's quibble that if man is totally depraved you would have to destroy the man to get rid of the depravity is fully met. Baptists do not teach that man is depravity, but that man is depraved in all his faculties.

My opponent says I said that "flesh" meant depravity. I never said it. I said "flesh" meant the "natural man," the entire man as he is by nature. "Flesh" cannot mean "body," for Paul said: "But ye are not in the flesh." They were in their bodies. Hence "flesh" does not mean the body. But how is it, says my opponent, that the children of Christians do not inherit the Christian nature? The answer is that our new nature, given to us in the new birth, did not destroy the old nature. There are two natures in every Christian. One serves the Lord, and the other, the outer man serves sin. Paul said that these two natures kept up a constant war so that with the "flesh" he served sin while in the inward man he served the Lord (Rom. 7:15-23). This inner man, which serves the Lord, is spoken of in Eph. 3:16; 1 Pet. 3:4, and both the outer and inner man are spoken of in 2 Cor. 4:16. This inner man is called the "new man" in Eph. 4:24. This "new man," which is a thing of the heart (1 Pet. 3:4), does not beget children because it came into existence by a grafting process and a graft never does reproduce itself. Jas. 1:21, says the word "engrafted" and a graft never produces seed that will produce fruit like it. If you plant the seed out of a grafted apple it will not come up a tree that will produce another apple like the one from which the seed was taken, but on the contrary, the seed out of the grafted apple will produce a scrub of inferior grade. A seed out of a grafted Elberta peach will not produce another Elberta, but a scrub peach instead. Since, therefore, the Christian is a Christian because the word is "engrafted" into him his "engrafted" nature will not reproduce itself. The seed of all grafted fruit produces trees that will not bear grafted fruit unless they are or themselves also grafted, and since the Lord used the grafting as an illustration of how we are saved, I can understand how the seed of Christians will not produce another Christian.

Mr. Warlick's reference to the girls (for the purpose of creating prejudice) is answered by the fact that outward acts of sin are only expressions of the state of the heart. If he will show me a girl who never had an evil thought or evil inclination that she needs to keep under, then there will be some point to his reference.

Mr. Warlick says that "phusis," the Greek word for nature, has no secondary meaning. Then it means: "Natural birth, Gal. 2:1-5; natural disposition, propensity, Eph. 2:3; native qualities, or properties, Jas. 3:7." (See Hinds & Noble Lexicon, and I have quoted verbatim). If this definition is correct, then the Bible plainly says: "We are by natural birth the children of wrath even as others." Mr. Warlick denies this, but in doing it he denies the Bible. Liddell

& Scott's Unabridged Lexicon lies open before me as I write and this, the greatest of Lexicons says: "The nature, i. e., the essence, inborn quality, property or constitution of a person or thing—one's natural inborn powers, parts, temper or disposition." Mr. Warlick says it has no secondary meaning. Then it means that "we are by inborn quality or disposition the children of wrath." If that is not hereditary depravity, what is it?

Mr. Warlick does not know what Paul wanted the people to pray for him for, but he thinks it was not for a direct impact of the Spirit. Well, think again. Paul had the word, he had oratory, he had logic, but he needed more. What else is it unless it was the accompanying power of the Holy Ghost? No need for prayer if he already had all the power with him; he needed. We pray for daily bread, says Mr. Warlick, but do not expect God to send the bread down already cooked. Exactly. Thank you for the illustration. We do pray for bread. We then do all we can to produce the bread. Then God does his part by giving strength to the soil, and he gives the rain to the soil, and the result is bread. So we preach and ask God to do the rest. What is it that God does in connection with our preaching? He sends the Holy Spirit in addition to the word and the result is souls are saved. This is in perfect harmony with the Bible idea. In 1 Cor. 3:6-7: "I have planted and Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." What is the planting and the watering? It is preaching as all must admit. But, in addition to the word preached, God gives the soil (the heart) power to produce and bear fruit. No farmer ever raised a crop except by such a partnership with God. No preacher will ever be a winner of souls except he preach and God put forth power in addition to the preaching in the conviction of the sinner in order to his salvation.

The "hand of God is upon all them that seek him" (Ezra. 8:22), my opponent thinks I am guessing when I say that it is direct impact. I have shown how a man is born of the Spirit and asked how one can be born without coming into a personal contact with that of which he is born, and Mr. Warlick says I guess at it. Well, tell us how, please. Mr. Warlick demands the verse where the Spirit actually touches the heart in conviction. I gave it in my last, but he forgot to comment upon it. It is 2 Cor. 3:3: "Ye are the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of God: not on tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." Paul was the pen, Jesus was the writer, the Spirit was the ink, and the heart was the paper. As sure as the ink touches the paper to make an impression, so sure does the Spirit touch the human heart in producing his salvation, no matter how many means are used to bring it to pass.

All those passages which he has quoted to show that the word, the gospel, preaching, etc., used in conviction and conversion, I most heartily accept. But not the word only. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation, but God himself by the Spirit exercises the power—uses the word—in saving men. The Spirit is just as certainly there as is the word. My opponent says Lydia's heart was opened by the preaching, but the inspired writer says: "Whose

heart the Lord opened that she attended to the preaching of Paul. Who are you going to believe, Paul or Mr. Warlick? This disposes of all he has said and more besides and I shall offer a few more advance arguments:

Acts 11:20: "They spake to the Grecians and the hand of the Lord was with them." Here is preaching and in addition to the word was the "hand of the Lord." So always, where any good is done.

2 Thess. 2:13: "Sanctification of the Spirit and the belief of the truth." Here the work of the Spirit comes first as we see always.

1 Pet. 1:2: "Sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience." As ever we see the Spirit in the word before anything is accomplished. The word for "obedience" is "hupakoen," which means 'hearkening,' thus showing that the sinner can not hear (understand) without the aid of the Spirit. This necessitates the conjoining of the word and the Spirit as my proposition demands. But this is sufficient.

MR. WARLICK'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

Mr. Bogard should not complain at my refusing to address the moderators in this written debate, until he is able to tell who they are. I do not know their names, and so will not play sham.

The difference between the Missionaries and Hardshells on this question is, that the Hardshells are consistent. They believe in the direct operation of the Holy Ghost in converting sinners, and they make their actions consistent with that belief. The Missionaries say they believe the same thing, and yet they try when denying the plain teaching of the Bible on the subject, like my friend is doing in this discussion, to claim that there is another operation which is by means. So they send missionaries to the heathen to convert them.

My friend shall not get away from the fact that he has defined the word of God out of his proposition by using the prefix "con" in defining his terms. He said in defining, he meant by the words distinct from, not confused with. He quotes Webster, but does not seem to understand his author. Webster says he means by the word "distinct," "Separate in place, not conjunct, not connected by growth or otherwise." Syn—**Separate, Unconnected, Disjoined.** Mr Bogard quotes Webster as his authority for what he means by the term "distinct from", so I shall insist that he stand by his man, and if he does, he will have to give up all means in the conversion of the sinner, and go back to the Hardshells. Remember Webster says the word and the spirit shall not be connected in any way, but unconnected, disjoined. My friend's illustration of the two horses pulling the same load, but separated by the wagon tongue, is not his but mine. I have open before me Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, and he does not support, but actually denies what Mr. Bogard has quoted him to prove. He says any two things which are distinct can in no way be "conjoined," so my friend can not dodge by using this word. Come out in the open, Mr. Bogard, and stand on the old position, and say that you believe the Holy Ghost converts sinners immediately, that is, without media. This is what you teach. Confess it and be done with it. My friend's last illustration kills him dead. I should like for him to say whether the machinery of the engine pulls the train distinct from the steam, or whether the steam pulls the train distinct from the engine. If the engine without the steam represents the word, then there is a dead word without power. Paul says the word of God is quick and powerful, and he also says it is God's power to save. Rom. 1:16. My friend's dead locomotive is not the word of God. It may be the Baptist doctrine, but it can not in any sense be God's doctrine. The truth is, God's locomotive contains the steam, and is never without it. The steam of the locomotive brings to bear on the load, all of the power it uses, through the machinery of the engine, and never in a direct or distinct way. Is my friend not able to see this? I

am surprised that a man, when trying to prove the direct work of the Holy Ghost on sinners, will illustrate by steam in an engine as if he thought the steam could ever effect anything when not connected with the engine. Remember, Mr. Bogard, you have by the use of the word "con" in your definition extracted all the steam from the engine and you are trying to pull the load without the engine. My engine is always full of steam. Christ said: "I will be with you always." The steam is always in the engine, but it never operates without the engine, nor in any way except through the engine. Mr. Bogard, why don't you give this proposition up? Do you not see you are forever stranded? I am sure your readers see it.

When Mr. Bogard says that I believe the Spirit is not in the word, but only His influence is there, he misstates me again. The Spirit is always present in the word, but he exerts his influence upon the heart always and only through the word to convert sinners.

On the question of total depravity, my friend dies hard. He is forced to know that his own illustrations, as well as the doctrine he has always taught, makes the sinner as bad as the devil. Depraved means corrupt, and total means the entire sum or amount. Now, if such be the sinner's condition, then there is nothing in him but depravity so if you remove the depravity you will remove the man and leave nothing to be saved at all. My friend's quotations from Baptists will do him no good, after saying what he does in this discussion.

Dr. Jarrel says that every unregenerate person has "one devil in him." He also says the unregenerate one "is the child of hell." Mr. Bogard says that the unregenerate one is in the flesh and that he is possessed of nothing that is pleasing to God. If he be correct in this, then the sinner, depraved totally, can have no good in him at all, for that would be pleasing to God. How much worse can the devil be than this? Take the medicine, Mr. Bogard, you measured the dose yourself.

Remember you are the man who has the position to the effect that the sinner is in the flesh, that he has no good thing in him, and that he can not please God. Of course you are wrong in your effort to interpret Paul's language in the case, but this is your mistake, not mine. Paul has no reference to the sinner as distinguished from the Christian when he uses the language my friend quotes. I have shown this abundantly in a former article. I need do no more than mention it here.

My friend's illustration about the word being grafted into the heart of the sinner, and that the graft does not bring the seed, in order to get out of his trouble about the condition of the child of the Christian parent, gets him in bad sure enough. He says the tree that comes from the seed of this graft would be scrubby. Now, the word of God, he thinks, is equivalent to Baptist doctrine, for he thinks that Baptist doctrine is scriptural and this is the graft, so I suppose we are to understand that the people converted by sowing the Baptist doctrine as seed are a scrubby set? Are the Baptists readers ready for this conclusion? It is what your man said now, and you must

not get out of humor with him. He is in a close place. Excuse him. Paul's outer man and inner man have no reference to what my friend uses them for. I hardly think that any of our readers will believe that Paul served sin in his body all the time. Was Paul an adulterer? Did he in no way control his body? He said he kept it under, and if he did he did not serve sin with it. My opponent does not get the meaning of the apostle here. On the word **phusis** my friend loses everything. I have shown that the word in the lexicons means simply habit, practice, as used by Paul in Eph. 2d chapter. Dr. Thayer, who is the very best authority on New Testament Greek, says it means "a mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature." Dr. Groves says the same. Liddell and Scott say that it means "that which results from growth." Paul said the people of whom he spake in this case, were, at the time they were by nature children of wrath, "walking according to the course of this world." I have asked Mr. Bogard whether his children were born walking and he does not answer.

Again my friend wants to know why Paul would have the people pray for him? I answer that the word of God might have free course with the people. That Paul might do his work well. But for my friend's position, Paul should have requested the people to pray for God to do his part in sending the Holy Ghost down into the hearts of the folks, distinct from and in addition to what Paul was able to do in preaching the gospel which he said is the power of God to save.

What God does, in giving us bread, is done through operative law, not by miracle, and He always uses means to bring it to pass. He does not give us bread in a direct way, Mr. Bogard. Not distinct from, that is, independent of means, see?

Paul planted, Apollos watered, God gave the increase, but how? That is the question? I answer, by accepting the work of the hands of His apostles, and adding to the church those who were being saved by the gospel which they preached. No direct work in conversion here.

The hand of the Lord is upon all them that seek him is true indeed, but how? Direct? No, never. God's hand is over all, He does, but he does not compel by direct touch, if He did, He alone would be responsible for the loss of every soul that goes to hell.

The writing of the truth on the hearts of the people was through the ministry of the apostles, not direct, Mr. Bogard. I am surprised that you try to use 2 Cor. 3:3.

The Lord did open Lydia's heart, but Christ promised Paul in Acts 26:18 that He would open the hearts of the people by his preaching. I ask, in the language of my friend, whom shall we believe, Christ or Mr. Bogard? If Christ was loyal to what He promised Paul, He certainly did not open Lydia's heart by direct impact. But my friend's position does not only force him to go back on the Lord's word, but it would compel Christ to do the same.

Acts 11:20: "The hand of the Lord was with them." But it happens that the hand of the Lord was with the preachers in this case, and not with the sinners to convert them. This is my passage, Mr.

Bogard. 2 Thess. 2:13: "Through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth." This is also my scripture. The sanctifying is by the spirit, through the truth, and not direct. Does not Christ say in John 17:17 that sanctification is through the truth? Read it and be convinced. "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." On the passage from Peter my friend says that the Greek supports his doctrine, in which he declares that the sinner can not hear, unless the spirit in a direct way enables him to hear. He is wrong again. Moses said that if the people would not hear they should be condemned, and now Mr. Bogard says that God will condemn the sinner and send him to hell, for not hearing that which he could not hear except God enable him to do so by the direct work of the Spirit. I told you that my friend's doctrine blames God with the damnation of all the lost. Here is a man born into the world totally depraved. He is blind, deaf and dead. He can not hear, think or speak. God says if you do not hear, I will send you to hell, when He knows the sinner can not hearken? God refuses to give the sinner the ability, and then sends him to hell for not doing that which he could not do, and he too not responsible for his nature. Reader did ever the devils of hell dream of such infamous doctrine as this? But you must believe it or get away from my friend's doctrine and church.

Having now noticed and effectively turned against him all that Mr. Bogard has said, or can say, in favor of his proposition, and discovering the fact that he is not in mind to notice any of the counter arguments I made in a former article, I shall try him on some others. I wish he would try, however, to reconcile the great number of passages I gave him in other articles, with his position. I do not hope for him to try it, but I wish the readers to note the fact that he refuses.

If we take into our study the story of the creation of the material world, together with the matter of how everything in nature is perpetuated, we are at once convinced of the fallacy of the position of the Baptists as contended for by Mr. Bogard on this question. It took a miracle to create the things of the world, but in the 11th verse of the first chapter of Genesis God said: "Let the earth bring forth seed, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth and it was so." Here we are informed that the things of the material world were to be perpetuated by means of seed, not by miracle. That within everything is implanted the means of self perpetuation. The word of God is the seed of the Kingdom, says the Savior, and it therefore has within it the means of self-perpetuation. Conversion is no more a miracle nor is it any more the result of any direct touch of God, than is the sprouting and growing of the trees of the forest.

Christ said in John 17:8, speaking of His Apostles: "I have given them the word which Thou gavest me." This He said in His prayer to His Father. In John 6:68 we are informed that these words are the words of eternal life. These words were given of God to Christ, and Christ gave them to His apostles, and they de-

livered them to men. Jesus said in John 17:20: "I pray for those who shall believe on me through their word." Christ did not pray for the man who was made to believe by Mr. Bogard's direct work of the Spirit, but for those who were made believers by the gospel.

Christ promised His disciples that when the Holy Ghost came He would reprove the world of sin. When He came, He did that, but in no other way than by the words of the apostles. "When they heard this (what the apostles said) they were pricked in the heart." Thus convicted by the words. Acts 2:37.

In Acts 19:1-4 Paul asked the Ephesians whether they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed, not in order to make them believe. He said to the Galatians, Gal. 3:1, "Received you the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith." He says that the Spirit of His son is sent into the hearts because we are sons, not to make us sons. Gal. 4:6.

Abraham told the rich man that if his brethren would not hear Moses and the prophets, they would not believe though one should rise from the dead. Luke 16. But time would fail me if I were to undertake to present all the truth on this question. It is a noticeable fact that every scripture is mine, all being on my side, while Mr. Bogard does not have a single passage which he can by any sort of twisting make fit his position. I have asked him, and now I beg him again to present in his next and last article one chapter, one part of a chapter, one verse, yea even one part of a verse in all the Book of God that hints at his doctrine on this subject?

Here is where your proposition is crying out for your help, my friend, and you should be in haste to come to its rescue. Remember we are not asking for the verse which says the Spirit operates; we admit this to begin with. What we want is the passage which you can not find, and that is one which says or even intimates that the Spirit in convicting and converting sinners, does its work direct. Come to the fainting, failing, fading, falling proposition which you are affirming in this discussion, and save it if you can. Your friends are anxious that you present the passage called for; let us have it in your last?

MR. BOGARD'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am not "playing sham" when I address the moderators for when we agreed to, as nearly as possible, reproduce the oral debate, I understood it to mean such details as this. But this mere difference of opinion does not amount to enough to quarrel over.

Mr. Warlick at first tried to argue as if the Baptists denied the use of means, and took the old hardshell idea of the Spirit working without means, but now he concedes that he was wrong in that only he thinks we are inconsistent in holding such a doctrine. Why did he not say so at the first instead of making the wild statements he did about us denying the use of means? The only object he could have had was to darken counsel by false charges.

My friend says that Webster says that "distinct" means "separate, unconnected, disjoined." Certainly. That is one of the meanings. But not the meaning as used by me. Webster says another meaning is: "Clear, plain, unconfused. Now the last meaning is the sense in which I use it. Mr. Warlick knows that there are several uses of almost any word. If I were asked if I believed that the Spirit worked apart from the word, separate in place, and not connected in any sense, I should without any hesitation say I do not so believe. But if asked if I believe the Spirit's work is "distinct" in the sense of being clear, plain, unconfused, I should answer that I most certainly do. A debater has a right to define his terms, but it seems Mr. Warlick is determined to define mine for me. Webster gives two meanings of "distinct." Mr. Warlick quotes one and tries to make it appear that the one he quotes is the sense in which I use the word. I give the other meaning as given by Webster and tell him plainly that I use the word in that sense. This will satisfy all who wish to understand.

He asks me which pulls the train; the locomotive or the steam? I answer neither alone. The train is pulled by the joint work of the locomotive and the steam. The locomotive is dead to be sure, if there is no steam and the word is dead if the Spirit is not in it. Mr. Warlick has not produced the verse which says that the personal spirit is in the word all the time and he can not do so. If the Spirit was in the word all the time it would have the same power all the time, but we know it does not. There are times when the preaching of the word does not influence men and at other times it does. If the Spirit is in the word all the time, why this difference in the power? No passage has been given which shows the Spirit resides in the word. If such a passage exists you may be sure my astute friend would have quoted it. He thinks the Spirit is in the word as a man is in a letter he may write. The personal spirit is not in the word any more than the man person is in the letter he writes, but an influence of the Spirit is in the word as the influence of the man is in the letter. Mr. Warlick's idea rules the personal work of the Spirit out entirely.

He puts it a little different in his last. He says: "The Spirit is always present in the word, but exerts his influence upon the heart only through the word." I thought you believed something like that. He thinks the Spirit himself does not touch the sinner in his conversion. He influences him by words only. But my friend has not yet told us how a man can be born of a thing and not come into personal contact with it and I do not believe he can do so. The Bible says we are born of the Spirit, and I again ask how a birth can be a real birth and not have a personal contact? Mr. Warlick could have left off some of his ridicule and made an effort at answering this question, but he chose the other course for reasons that are apparent.

Mr. Warlick refuses to accept the definition as given by Baptists themselves as to what they mean by "total depravity." He still says we mean by it that a man is as bad as the devil. I simply deny it; and since I have given the definitions as given by our standard writers, it is enough for any honorable man. Mr. Warlick can make a better show fighting what he says total depravity is than he can fighting what Baptists say it is. But what Baptists mean when they say total depravity is the Baptist doctrine, and not what Mr. Warlick says they mean. Are we not to be allowed to explain what we mean by the use of terms? Must we go to Mr. Warlick and ask him what we mean when we use theological terms? Do we not know what we mean when we say "total depravity?" With one voice we tell you that we do not mean that a man is as bad as the devil. We do mean that the total man is inclined to evil. If Mr. Warlick can not meet the doctrine itself, then let him, like a man, acknowledge it and not continue to misrepresent us.

Yes, Paul kept his body under. That proved it needed to be kept under. Paul says we are "by nature the children of wrath" and "nature" in the Greek is "phusis" which means "inborn quality," "disposition," and while its secondary meaning is 'custom,' yet the habit had to become so fixed that it became a part of the man. I ask again a question, Mr. Warlick, so far has forgotten to answer, why the entire human race fell into the habit of sin if there was no natural disposition in men to sin? Is it not strange that not a man has escaped? If it is just as easy to live without sin as it is to sin, why has not at least one person in all the earth been found who has not sinned? Everybody knows who knows anything about the Bible or human nature either, that there is an inherent disposition in every man to sin. That is what Baptists mean by depravity.

Why did Paul want the people to pray for him? Mr. Warlick answers correctly when he says that it was that "the word of God might have free course and abound." Exactly. But I thought you had just been saying that "all the power was already in the word." If so, then what could the Lord do in addition? When you answer that question you will see that a power in addition to the word is used in the evangelization of the world. If you acknowledge that, then my proposition is proved. God gives bread in answer to prayer. Man uses means, but God does something in addition to what the man does—He gives the rain to the soil and the warmth to the

soil and He causes the seed to germinate and grow and the result is bread. The seed never would sprout and grow if power outside of itself was not brought to bear upon both the seed and the soil. So the seed, or the word, never will save unless a direct work of the Spirit is brought to bear upon both the word (seed) and the soil (heart). This is God's illustration and not mine. This is exactly what Baptists believe. The Hardshells believe that the power is brought upon the soil (heart) without any seed, and the followers of Alex. Campbell believe the seed is put into the soil with nothing to help it and without anything else except what is already in the seed, that there will be a crop. Both are wrong. Baptists are right in taking the Bible idea that seed (word) is sown into the soil (heart) and then a power in addition to the seed is brought to bear upon the seed and the soil and the work is done. If this is not true, we need a new Bible.

If Mr. Warlick can conceive of ink making any impression on paper without any actual contact with the paper, then he may see how the Holy Spirit can be to the heart as ink to paper without coming into actual contact (2 Cor. 3:3). No matter how many means are used, the point is that the Spirit touches the heart of the sinner in his conversion as surely as the ink touches the paper. The Lord did not say that Paul's preaching would open hearts. He was sent to open eyes as an instrument, but I do not deny the use of means. The Spirit worked with Paul and "opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles" (Acts 14:27). It is with the heart men believe and if the door of faith was opened by the Lord that they might believe then the Lord opened the heart of Lydia and the rest that they attended unto the things spoken by Paul. The heart is the door opened.

Mr. Warlick seems to think that because the "hand of the Lord was with them," that is to say, with the preachers in addition to their preaching (Acts 11:20), that this proves nothing for me. Did the "hand of the Lord" in addition to the preaching have any influence on the people who heard the preaching? Certainly. Then there was a power of the Spirit in addition to the word that was used in the conviction and conversion of sinners.

2 Thess. 2:13 says: "Sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." But Mr. Warlick changes it and says it means sanctification of the spirit through the truth. Mark you, a Christian is sanctified through the truth. But this is not the sanctification of a Christian, but says the writer: "God hath chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth." Sanctification means to "set apart." So we were "chosen to salvation by being set apart by the spirit and belief of the truth." The Hardshells say the Spirit does it all, and Mr. Campbell's disciples say the word does it all. But Baptists say the Spirit and the word do the work. I can not allow you to change the Bible to suit your theory, Mr. Warlick, without calling attention to it.

Mr. Warlick thinks that since God must give the sinner the power to hear that if the sinner does not hear then God is to blame and the sinner goes to hell because God would not allow him to

hear. But it happens that God does give the sinner power to hear, but He does not force him to hear. Enabling power is one thing and force is another thing. Hardshells believe God forces sinners to hear and Mr. Campbell's disciples think God does nothing for them at all. Baptists believe God enables them to hear, but allows them to do their own hearing. No difficulty here, my friend.

Mr. Warlick's advance negative arguments are amusing to a Bible student. He tells us God created all things and then gave them the power to reproduce themselves. Exactly. But nothing has the power to reproduce something contrary to its nature. If a graft is put into a tree which is different from the tree, the fruit from the graft will be good, but that tree can not reproduce another tree of the nature of the graft. Since the saving of our souls is a grafting of the word—putting into us something that we do not have by nature—we can not reproduce that in our children. Hence Christian parents can not beget children who are by nature Christians. Mr. Warlick's ridicule about Baptist children being "scrubs" only belittles him and does not hurt me so I let it go. If Baptist doctrine was the seed that produced natural children there would be some point to Mr. Warlick's foolishness. But Baptist doctrine, nor any other doctrine, can beget a fleshly child. It takes a different sort of seed to do that. The natural seed of Baptists produces a natural child and since our salvation is not a thing of nature, but the result of grafting in the word, then it follows that our natural children are not born Christians. Mr. Warlick is a splendid hand at ridicule, a thing that is contrary to the rules of honorable controversy, and when he can't meet an argument he proceeds to ridicule. Baptist doctrine (the truth) is the seed that produces Christians, but Baptist doctrine is not the fleshly seed that begets babies. Baptist doctrine engrafted in a man will make a Christian of him, but that salvation can not be passed on down to the Christian's children by natural birth. But unsaved men have nothing righteous about them, and since they beget children according to their nature. Their nature is a depraved nature, hence they beget depraved children, inclined to evil, and so soon as they get old enough to act for themselves they all do sin and that is additional proof that they have a nature that inclines them to sin. Thank you, Mr. Warlick, for your nature illustration. But you are mistaken when you say that there is nothing like a miracle in regeneration, I know you believe that God dishonoring doctrine, but the Bible is against you on it. In the first place we are saved by the word being engrafted. A graft never did put itself into a tree. It always takes power outside of itself to get the graft into the tree. So it takes power outside the word and in addition to the word to get the word into our very being so that we may bear the fruits of righteousness. If Mr. Warlick says that the word itself is that which has received the graft, then he runs in the face of all standard commentators in the world. Matthew Henry says it means that the "word has been engrafted into our souls." So say all. If Mr. Warlick denies it he denies the opinion of the ripest scholarship of the world. If the word is engrafted, there is a miracle. 1 Pet. 2:2 says we are "new born babes."

2 Cor. 5:17 says "if any man be in^{*} Christ he is a new creature; old things have passed away and behold all things have become new." O, no, says Mr. Warlick; it is the same old man just doing different. There had been no real miraculous change. Why will he thus flatly deny God's word?

Mr. Warlick quotes a number of passages which say that we believe through the word and that Christ gave the word to the disciples, and they in turn passed it on down to others, and how that when the people heard the word they were pricked in the heart, etc. All this I most steadfastly believe. All Baptists so believe, but not the word only. The Spirit works with the word.

Then my friend quotes where nobody can receive the Spirit except Christians and they received the Spirit "because they were sons" and not to make them sons. All this I most steadfastly believe. No sinner receives the Spirit. Nobody but children of God, saved people, receive the Spirit. All Baptists believe this. That is why they say Cornelius was a Christian before he was baptized (Acts 10:43-48). He received the Spirit before he was baptized and, as Mr. Warlick says, nobody but "sons" receive the Spirit. I am glad he put that in at this point because you are going to hear him say before this debate ends that Cornelius received the Spirit before he became a Christian.

Then do I contradict myself when I say that only sons or Christians receive the Spirit and then say that the Spirit operates on the sinner in his conversion? Not a bit of it. The Spirit operating on a sinner is a different thing from the sinner receiving the Spirit. The miraculous operation of the Spirit brings salvation and the sinner thus operated upon and becoming a new creature in Christ Jesus, so soon as he is made alive by the operation of the Spirit he receives the Spirit as comforter and guide. So Mr. Warlick will have to try again.

Mr. Warlick says that if I am correct about Paul's statement, that they who "are in the flesh can not please God," then it would follow that there is no good in a sinner at all. Certainly, that is what I have been telling you all the time. The utter absence of good is what we mean by total depravity, and not that the man is as low in the degree of badness as he can be. Glad you now see it. But, says Mr. Warlick, Paul by "flesh" was not trying to show the difference between a Christian and a sinner. Why, then, did he say the Christian was "not in the flesh?" (Rom. 8:9).

Mr. Warlick asks if children are born walking? No. Paul did not say that the "children of wrath" had to walk to become children of wrath. He said they "were by nature children of wrath," where-in they also walked—children of wrath first and then walked as such. (Eph. 2:3).

A Brief Review of What Has Been Proved:

Eccl. 8:4: "The hearts of the sons of men fully set to do evil." Webster says "heart" means "the seat of the affections and passions, emotions, will, spirit, energy, ^{TLC} power, resolution, conscience." Then it follows that all the intelligent part of man is bent on evil. Mr.

Warlick has made no reply to this. This one passage is sufficient to prove the doctrine of the entire man being depraved—total depravity.

That the Spirit actually touches the heart like the ink touches the paper has been proved. 2 Cor. 3:3.

That prayer brings something from God that is not in the word, if not, there would be no need of prayer. 2 Thess. 3:1.

That in being born of the Spirit there is of necessity a personal contact for a thing must be in contact with that of which it is born. Joh. 3:3-8.

We have seen that the gospel is God's power to salvation, but the Spirit—operates the power.

Thus the matter stands, and what we have written must be met before the bar of public opinion and before the bar of God. I have no reply to anything my friend may say in his next speech and if he does not introduce new arguments or new scriptures I will have no need to reply. Mr. Warlick says I am defeated. He thinks he must tell you for you never would have suspected it if he had not told you.

MR. WARLICK'S FOURTH NEGATIVE.

I am willing to quit the quarrel with Mr. Bogard on the matter of his addressing the "imaginary moderators." I have tried to get the names of the gentlemen, but he will not give them, so I shall pass it up as another Baptist dream which has no real foundation in fact.

I have never taken two positions as to what the Baptists believe on the matter now under discussion; my friend has, however; in fact, he has taken a number of positions on it, for what he says about one passage never agrees with what he says on another one. It is his predicament and not mine. I know that when we get into debates with them on the subject of depravity and the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion, they can not defend their idea for a minute without getting onto the old Baptist platform, and when they try to find means in the conversion of the sinner, they try to screen their position by misstating what our position is, and then appearing to oppose that. But we are concerned in this case only about what appears in the columns of the papers in which this discussion is to occur.

Mr. Bogard says he did not expect to be held responsible for all the meanings of the word "distinct" as given by Webster; he only thought that a garbled extract from that author would be given. He thinks that if he holds to the word "unconfused" he is safe. But Webster does not contradict himself. He says that the word distinct means unconfused, and that this means not "conjoined." The prefix "con" as employed by my friend cuts out all idea of means in the conversion, especially must he never join in any way the Spirit and the word; but this he has tried to do all through the discussion, and it is the very thing which I have kept him from doing and the readers will see it; it is too evident. My friend would like for me to allow him all the dodging ground he can find here, but I shall hold him to the point and to his own definitions of terms. Webster tells him that when he affirms the Holy Spirit operates in a way "distinct from the word," he shall not in any way associate the two influences. They are not confused, are not to be "conjoined."

The engine pulls the train when it contains the steam, but not without it, and the steam can not in any way pull the train except through the machinery of the engine, and this is just what I have contended for all the time; it is what my brethren teach; it is what the Bible teaches, but it is just what my friend denies in the debate. He says the steam must act directly upon the train, and that it is not to be "conjoined" to the engine.

I am willing for the Baptists to define what they mean by total depravity, as long as they use the words in the accepted sense. If they want to dodge, they should not want to give to the words a meaning unknown to the books, and contrary to every use made of them in all the history of these terms. Let them get up some other words which may be twisted into the meaning my friend wants to give these words in this case. Total means the entire sum or

amount. Depravity means corruption. Now, I know and so does everybody, that if the sinner, even the baby, is entirely corrupt, then there is nothing in him but corruption, and I am sure the devil is no worse than this. I know also that if you remove the corruption, you will remove the whole man, and so leave nothing to save. No sort of work to dodge this will avail my friend and his cause. He accepts this result when he says there is nothing in a man by nature that pleases God. If this is true, then there is absolutely nothing in the sinner except sin, corruption or evil. How much worse can the devil be than this? I insist that my friend must cease talking as he does about the sinner, and quit using unequivocal terms to describe his condition, if he wants to palliate the effect of his claims.

Answering Mr. Bogard's question I beg to say that I seriously doubt; in fact, I am certain, that the child does not show evil in its natural composition, any more than it shows good. By nature children do right as often and even more often than they do wrong. By nature they show to be of the right spirit more than of the evil. When they arrive at the age of accountability, and sin, it is the result of temptation, and not of what they inherit of evil from their parents. If Mr. Bogard's idea of the child were true, then it would never smile or laugh, but would cry all the time. It would never tell the truth, but would lie about everything. Pshaw, the idea is ridiculous, but you must accept it if you believe the doctrine of the Baptists on the matter of total depravity and the work of the Spirit in conversion.

When Paul asked his brethren to pray for him, he expected that the effect of the prayer would concern him, and in no way touch except by and through his preaching, the sinner to be saved. He said the gospel was the power for this purpose, and so all he wanted was that the people might have the gospel.

The seed is the word, and it brings the crop, but my friend says it must have sunshine and rain. Sure, but this all comes not by miracle, but through operative law. God says his word is like rain that comes down from heaven, and that it is the light to the feet of all. There is no need for, and God has absolutely no use for that imaginary direct influence of the Spirit which my friend tries to lug into conversion.

When the apostles preached the gospel inspired as they were by the Holy Spirit, and thus converted the people as Paul did at Corinth, the Spirit, did not come in direct contact with the heart, for it was ministered by the apostles. This is the statement of Paul. Why doesn't my friend see it? Does he not see that Paul actually denies his doctrine here? "Written by the Spirit, but ministered by us." My friend surprises me when he says there is the direct work of the Holy Ghost in this passage?

I did not say that the children of Baptist parents were naturally scrubby. I simply showed, by what Mr. Bogard himself had said about the seed from a graft being scrubby, that since the graft is the word of God, and since my friend thinks Baptist doctrine is scriptural and therefore identical with the word on this question, that

converts produced by Baptist doctrine would be scrubby. My friend did not claim that it is not so. But it is his predicament, not mine.

Mr. Bogard wants to know if anyone ever saw a graft put itself into a stock? I suppose not, neither do I think anyone ever knew a graft to beg the stock to get into it, like Mr. Bogard and his people think is true concerning the word of the Lord?

I have shown that the word nature in Eph. does not mean that which we get from our parents, that the word **Phusis** means that which results from growth; that it means habit, practice, custom, and that Paul said when these people were by nature the children of wrath, they were walking according to the course of this world, and that the idea the Baptist have of the case is not only not in the passage, but that Paul clearly cuts their idea out.

Again I ask whether when a man has short hair by nature, does he inherit this from his parents? Does my friend ever have his hair cut? If so, why does he? If his idea of the word nature is true, it would never grow long for nature teaches him that it is a shame for him to have long hair. Well, it is funny to debate with my friend on this question, but he only is responsible for the fun. I do not ridicule as he says. I simply call attention to his ridiculous doctrine.

My friend thinks that every child goes wrong by nature. Wrong again. I am sure that as many children act right, polite and nice by nature as ever do otherwise.

Mr. Bogard thinks the baptism of the Holy Ghost at the house of Cornelius, which was only a miracle and the last one of its kind that ever did occur, is the work of the Spirit in the ordinary way. He thinks this is relief to him on the next question. He is wrong again. Balaam's ass spoke with tongues the same as Cornelius, but I do not think any Baptist church would receive the ass on the experience. Stay with the question in debate always, and you will not get into so much trouble, Mr. Bogard. All our readers can see my friend's contradiction here. It would be impossible for the Holy Spirit to operate effectively by direct work on the sinner without the sinner receiving it. Mr. Bogard is tied here, and he would like for some one to help turn him loose.

When Paul said that the Roman brethren were not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, he said such was the case only upon the condition that they walked after the Spirit and not after the flesh. This shows that Christian people may walk after the flesh the same as sinners and that Mr. Bogard is wrong again as usual.

My friend admits that children are not born walking. Paul says they were walking at the very time they were children of wrath, and this shows that the word nature, as we have before seen, does not mean an inherent quality like Baptists foolishly teach.

My friend's closing is rather pathetic. I have given him so much to do he has no time for summing up. He uses about a dozen lines, some of them short, for his summary. I have taken the few passages he uses away from him so I shall not repeat. He says I claim that I have defeated him, and that I think the people will not see it if I do not tell them. ^{l.} Mistaken again. I know the readers will all see it except Mr. Bogard himself, and since I like him

personally and so much dislike to see him stand alone, I simply thought to call his attention to the fact that he might also see it and admit it too, so he would not be alone in the verdict.

My friend's hint that I may introduce some new arguments is pitiful. The Lord knows I need no new matter. I have given him passage after passage, and but very few of them has he even noticed. I have made many arguments, and he refuses to answer them or even try to do it. Why should I want to try something new now? I shall therefore come to my summary and with it I need not be tedious. I have plenty of space in which to be deliberate but I shall be concise.

We have seen that the position of Mr. Bogard and the Baptists on the question of depravity is not only unscriptural, but is really an insult to all reason. The idea of inherited sin is preposterous. We have shown by the lexicons that they are wrong on the meaning of the word *Phusis*, the word in the Greek for nature in Eph. 2. We have seen that the word means habit, practice and custom in this verse, and have proven it by the verse itself.

Dr. Thayer says the word means that from long habit or custom a thing has become nature or natural to us. On the subject of depravity, we have taken from our friend every passage and every definition he has sought to offer, and turned each one against him. He has tried in places to defend his real position on the subject of depravity, and at other places in the discussion he has sought to screen himself by apologizing for the doctrine, and has even tried to deny that it is as bad as it really is.

On the work of the Holy Spirit in conviction and conversion, Mr. Bogard tried to occupy at least two positions. In the definition of his terms in his opening article, he, quoting from Webster, said that he meant by the word distinct in the proposition, affirming as he had, that the Holy Spirit operates distinct from, not by means of the truth, but "unconfused" with the word. I showed him that by the use of the prefix *con* he cut out the idea of the Spirit operating by the truth, through the truth, on or by and through means of any kind and in any way. This lost to him two-thirds of his matter.

I then showed from Webster that the words distinct from meant separate, not "conjoined." Here Mr. Bogard lost his case completely.

I have handled and turned against him and his people every passage they ever try to use in favor of their position on the work of the Spirit, and run him back into the old Baptist camp. I have been able to prove and have shown that all the scriptures he can use are on my side, and so belong to me. I have called continually for the passage, the verse, the part of a verse which says there is a direct work of the Holy Ghost on the heart of the sinner in conversion. I have not been shown the verse nor has he even tried to find it for me. I then took up the New Testament and showed to be true, that for which the negative contends in this debate. That the Holy Spirit does operate in the conviction and conversion of sinners, but never direct or without means. But that it always uses the truth to convert the soul. I have made plain the fact that the difference between Mr. Bogard and me, and between

the Baptist doctrine here and the Bible is, not whether the Holy Ghost does really operate in the conviction, but how it does it. I have used all the following scriptures to show that I am right and that Mr. Bogard is woefully wrong. I have used many scriptures, but only a few of them need be mentioned here. The readers will know how nicely my friend has passed these up without even a mention of them.

How does the Holy Spirit operate in converting sinners? Mr. Bogard says direct. I say no, but through the word. What is the Bible answer?

1 Cor. 4:15, "Though you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." I say amen. Mr. Bogard says not so, it is by direct impact.

James says (Jas. 1:18): "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth." I say amen. Mr. Bogard and his brethren say it is not true, there is a need for direct work on the heart.

Rom. 1:16, Paul says, "The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." I say good, I will take that. Mr. Bogard says, I will not. There must be a work of the Holy Ghost distinct from the gospel to convert.

David says (Psa. 19:7): "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." I say all right, David, I will take that. Mr. Bogard says, David, you may have been a good singer, but you do not understand the question of how sinners are converted. The law is not perfect. There must be a direct work of the Holy Ghost on the heart before sinners can be converted.

Jas. 1:21: "Receive with meekness the engrafted word which is able to save your souls." I say, well and good, that suits me. Mr. Bogard says it does not suit me, and I will not have it. The word though it be already the engrafted word, can not save the soul. There is a need for the direct or the immediate work of the Holy Ghost.

1 Pet. 1:22-25: "Ye are born again, by incorruptible seed which is the word of God." I say I will take this statement without comment. Mr. Bogard says I must contend for the direct touch in every birth.

Rom. 10:17: "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word." I accept Mr. Bogard rejects.

Acts 15:7: "By my mouth they should hear and believe." I accept. Mr. Bogard rejects.

Christ said in John 17:20: "I pray for them who shall believe on me through the words of the apostles." I accept, and say I am glad I am included in this mention. Mr. Bogard rejects, and says he must have the direct or immediate work in the heart before he can believe. Poor fellow.

Closing, I will appropriate the closing words of my friend, only adding that for the reason that we shall have to give an account for what we have said and taught on this question, I hope he will repent of his mistakes and get right before it is too late for him to do so.

Second Proposition

The Scriptures teach that baptism to the believing penitent, is for (in order to) the remission of past, alien sins.

MR. WARLICK'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE.

With this article we begin a new proposition. I feel that there is need for but little defining, so I shall not spend much time at that.

We mean by the Scriptures, of course, the Bible. By teach we mean simply that the doctrine of the proposition is taught in the Bible. By Baptism we mean what the Savior did, when He told His disciples to baptize those whom they taught, and persuaded, to obey the truth. By the believing penitent we mean the man, who after having believed the truth, repents of his sins, and expresses a desire to be a Christian. We define the word *for*, by the parenthesis *in order to*, which means a condition of. By *past or alien sins* we mean sins of which one is actually guilty before he starts out to live the Christian life.

A want of space as well as a desire to be concise, will prevent rambling about over the whole Bible, calling attention to what might have been necessary as conditions of pardon, under former dispensations, for my opponent agrees with me that Christianity is preeminently a New Testament institution, and so we shall be confined largely if not altogether, to the teaching of that part of the Bible as authority in the discussion of this question. It may be stated also, that as far as I am concerned at least, we shall need only such passages as those found, this side the cross. While there are Scriptures written of things, and of sayings, occurring before Christ died, which we could use, it is not of special importance that we take time with them now. However, we may use any passages which we may certainly know, have reference to the New dispensation.

In 1 Peter 1:1-12 Peter says even the angels desired to look into the things which the apostles preached, as they were inspired by the Holy Ghost. If the angels desired to understand, but were not permitted to know what the conditions of salvation were to be under the gospel, I hardly think we can find out by consulting the teaching of the Old Testament prophets, or of others who spoke before the apostles gave us the message.

The Savior told the apostles that they would need the Holy Ghost in order that they might remember what He wanted to give out to others. If the Lord was not willing to risk these apostles, who had been with Him very closely for more than three years, with the responsibility of giving out the conditions of salvation under the new order, I hardly think he would be willing for us to try to find the conditions, until the apostles had given them to us; preaching as they did with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven. It is certain-

ly not possible for even Mr. Bogard and myself to select from the teaching of Christ during His lifetime just what He was expecting His disciples to teach, aided as He promised they would be, by **Ple nary Inspiration.**

But Paul tells us that the "Great Salvation" which he, and others preached, was first spoken by the Lord, and that it was confirmed unto us by them who heard Him speak it. Peter also says that the word of the Lord in which peace is preached by Jesus Christ began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached." In these two passages, taken from Heb. 2 and Acts 10, we have reference to the Great Commission given by our Lord after He arose from the dead. This commission is recorded by three of the Evangelists, Matt. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16; Luke 24:44-47 * * * * * In the Commission, as given by the three writers, we find Faith, Repentance and Baptism as conditions of Salvation. These items we represent by the initial letters.

Matt. 28:19-20 X — X — B — X

Mark 16:15-16 B — X — B — S

Luke 24:44-47 X — R — X — S

Here the Lord met His disciples in Galilee and gave them His parting blessing, and told them to tarry in Jerusalem until they received the power necessary to carry the message to the people.

In this commission we have certain conditions named as necessary to the forgiveness of sins or to the remission of sins, which means simply the pardoning of all past offenses. Not salvation in the ultimate sense, but simply remission of sins.

In Matthew we are told that the Lord said unto the disciples: "Go teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Mark makes it more full in his statement, when he says the Lord said: "Go preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: he that believeth not, shall be damned." Luke's language is different from the others, but is in perfect harmony with them. He says the Lord said unto them, "Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Putting these three statements of the commission together, we have Faith, Repentance and Baptism, clearly declared to be conditions of salvation to the man out of Christ. While Matthew does not say that the baptism of which he speaks is a condition, Mark declares it is, and Luke mentions the only other condition not mentioned by either Matthew or Mark, when he says repentance must also be preached.

It may be remarked just here that while neither Matthew, nor Luke, mentions the necessity of faith as a condition, and Matthew does not say that repentance is necessary, Mark declares that faith is a condition and Luke says repentance is important. Thus faith is mentioned by only one of them, while two of them take the pains to mention baptism, not that it is of more importance than either faith or repentance, but that it is of equal importance, and

should not be discriminated against as it sometimes is. I have thought perhaps the reason the Lord had baptism mentioned twice while He had the other two mentioned only once each, was because He knew that there would be people in the world sometime who would say that baptism was not necessary like faith and repentance are, and hence He took pains with the matter, and had the recorder specially mention the importance of baptism. It is also noticeable that we do not have to imagine its place nor purpose, for Mark represents the Savior as saying that it is necessary to salvation. Hear him. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Not "he that believeth and is saved may be baptized," as some seem to think, but "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now such is the very doctrine, and almost the precise language of my proposition, therefore, to believe and accept fully just what the Lord said, is to believe and accept fully just what I am now affirming. While to deny the proposition is tantamount to denying just what the Lord taught in the Commission as given in Mark. Please read the statement: "And He said unto them, Go preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." Could anything be plainer? Why, it is plainer—if possible, than my proposition, and in doctrine it is precisely like the proposition. Here I could rest my case and be satisfied.

But we have seen that this Commission is what the Savior gave to His disciples, and so it only remains for us to see whether they carried it out. Paul tells us in Heb. 2 that what the Savior said in the Commission to them, they confirmed unto us. Did they do it? We shall see.

The first recorded case of conversion, under this commission, is in Acts, the second chapter. It was on the day of Pentecost. After the Holy Ghost, in keeping with the promise of the Master had come upon them, and they were inspired by it, we learn that Peter the principal speaker on the occasion, stood up with the eleven and corrected an impression under which the people present seemed to be laboring, as an explanation of why the apostles could speak in new tongues. He declared that the gift with which they were possessed was only a fulfillment of prophecy, and he quoted Joel to show that it was so. He then said: "Let all the House of Israel know assuredly (that is, believe without doubt) that God had made this same Jesus whom they had slain, both Lord and Christ." When they heard this they were pricked in their hearts and cried unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, saying: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter answered them by saying: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here the apostle taught exactly what we find in the Commission—faith, repentance and baptism—all for the remission of sins.

The next case is in Acts 8:12. This is where Phillip went down to Samaria and held his meeting there. In the 12th verse it is said, "When they believed Phillip's preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were

baptized, both men and women." What did Christ say in the Commission? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The Samaritans believed and were baptized, and were therefore saved under and by the Commission which promises salvation to the baptized believer.

The third case we notice is that of the Ethiopian Eunuch, Phillip having accepted his invitation to ride with him in his chariot, was preaching unto him Jesus. We are told that as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water, when the Eunuch said: "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Phillip answered: "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." The Eunuch said: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Acts 8:37. Upon this, Phillip at once baptized him. Was he not also saved under the Commission which says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved?" He was, and so Phillip's teaching in these two cases, both of which are found in Acts the 8th chapter, was as Paul afterward allowed, a confirmation of the doctrine which Christ taught when He gave the commission.

In the 10th chapter of Acts we have the account of the conversion of Cornelius and his family. They also believed and were baptized and were therefore saved under the Commission. The same is true of the Corinthians, in Acts 18:7, who, when they heard Paul preach, believed and were baptized. Of the Ephesians, in Acts 19:1-4, the same may be said. They also believed and were baptized. The jailer's case in Acts 16 is another case in point. It is expressly stated that he believed and was baptized. The last case we shall notice is that of Saul, to whom Annanias said: "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." In each case the believers were baptized, and therefore were saved and all saved alike, and in perfect keeping with the doctrine of Christ as given in the Commission in Mark 16:15-16. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

MR. BOGARD'S FIRST NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The passages introduced by Mr. Warlick to prove that baptism is necessary to salvation do not teach what he thinks they do. I shall show that they are in my favor and against his proposition.

Mark 16:16 he thinks is a sure thing in his favor. First, I will call attention to the fact that it is regarded by the best scholars as an interpolation and is not really a part of the Scriptures. To base a doctrine on a doubtful passage is poor business. But allowing that it is the Lord's word it still does not help Mr. Warlick's position. There is the emphatic statement that only those who believe not shall be damned. If that is true, then no believer will be lost and since we believe before we are baptized it follows that we are saved before baptism. Nobody but unbelievers will be damned and if that is so, then Paul was right when he told the jailor to believe on Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and all are wrong who say the believer is still unsaved. If nobody is saved except those who are baptized and nobody is lost except unbelievers, it would follow that a believer who had not been baptized could not go to heaven or hell either. He could not go to heaven because he had not been baptized and he could not go to hell because he is a believer. Where then can such an one go at death? This passage must therefore be interpreted in harmony with other plain passages and when this is done we find salvation comes at faith.

Acts 2:38 is thought by Mr. Warlick to teach the necessity of baptism to salvation. To be baptized "for the remission of sins" is like a man who laughs for joy, or weeps for sorrow, or is hanged for murder. A man does laugh for joy, but not in order to get joy; he does weep for sorrow, but not in order to get sorrow; a man is hanged for murder, but not in order for him to murder. So a man is baptized for remission of sins, but not in order to get the remission of his sins. When we say a man laughs for joy we mean he laughs on account of joy and when he is baptized for remission of sins it is on account of remission of sins.

The Commission as given by Matthew does not teach that baptism is a condition of salvation. "Go teach all nations, baptizing them," by our best scholars is explained as follows: Go make disciples of the nations and then baptize the disciples. But a disciple is a Christian for Jesus said (Luke 14:26-27) that a disciple, a true disciple of course, is one who has forsaken all and is bearing his cross. This can be said of none who are not already regenerated. But it is the disciple who is to be baptized for the Greek word translated "teach" ("matheteusate") means disciple. Hence the Lord commanded His church to baptize only those who first became disciples or saved people. Then all that argument which Mr. Warlick made about the commission commanding that the apostles baptize in order to remission of sins is answered and fully set aside. If the apostles baptized according to the commission, and we are sure

they did, then it follows that they baptized nobody except those who first became disciples and since the Lord himself defined what a disciple is we know that the apostles did not knowingly baptize any but such as had obtained the remission of their sins.

In Acts 16:22, where Saul was told to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, Mr. Warlick thinks he has a strong thing, but when we consider that the washing away of sins in baptism was a symbolic washing away and not an actual washing, it will be seen that Mr. Warlick is wrong again. The blood of Christ actually washes away sin and water symbolically or figuratively washes them away. First, the fact and then the symbol of that fact. First the substance, then the picture of that substance, First the real saving by the blood, then the figure of the saving.

While I take issue with Mr. Warlick about the way of salvation being changed in this dispensation from what it was in the old dispensation, yet I will not use the space allotted to refute him on that point for that is not the issue between us. We agree that there is a way of salvation in the New Testament and the issue is as to what is that way. He says baptism is a condition and I deny and I shall confine myself to that issue. Anything else is irrelevant.

Negative Arguments.

I here offer the following negatives:

1. If we are not saved until baptized then it is impossible to love God before baptism, 1 John 4:7, "He that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God."

If a man loves God before he is baptized then he is born of God before baptism and that would ruin my opponent's theory. If a man can not love God before baptism then a hater of God is baptized to make a lover of God out of him. Jesus said: "He that is not with me is against me" (See Matt. 12:30). To take a man who is against the Lord and baptize him to cause him to be for the Lord is absurd. If I believed a thing like that I would do my best to force all the people to be baptized since no man could love God and my only chance was to baptize haters of God I would get busy and catch all I could and force them in and thus make lovers of God out of them.

2. If we are not saved until baptized then it is impossible to do any work of righteousness before baptism. Acts 10:35. "In every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." If a man do a work of righteousness before he is baptized it would show that he was accepted of God before baptism and that would ruin my opponent's theory. If a man can not do a righteous act before baptism then there are no good works among any except those who have been dipped in the water, an absurdity too glaring for sensible people to accept.

3. If we are not saved before baptism then it is impossible to confess Jesus before men until after we are baptized. Matt. 10:32, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven." To have the guarantee of

being acknowledged before God on the last day it seems would be good enough for any man and this guarantee is made to those who confess Jesus before men. Is it possible that this cannot be done before baptism? Is it not a fact that all really do confess before baptism if they go according to the scriptures? Then does it not follow that salvation and a promise of being acknowledged in heaven are secured before baptism?

4. If men can not get forgiveness for leaving off baptism then leaving off baptism is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and of course that is a glaring absurdity. Matt. 12:31, "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." Again I ask: Is leaving off baptism the sin against the Holy Ghost? If it is not, then one who leaves off baptism may get forgiveness for it and if he can get forgiveness for it he can be saved without baptism. If he can not get forgiveness for leaving off baptism then it follows that leaving off baptism is worse than any other sin, in the eyes of God. Let us suppose the case of a man, and there have no doubt been many such persons. He is in the last moments of his life and he sees his doom staring him in the face. He has left off repentance, faith and baptism up to that time. He prays for forgiveness. He confesses his sins to the Lord. He tells the Lord that he has been a very bad man. He confesses that he has lied, stolen, murdered, committed adultery and he has left off baptism. He repents of all his sins. He asks forgiveness. Imagine God answering something like this: "My man, I can forgive you for living a life of impenitence and unbelief, I forgive you for lying, stealing, adultery, and murder, but you have committed one sin I can not forgive; you left off baptism and for that sin there is no forgiveness. The only chance for you is to get somebody to baptize you and then all will be well. If there is nobody in reach of you who will baptize you, then you must sink into hell. That makes leaving off baptism the worst crime in the world.

5. I object to the doctrine because it puts a man's salvation into the hands of another man. If I can not be saved unless I am baptized, and since I can not baptize myself and God will not baptize me, it makes it necessary for me to apply to another man for salvation. How much better is that than Roman Catholicism? Is that not priestcraft? However much I may repent and believe and confess and work righteousness, I must go to hell unless I can find some one kind enough to put me under the water. It is the same thing in principle as seen in the deluded Catholic who goes to the priest and puts his case into the hands of the priest. Now is the time, says the Lord. Not so, says friend Warlick and his people. You must wait till you can find a man kind enough to baptize you.

6. I object to the idea that baptism is necessary to salvation because, if true, it makes God dishonest. If I offer you a horse for one hundred dollars and you get the money and bring it to me for the horse and after you come and accept my own terms. I come up on the price, you would say I was a dishonest man. That is evident. Well, God has said in His word that salvation shall be had

at faith. Acts 16:31, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." That is the language of inspiration to the jailor and if after he believes, the Lord comes up on the price and demands baptism or anything else under the sun, it would not be honest. If I offer you a horse for one hundred dollars I may honestly take less for the animal, but I can not take more. If God, on the same principle, offers salvation for faith, he could save for less, and be honest, but he can not demand more. This one principle of common honesty settles the matter about baptism being necessary to salvation.

7. If salvation comes only in the act of immersion, then we can measure the distance to Christ with a tape line. Tell me how far it is to the creek and I will tell you how far it is to Christ. It therefore follows that it is more difficult to be saved in dry weather than it is in wet weather. Such absurdities are too glaring for intelligent people to accept.

8. If baptism is necessary to salvation then no preacher dare tell an inquiring penitent what Paul told the jailor: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." A system of doctrine that forbids a preacher using the Bible language in giving instruction to a penitent can't be true.

MR. WARLICK'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

Mr. Bogard begins his reply to my argument, not by taking up the arguments I made in my former article, but by lining up with the Infidels. He says a part of the Bible is not Divine, not true, He denies that Mark 16:16 is authentic, and says the scholars say so. In this he is incorrect as usual. Not one scholar in all the world denies the inspiration of the passage. Some of them say that Mark may not have written it, but all admit that it is the Word of God. Not one translation has left it out, and while the Revised Version places it to itself, they leave it in, just the same, and they explain why they did this, denying all the time that it was questioned for a moment. Mr. Bogard says it is not Scripture, and so say the infidels about the whole Bible. What is the difference? Now Christ said in Mark 16:16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Bogard knows that Christ said as plainly here that baptism is necessary to salvation as faith, and so he thinks the shortest way out of it, is to turn infidel and deny that the words are in the Book, or that Christ ever said any such thing.

It is a fact that the passage from the 9th verse of the chapter, to the close, was not found in two of the oldest Mss. It is in two others, however, just as old, and in every other one ever known to students. All real scholars laugh at the idea of challenging the text.

Mr. Bogard next thinks to dispose of the passage and the argument I made on it, by saying that it does not teach baptism as a condition of pardon, for the reason, that only the unbeliever is to be condemned. "He that believeth not shall be damned." He cannot see that it takes two things to save, but only one is necessary to condemn. Take another passage as an illustration. Christ said in Luke 13:5: "Except you repent, you shall perish." Baptists say: "He that repents and believes shall be saved." But Christ did not say: "He that repents not, and believes not, shall perish." He simply said: "Except ye repent ye shall perish." With Mr. Bogard's logic in the first case, used in this one, we have a repentant man, who cannot perish, but who cannot be saved because he has not yet believed, for Baptists say, you know, that repentance precedes faith in Gospel order. The repentant man, cannot go to hell, because he can't perish, but he cannot go to Heaven, because he has not believed. So much for my friend's nonsense. Reader, is it not strange that a man who does not want to believe the truth will resort to such quibbling as an excuse for his unbelief?

Mr. Bogard says that the word "matheteusate" translated teach, in Matthew 28:19: "Teach all nations, baptizing them," means in fact, disciple, and that the command was to make disciples, and then baptize them. He also says, that disciple means a Christian. He will not stay by this position, for when many of the disciples went back and walked no more with the Savior, and when Judas, who was a disciple, fell and so like the others mentioned in John 6:66, who were saved people but fell from grace, the doctrine of apostasy is proven, and the Baptists will hardly accept this result, I think. I

shall leave this for my friend to clear up in his next article. But the truth is, the real grammar of the passage says: "Make disciples by baptizing them, as the woman says to the maid: "Cleanse the floor, sweeping it, that is, by sweeping it." Christ means as much for the purpose of baptism in Matthew as He does in Mark, where He said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," thus making baptism a condition beyond all doubt.

It is amusing to read my friend on Acts 2:38. Here Peter said to believers: "Repent and be baptized, for the remission of sins." Mr. Bogard says, "for" here, means because of, and is like "laughing for joy, weeping for sorrow." Well, since the people were not only commanded to be baptized for remission, but were also commanded to repent for the same thing, then they repented I suppose because of salvation, or because they had been saved. Eh! Such nonsense. Why not take the passage as it reads. "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. If Peter told the truth, and he did tell the truth, baptism is necessary to remission. If the doctrine be denied, the words of Peter are disputed.

Ananias told Saul to "Arise and be baptized and wash away his sins." My friend says this was a symbolic washing away of sins. Will he tell us where the Bible says anything about a symbolic washing away of sins? Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." Is this a symbolic salvation, or a real salvation? Will my friend answer? If he says it is a real salvation, then he has baptism as a condition of it, and if he says it is a symbolic salvation, he has faith a condition of it, so there you are. Pshaw, Mr. Bogard, what is the matter with you at this point? The world never heard of this symbolic salvation, and real salvation, until Baptist preachers began to dispute the plain word of the Lord. All symbols in the Bible, have preceded the real, and so if my friend were right in the case, he would have a man symbolically saved first, and really saved afterward. The sacrifices under the law were symbols, but Christ is the real. We had the symbols first, however. Now if we are saved by faith in one sense, and by baptism in another, the one symbolic and the other real, since faith comes first, and since the symbol comes first, then we are symbolically saved by faith, and really saved when we are baptized. Christ taught that salvation comes after both. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." This is true or false. If true, then my proposition is established. Yea, abundantly established.

My friend next offers what he calls some negative arguments, but which in reality are only quibbles, and of a very foolish kind at that. If he prefers to take the laboring oar in his own hand, and proceed with the task of showing that something else, beside what the New Testament teaches on the design of baptism is true, he is welcome to the job. I shall now fall in behind him, and thus take the course he seems to want me to take.

These negative arguments, like all quibbles generally used to make false what Christ and His disciples taught, may be turned against the fellow who uses them. Take the first one, for instance. It is loaded for my friend, not me.

If we are not saved until we are baptized, and Christ said we are not, Mark 16:16, then it is impossible to love God before we are baptized. "He that loveth is born of God and knoweth God." Of course everybody but Mr. Bogard knows that the people here mentioned by John, had been baptized years before this was written, but what does he care for this? He thinks there is furnished in this text an excuse for his disputing the New Testament. But notice, Mr. Bogard says a man repents before he can believe. Now try his logic again. If faith is necessary to salvation, then it is impossible for one to love God who does not believe, therefore he has a penitent man, who hates God. Can you see this point, Mr. Bogard?

If we are not saved until we are baptized, and Peter says we are not, 1 Peter 3:21: "There were eight souls saved by water, so in the antetype, baptism saves us." My friend now says, we cannot work righteousness until after we are baptized, for the man who works righteousness is accepted of God. Try his logic on his own position. If the penitent man is not saved until he believes, and Bogard says he is not, then repentance is not righteousness, else the man is saved before and without faith. See how foolish your quibble, Mr. Bogard?

My friend's third, on confessing Christ, is an address by the Savior to His disciples, and has no reference whatever to an unbaptized man. He thinks if Christ were correct about it, when He said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," the leaving off baptism would be the sin against the Holy Ghost. Well—I wonder. To refuse to be baptized would be a sin of disobedience. To refuse to believe would be a sin of the same kind. Now take Mr. Bogard's man up to the judgment. God says, I forgive you because you have repented of your adultery, theft and lying, but you have left off one thing, you have not accepted the truth on the subject of who I am. You did not believe on me. This means, Bogard says, that not to believe is the sin against the Holy Ghost. Mr. Bogard is an interesting character to students of logic.

My friend thinks, when Christ said. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved," and telling the apostles to baptize the taught as he did, that such a doctrine puts salvation in the hands of man. He says you can take a tape line and measure the distance to salvation according to this doctrine of Christ. I wonder. But see what his illustration does for him. He says you must send men to the heathen to convert them. On this matter the Missionaries and the Hardshells split. If the preacher must go to the heathen to convert them, and the Baptists have to support the missionary to do the work while he is at it, then Mr. Bogard will take his tape line, and measure the distance between the church, the missionary, and the heathen in sins. He must also say, that the circulating medium, and the condition of the banks in this country will have to do with the sinner's salvation. And so it is easier to save sinners, and he has more salvation for them in good times than he has when times are hard and the banks oppressive. Mr. Bogard, are you not ashamed of yourself at this point? You ought to be, and I

think the readers will be, even your own brethren will wish you had left this quibble off.

Another objection to the doctrine of the Bible on this subject offered by Mr. Bogard. He says: It makes God dishonest. If he (Bogard) were to say he would take one hundred dollars for a horse, and then add to that price when he came to deliver the horse, he would be dishonest. Now apply this argument to his proposition. He says God offers salvation at faith—and certainly He will not add to the faith, baptism. He forgets that the kind of faith, upon which God offers salvation, is an obedient faith, and that this includes baptism, and that God does not offer salvation on an unbaptized faith. The devils had faith, but it was not of the genuine article. They had a false or counterfeit bill with which to pay for the horse, such as Baptists propose to get the horse with, or to be saved on, but God will not accept that kind. But listen, Mr. Bogard. Acts 11:18 says: "Repentance is unto life." Now you say a man repents before he believes. God has promised him life if he repent, and yet you say He afterwards tacks on faith to repentance, the hundred dollars as you say, so you think God is dishonest. Shame on you, my friend.

When Paul told the jailor to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and he should be saved, he meant a faith that would and did include baptism. They went immediately, and he was baptized. Then they came into the house and the jailor rejoiced after he was baptized, not before, Mr. Bogard. You and your brethren are the people who cannot tell sinners what Paul told the jailor. You know you make them rejoice first, and then you baptize them, see?

Thus I have answered all of his foolish quibbles, and have shown that there is not only nothing in any of them, but that they are his own missiles, constructed by his own hands for his own suicide, and all I have to do, is to turn their points "Baptistward" and he, with all his brethren who talk as he does on this subject fall dead by their own inventions. Some people have sought out many inventions, and I am sure my friend is one of that number.

Readers, is it not strange that men will spend all their days in mere quibbling, rather than to come up to the truth and take it just as God gave it to us?

Who said: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved?" Christ said it. What did He know about it? He knew everything about it. Who denies that baptism is necessary to salvation? Ben M. Bogard. What does he know about it? Nothing. Who said "Repent and be baptized, every one of you for remission of sins?" Peter said it. What did Peter know about it? He knew everything about it. Who denies this? My friend, Mr. Bogard. What does he know about it? Absolutely nothing and he seems to care less, if possible. Who said "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins?" Ananias said it. Acts 22:16. Did Ananias understand it? He certainly did. Did Paul understand what Ananias meant? He most assuredly did, for he afterward said he was baptized into Christ, where all the blessings of God are to be found. Gal. 3:27; 2 Cor. 5:17. Who denies all this, and says that Saul was baptized because his sins had already been washed away, and that men are in Christ before, and

without baptism, and that they have all the blessings of salvation without what Paul taught was true in the case? Mr. Bogard is the man. Well, does Mr. Bogard understand it? He does not, and it would seem that he is determined not to understand the matter, but instead, shows by what he says, to actually despise the doctrine. Who is to blame for this condition? Mr. Bogard himself. If God has sent him strong delusions, that he may believe a lie and be damned, it is because he will not have the truth, but has pleasure in the traditions and doctrines of men. What! you say: Mr. Bogard will be damned? No. I did not say so. Christ said so. Hear Him: "Go preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He that believeth not, shall be damned." I can't help it. I am sorry. But Christ did actually say that baptism was a condition of salvation, and that He wanted the apostles to so preach, and that if people would just not believe what they preached, they would have to be damned. I like my friend Mr. Bogard, but I cannot help it if he just will refuse the plain statement of the Master.

MR. BOGARD'S SECOND NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My honorable opponent says I line up with the infidels in denying that Mark 16:16 is a part of the Scriptures. Well, I have some fine company. The Revised Version in a foot note says: "The two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other documents, end this Gospel with verse 8. Some documents give an entirely different ending from verses 9-20." Are the revisers of the New Testament, who unanimously made this statement, infidels? All the Greek Testaments I ever saw put that part of Mark in brackets, which signify that the passage is doubtful. But Mr. Warlick says that while the passage is not found in "two of the oldest" manuscripts, it is found in "two others just as old." This is characteristic of my friend. The foot note just quoted says: "The two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other documents end this Gospel with verse 8." It does not say two of the oldest, but the two oldest." How then can there be others just as old? If it had been said the two oldest. That does not admit of any others being just as old, as Mr. Warlick says. My friend says: "Not one scholar in all the world denies the inspiration of the passage." Well, let's see. Is Phillip Schaff a scholar? He was recognized as the greatest Bible scholar in America. He was one of the revisers of the New Version. He has published a "Greek-Revised English" edition of the new Testament, with a long introduction, telling how they arrived at conclusions and then gives the interpolations so all can see for themselves. On pages 59-60 he says of interpolations:

"Additions from oral traditions, ancient liturgies, and explanatory glossary. Under this head we may place the most important and serious interpolations, which are rejected by critics. They are as follows:

"The doxology in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:13- * * * *

"The concluding twelve verses of Mark (9-20 which were added after the first incomplete edition of the Gospel had got into circulation."

Is Phillip Schaff an infidel?

Schaff says: "Tischendorf and Tregelles set the twelve verses apart; Wescott and Hort enclose them in double brackets; the Anglo-American Revision properly retains them with a marginal note (The note that has just been quoted. B. M. B-

"Even Dr. Schrivener, one of the most conservative critics says: "To maintain the genuineness of these passages is simply impossible."

Are Schaff, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Schrivener, Westcott, Hort and others all infidels? Mr. Warlick should be careful how he flings epithets. It is easier to call a man an infidel than it is to answer his argument. Mark 16:16 was added by Catholic priests who needed it to bolster up their Romanist doctrine of baptismal salvation and the followers of Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Stone adopted the Romanist idea and teach the same doctrine. If you

are going to adopt this interpolation, why not take the several books that Catholics have added to the Bible? Why not take the "Book of Mormon" that Joseph Smith added to the Bible? I am sure that Mr. Warlick, in giving reasons for rejecting the books added by the Catholics and the book added by Smith, would say that these books cannot be found in the manuscripts from which we get our Bible—the Greek manuscripts which came from the hands of inspiration. If he rejects the Catholic additions and the "Book of Mormon" on the ground that they are not in the Greek manuscripts, on what ground does he accept Mark 16:16 when it is not found in the same Greek manuscripts?

But, even granting that this Catholic addition to the Bible is a part of the Scriptures, it does not help Mr. Warlick. It plainly says that nobody but unbelievers will be lost. If so, then it follows that no believer will be lost in hell. That is too much for Mr. Warlick. He can not dodge this point.

My friend attempts to dodge by saying that the Bible says that "except you repent ye shall perish," and that while this is true if a man repents and refuses to believe he would be lost. I deny his argument. No man, who ever did truly repent, ever perished. Why? Because true repentance includes faith. Repentance means "a change of the mind," and Mr. Warlick will not dispute it. Well, if the mind of the sinner is fully changed it becomes a believing mind—changed from unbelief to faith. If so, an unbeliever who has repented, does not and cannot exist. The great theologian, Hovey, has expressed the Bible idea of repentance, as follows:

"We understand repentance to be a voluntary turning of the soul from the exercise of unbelief to the exercise of belief, and from a paramount love of self and sin to a paramount love of God and holiness." I endorse this definition. If this is true, then no repentant man is an unbeliever.

Lest Mr. Warlick set aside the definition because Hovey is a Baptist, I will give Elder J. A. Harding's definition as found in the Moody-Harding Debate, pages 77-78: "When a man believes in this way, we say he believes with the heart, and that he is prepared for baptism. We claim that this faith includes repentance and necessarily implies godly sorrow for sin." If faith that fits for baptism, as Mr. Harding says, includes repentance, then one does not exist without the other. This is Baptist doctrine and Bible doctrine, even if Mr. Harding did stumble upon it and thus destroy his own doctrine. A man has not fully repented until he exercises faith, for the mind is not fully changed until it rests in faith on Christ as his Savior. Hence, all that talk, my friend has given us, about the possibility of a man being lost who has not believed after he has repented goes, as has other sophistries. So his supposed offset to my argument on Mark 16:16 is set aside. I still say that if a man can't go to Heaven unless he is baptized and can't go to hell if he is a believer, as Mr. Warlick's idea of Mark 16:16 will force us to conclude, that this makes the idea absurd and hence it can't be true. I have shown that such a condition can not be for a man who has repented, for no man ever repented who failed to become a believer

as repent means to change the mind from unbelief to belief, involving the idea of sorrow of soul while the change is being made. Mr. Warlick can not show that baptism is thus sure after faith. Hence he is caught in his own dodge.

Our Lord, in giving the commission, said: Go, make disciples, baptizing them." I proved that a true disciple was one who had forsaken all and had taken up his cross and was following the Lord. Hence nobody was to be baptized except Christians. Mr. Warlick says in response that some of His "disciples went back and walked with Him no more," and if I hold to that idea, then I lose out on falling from grace. Not much. There are two sorts of disciples, viz., the true and the false. The false disciples were the ones who went back and walked with Him no more. 1 John 2:19 says: "They went out from us because they were not of us, for if they had been of us they would no doubt have continued with us." This proves that those who went back were only nominal or false disciples. No true disciples went back. But the Lord certainly did not command His Church, to which He gave the commission, to make any but true disciples and a true disciple is a Christian. Since they were commanded to baptize true disciples, it follows that they were commanded to baptize Christians. But my opponent says that the true rendering of the commission would be "go make disciples by baptizing them." If this is true, then no repentance and faith is required, which makes the idea absurd, and Catholicism is established.

The only criticism he offers against my interpretation of Acts 2:38 is, if baptize is on account of remission of sins, so is repent. of course he knows that "repent" in the Greek is second person plural, and "baptize" is third person singular, and there is a rule in grammar that says: "Verbs must agree with their subjects in number and person," hence "repent" and "baptize" can not be joined together so as to have the same subject. If this is true, and it is, it follows that they are not joined together to secure the same result. It simply means: Repent (which carries with it the idea of faith, for complete repentance is faith) and since faith brings remission of sins, be baptized for (that is on account of) remission of sins.

Mr. Warlick says that symbols come before the fact. I flatly deny and call for the proof. In the Old Testament the fact of salvation existed for hundreds of years before the Law of Moses came into existence, being added because of transgression, and used as a teacher. The blood of Christ has always done the saving for the blood of bulls and goats never did take away sin. Christ stood as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8). That blood in promise was as effective as it is in history. It saved Abraham four hundred and thirty years before the symbols of that blood were instituted at Sinai (Gal. 3:17). We need something besides assertions on this, my friend. If we can not reach the benefits of the fact until we have reached and observed the symbol, then no man has ever received the benefits of the broken body and shed blood of Christ until he has partaken of the Lord's Supper. That reduces Mr. Warlick's idea to an absurdity. So Saul washed away his sin in symbol and not in fact, when he was baptized. My friend wants me

to tell him if we get a real salvation or symbolical salvation. Both. We get the real first and then observe the symbol: "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us." Saves in figure after we enjoy the fact. So says Peter in 1 Peter, 3:21.

On my negative arguments my friend dies hard. On the point that Mr. Warlick's doctrine makes it impossible for a man to love God before baptism, he walks up like a man and acknowledges that this is so. Then a hater of God is led into the water hating God and the dip in the water causes him to love God. Then no man is baptized from love. It is wholly a proposition of acting through fear of hell, as Jesus said: "He that is not for me, is against me," and here is the man who is against God wading down into the water so that he may be dipped into the love of God. Tens of thousands are conscious of the fact that they did love God before they were baptized and the book says: "He that loveth is 'born of God and knoweth God" (1 John 4:7). His dodge that my man who had repented and had not believed was a penitent man who still hated God has already been answered, as such a man never was and never can be, for repentance complete is faith.

Can a man work righteousness before he is baptized? Mr. Warlick refuses to answer, but tries to work my man who has repented and not believed again, and such a man never existed and never can exist. If confession is a work of righteousness, and it comes before baptism, then Peter says that "he that worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." No wonder he refused to answer.

Mr. Warlick dodges on confession, by saying that when the Savior said if we confess Him before men He will confess us before the Father, that He was talking to His disciples, all of whom had been baptized. Well, let's try one which undoubtedly refers to some who are not saved. Try Rom. 10:9: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth, the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God has raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Is it possible to believe in the heart that God has raised Christ from the dead and to confess this before men before a man is baptized? If so, he has the promise of salvation before baptism.

Is leaving off baptism the sin against the Holy Ghost? That question is still unanswered. If leaving off baptism is not the sin against the Holy Ghost, then a man can be forgiven for it. I supposed a man who in the dying hour repented and believed and asked forgiveness and he could be forgiven for all his sins except the sin of leaving off baptism, which makes leaving off baptism worse than murder or rape. That is too ridiculous for any man to believe. But Mr. Warlick supposes a case of a man at the Judgment who was forgiven all except lack of faith. He has his man too far in the future, for in the world to come there will be no sins forgiven at all for the time of mercy has passed. Keep your man here in the world, Mr. Warlick, and let him ask forgiveness, as I supposed, and see how ridiculous your idea of baptism becomes.

Mr. Warlick does not deny that his idea of baptism puts every man's salvation into the hands of another man, since we must get the consent of some man to baptize us and any man would have

the power to refuse, hence have the power to refuse us salvation. How much better is this than Romanism, which puts salvation into the hands of the priest? But, says Mr. Warlick, Baptist doctrine does the same, as we think the word of God must get to the heathen before they can be saved and men must take it to them. But the difference between us is that after the heathen gets the Gospel, it is still not the power of God unto salvation to him unless one of Mr. Warlick's preachers comes along and helps the helpless thing to do the work. If a man learns the truth, Baptists believe that no man has the power to step between him and his God.

If baptism is necessary to salvation, it makes God dishonest. There that charge stands. God said that salvation can be had at faith: "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved" (Acts 16:31). But after the man believes, God comes up on the price and says he must be baptized. If a man acts that way, we call it dishonesty. But to offset this, my friend says the kind of faith God offers salvation for is an obedient faith, and "that includes baptism." Faith includes baptism!! I thought you had been telling us that you had to believe before you can be baptized and now, presto change, faith includes baptism!! The poor fellow must believe before he is baptized and yet he can't believe till he is baptized! If you haven't got your man in the middle of a fix, I can't read. Again he works my supposed man who repents unto life, and, says Mr. Warlick, God has promised him life when he repents, for repentance is unto life, and when he repents and comes up for salvation God adds faith as an addition to the price. That would be a fine argument if such a man could exist. **Repentance complete is faith for the change of the mind—repentance—is not complete until the mind rests on Christ by faith.** So the case is not parallel. On this position Mr. Warlick is ruined unless he can prove that baptism is a part of faith and that faith is not complete without baptism. But when he does that, he will cut off his head on the part of his doctrine that **requires faith before baptism.**

Thus every thing has been swept from my opponent and I will now offer a few more negative arguments.

John demanded fruit of those who were to be baptized of him (Matt. 3:7), but Jesus said "Ye can not bear fruit except ye are in the vine (John 15:4), but Jesus Himself is the vine" (John 15:1) | It therefore follows that John demanded that those he baptized be saved, fruit bearing children of God, before baptism.

Mr. Warlick baptizes a child of the devil to make a child of God. Baptists baptize a child of God because he is a child of God. If he denies this, let him say whose child he does baptize.

Mr. Warlick and his people baptize a man on a dead faith, for they steadfastly hold that James meant just that when he said that "faith without works is dead." They think "works" in James means baptism. If so, then they baptize on a dead faith.

Peter said: "Add to your faith virtue" (II Peter 1:5). My friend Mr. Warlick thinks that means to add to your faith repentance, and to repentance, baptism. Alas! But this will suffice.

MR. WARLICK'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE.

I am specially delighted to reply to my friend's second article on this question. I knew we had two propositions on the subject, so I have been very deliberate. I did not suppose that Mr. Bogard would be so easily upset when I was not ready for that yet, but he seems all unnerved in some way, I hope to help him a little.

He has certainly lined up with the infidels in denying the inspiration of a part of the Bible. He thinks that a part of Mark's Gospel is not inspired. Infidels say that none of the Bible is inspired. It is only a matter of quantity and not quality, that divides Mr. Bogard and the infidel, that's all.

Mr. Bogard does not seem to understand his own authors at this point. Not one of them denies that the passage is inspired. No one ever did this. They simply say, some of them, that since it was not in some of the old MSS. Mark must not have written it. It is the Genuineness, not the Authenticity of the passage that they question. I suggest, that my friend try to know what his books are written to show, before he quotes from them in a discussion.

The passage has never been left out of any translation. Prof. Schaff, from whom my friend quotes, does not leave it out. If that gentleman were living today, he would feel sorry that Mr. Bogard quotes him to prove what was never in his mind.

Prof. Broadus, the only really scholarly educator the Loyal Baptists have ever produced in this country, in an article published in the Baptist Quarterly for 1869, said much upon this subject. In that article he shows clearly from Mark's peculiar use of the Greek, that the section was most certainly written by him. In concluding his article he calls "foolish" a man who would question the Genuineness of the passage. From the article respecting it, on the page found in Hurt's Comentary, I quote the following, "the section is found in the Alexandrian and the Cambridge MSS. which are said to be as old as those that omit it. It is also found in the twelve uncial MSS. said to be as old as the former MSS. and in all the cursive MSS. (So-called from the form of the letters.) It is quoted by Irenaus and Tatian who lived and wrote in the second century. Irenaus quotes from it as written by Mark. He says, "But Mark, in the end of his Gospel says: And the Lord Jesus, after He had spoken to them, was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God," too soon for the Catholics.

Paul refers to Mark's account of the Commission when in Heb. 2, he calls the Commission "The great salvation which the Lord first spake and which was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him."

A man talks silly who denies the inspiration of the passage. This has never been questioned by any one however, and the scholars, all of them, now allow that Mark wrote it.

My friend thinks that the book of Mormon, which no one has ever put in his translation, is on a par with this, and he asks me why I

do not take that too? Pshaw! I wonder what Mr. Bogard will say next.

But I am told that since the unbeliever only is to be condemned by this passage, then baptism is not necessary, although Christ said it in plain terms: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Why all this quibbling? I have shown that since the Baptists say that repentance precedes faith, and since Christ said "Except you repent you will perish," that according to their logic, then we do not have to believe to be saved. In reply my friend, seeing this trouble tries to dodge by saying real repentance does not precede faith, but includes faith. Well, now what will he do with his former teaching on the order of repentance and faith? In a booklet which Mr. Bogard wrote, and which is a part of the Landmark Sunday School Literature I think— he takes the position that repentance precedes faith. In answer to the question, "Which comes first, repentance or faith? Mr. Bogard, in answering, refers to those verses in the New Testament where repentance is mentioned first, showing that at the time he wrote that book he still believed the old doctrine that repentance comes first, but now he thinks differently? I wonder why he has changed. The answer is, he is in a tight. He has discovered that all of his quibbling on Mark 16:16, in an effort to deny flatly what the Savior said on the importance of baptism is turned against him, by showing up his position on repentance and faith, and so he changes his base on the order of these words.

Mr. Bogard says that repentance is a change of mind, and that when the unbeliever repents he changes his mind to a believer. Now you have it? Then I suppose, when a believer repents, he becomes an unbeliever? Mr. Bogard says he sins, and if he does, of course he repents, but he says he is a believer. Then I suppose he, after repenting, is an unbeliever? Eh? But this is just one of the amusing predicaments in which one involves himself when trying to deny the plain word of God.

I shall maintain that the kind of faith that saves is a faith that has been baptized, that is, a faith that has led one to be baptized. My friend need not quote those Scriptures which ascribe salvation to faith, they are all on my side. They refer to a faith that has passed through baptism. Christ endorses this idea when he says, it is the baptized believer who is saved. Mark 16:16.

My friend says you can't have a genuinely repentant man who is not a believer. Suppose he is correct, and he is, for a man has to believe before he can repent. But he wants to say this with the idea that repentance comes first, although he denies it a part of the time. May I not say also that you cannot have a real believer who has not been baptized? How will my friend answer his logic which I may appropriate if I want to?

Mr. Bogard is a funny fellow. He says those disciples who went back and walked no more with Him, were not real disciples. He admits that Christ made them disciples, but that he did not get the right scald on them some way. He says that surely when Christ told His disciples to make disciples, He did not expect them to make a failure in some cases like He had done. for He knew they would

not make any nominal disciples, but theirs would all stick. How does that strike our Baptist readers? Who ever heard of these nominal and real disciples until some men felt that they just must get up a reply to the truth on the design of baptism. Those disciples who went back were as real as the rest of them. When Christ said make disciples of the people, baptizing them, He simply meant, make learners of them. As Dr. Smith in his Bible Dictionary says: "Make Believers," that's all. The Episcopal translation intended to teach that the disciples were made by baptizing them. But Mr. Bogard says this would cut out repentance and faith, and make disciples by baptizing only. I wonder. A. D. D. of Dallas, writing in a recent issue of the Baptist Standard, says that people are made Baptists by Baptism. "Baptism is the door into the Local Church." I suppose, according to Mr. Bogard, that there are no repentant ones nor any believers in the Baptist Church. Is this it?

Acts 2:38, Peter said to inquiring believers, who asked what to do to be saved? "Repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." This is as plain as language could make it.

What did these people want to know? They wanted to know what to do to be saved. Did Peter know what to tell them? He did. What did he tell them to do to be saved? He told them to repent and be baptized. What were they to repent and be baptized for? For the remission of sins. Did Peter tell them the truth? He did. Well, who denies that he told them the right thing? Mr. Bogard. What does Mr. Bogard know about what Peter should have said on this occasion? Nothing in the world.

Now, Mr. Bogard says these two verbs, repent and baptize are not of the same voice, the same number and the same person? So he thinks they are not to be joined together to secure the same promise? I wonder.

When Christ said, "Repent and believe the Gospel," did He intend for the same person who repented to believe? Mr. Bogard will say He did. Now, will Mr. Bogard tell us what the voice, the number and the person of the verbs—repent and believe are in the above passage? Again—when the mother says to her children in bed, "Arise, and each of you be washed for breakfast," I wonder if Mr. Bogard thinks that mother has two sets of children, one still in bed without breakfast, and the others up and ready? Now readers, this is the way men will act and talk in order to get rid of some of the plainest passages in the Bible. If you were trying to say that baptism is for the remission of sins, you could not, to save your life, make it plainer than Peter does in this verse, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. The Co-ordinate conjunction connects repent and baptized, and thus they are coupled together for the same purpose. It is foolish to deny this.

My friend thinks that when I lead my candidate down into the water, he is a hater of God. Not so, any more than his repentant unbeliever is a hater of God. But the man who loves God and who is born of God referred to by Mr. Bogard, in 1 Jno. 4:7, had been

baptized a number of years, and Mr. Bogard thinks he was an unbaptized man. Pshaw—find an unbaptized man who has been born of God? We are not caring about what is said of the man who loves God, and who has been in the church for years. This is true of the man of whom John is writing in your reference.

Mr. Bogard thinks that the real must come before the symbolic. Is it impossible for him to get anything right? In the third chapter of Galatians, Paul asks "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgression till the seed should come." Again he says: "Before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterward be revealed." Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. "But now since faith is come, we are no longer under a school-master." Mr. Bogard says, Paul what do you mean? Do you not know that the faith was long before the law? Don't you know that Abraham was saved by it? What is the matter with my friend anyway? Everybody knows that the law, which was pre-eminently an age of symbols and pictures came before the gospel. Read the book of Hebrews, Mr. Bogard, and be ashamed of yourself. John says the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. Jno. 1:17 I shall insist that if we are saved in both a real and in a symbolic sense, that since the real must include all there can be in the symbolic, then we must be saved symbolically first, and then really, and since faith is first, and then baptism, we are symbolically saved when we believe but not really saved until we are baptized. But my friend did not answer the question on Mark 16:16. "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." What kind of "saved" is this? Is it symbolic or real salvation? If he says real then he has baptism connected with it. Tell us which it is, Mr. Bogard? No dodging. Is it real or symbolic salvation? The truth is, we should never have heard of this symbolic and real salvation business if some fellow had not wanted to get around the plain teaching of the Bible on the design of baptism.

Mr. Bogard thinks he has a passage in Rom. 10 which teaches that one confesses Christ before he is baptized, and he says that when one does this it is evidence that God dwells in him and he in God. But he must see also that the confession in the passage seems to precede the faith of the passage. Read it: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God has raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." I wonder if he thinks the man who confesses with the mouth, without this faith is a Christian? Let him answer.

If a man can work righteousness before he is baptized, he is saved before and without it says Mr. Bogard. Forgetting as he does that repentance is as much righteousness as faith or baptism, but Baptists have always said that repentance comes before faith, therefore men work righteousness before they believe and so according to Mr. Bogard's logic, are saved before and without faith.

To talk about a failure to be baptized being a sin against the Holy Ghost is silly. I have shown that according to my friend's position that a man who has repented, but has not believed, when he

comes to die, may have forgiveness for all his sins but that of unbelief, and so he would, I suppose say that man had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost. All of this is to be noticed only because Mr. Bogard does not want to believe the statement of Christ, when He said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

I insist that if baptism be not necessary, (though Christ said it was) because some one has to do the baptizing, then faith is not necessary because Baptists have to send the Missionary to the heathen to convert them. Mr. Bogard says that a man may be necessary until God gives the heathen a chance, and then he dismisses the man from the work entirely. I suppose he thinks God needs the help of man to get Himself started to save the heathen, but that after man has done the hard part, then God finishes the job by Himself? This is ridiculous, but you must believe this absurd thing, or else turn from my friend's teaching at this point.

My opponent says again that if baptism is necessary, that means if the Master actually told the truth when He said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," then God is dishonest for He promised salvation at faith, and so He could not tack on baptism without being dishonest. I showed that the same objection would come against God on His repentant man who had not believed. I also showed that the kind of faith upon which God promises to save is a faith that leads to baptism and that it does not save until after baptism. Christ said it in so many words in the language just quoted. Mark 16:16.

Mr. Bogard advances a little and says that John demanded fruits of those whom he baptized. "Sure and the fruits were a call upon them to confess their sins." See Mark 1:5. John baptized for the remission of sins, and the people were required to confess their sins. This shows they had sins to confess, and that they were baptized for the remission of those sins. So Mr. Bogard and all the Baptists lose this case.

Mr. Bogard says he baptizes a child of God. I deny that he does. He says that baptism is an act of the body, and that the body of no one is ever regenerated until it is redeemed from the grave. Baptists baptize children of the devil, who never become children of God, while they live in the world, and they admit only that class into their churches and to their communion table.

Peter says to people who had been baptized for many years, "Add to your faith virtue," etc. Mr. Bogard thinks Peter was talking to unbaptized folks when he wrote this statement. I wonder if he thinks all of the Christian graces are to be added before one receives the baptism he administers? If so, since these induct a man abundantly into the everlasting Kingdom, he must be there before he can get into the Baptist church by baptism. Well, well, this is funny, but when Mr. Bogard makes breaks of this kind, he does not look before he leaps. It is too bad, but he does it himself.

MR. BOGARD'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen! Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

If I am an infidel for believing that Mark 16:16 is spurious, then the ripest Christian scholars are also infidels. Mr. Warlick thinks because the verse is in the translation which we call Bible, that it is necessarily genuine. I have seen Bibles with the entire Book of Mormon bound up in them. If you want to see it for yourself just write to the Latter Day Saints Publishing House, Lamoni, Iowa, and get one. How would Mr. Warlick go about proving that Mormon book to be spurious? He would do it as I have done the passage in Mark. I have a Bible, with all the books the Catholics have added bound up in it. How could I prove that these added books are spurious? In exactly the same way I prove the passage in Mark spurious. **The passage is not in the two oldest Manuscripts, and therefore Mark could not have written it.** To illustrate: If, in after years, I should be mean enough to take one of Mr. Warlick's speeches, as he has written them for this debate, add something to one of them and palm it off as what Mr. Warlick said, how would Mr. Warlick's friends go about proving that what I added was a forgery? Anybody knows they would find the original copies **as they were published in the Gospel Guide and in the Flag, and when they showed that what I had added was not in the original copies my fraud would be detected.** Exactly so have the scholars found that in the oldest copies of the Bible, as it was originally written in manuscript form, the last verses of Mark are missing. That settles it with all who want to know the truth. If a man is an infidel because he refuses to accept a forgery, which has been proven a forgery, then let me be an infidel. I had rather be an infidel than to be a "Christian" (?) who bases his hope on a forgery.

As I quoted Schaff in the last speech, as saying that these last verses in Mark were "added after the Gospel had got into circulation," I will now quote a lot more along the same line. Mr. Warlick is basing his contention on Mark 16:16, and when this is taken from him he loses over half of his material. Mark would not help him even if it was a part of the Gospel for it distinctly says that no believer can be lost, but since he thinks it helps him I shall take it from him, fully.

W. N. Clark, in his commentary on Mark says. "This question must be answered in the negative." What question? Whether Mark 16:16 "is to be received as of equal authenticity of the Gospel in general."

Alford says: "It would thus appear that, while this passage was appended as early as the time of Irenaeus, it was still absent from a majority of the codices as late as Jerome's day. The legitimate inference is that it was placed as a completion of the gospel soon after the Apostolic period." If it was placed there after the Apostolic period, it certainly was not written by the apostle or any inspired writer.

Smith's History of the New Testament, page 704, says: "The passage is rejected by the majority of modern critics on the testimony of the manuscripts."

Myer, one of the greatest of Bible scholars, says: The entire section, from Mark 16:9-20, is a nongenuine conclusion not composed by Mark.'

Wescott & Hort, Vol. 2, Appendix, says: "It manifestly can not claim any apostolic authority."

* G. W. Clark's commentary, page 8, says: "Since the appearance of Griesbach's second edition of the New Testament in Greek (1796- it has become common to regard these verses as not belonging to the original Gospel." I could quote other scholars by the yard but these will suffice. Mark 16:16 is not a part of the Gospel. Yet, Mr. Warlick and his people rest their hope of Heaven on what they think it teaches.

Mr. Warlick says that Dr. Broadus said in a magazine in 1869, that people were "foolish" when they say that Mark 16.16 is not a part of the Gospel. You notice Mr. Warlick did not quote the words of Broadus, and he did not give the exact date of the magazine.. Dr. Broadus was always gentle in speech and he never called any body a fool in his life. Mr. Warlick has forgotten his words, if he ever knew what Broadus said, and in the absence of the words of Broadus we shall place no confidence in what my friend thinks possibly he might have said. Mr. Warlick says that Broadus is "the only really scholarly educator the Loyal Baptists have ever produced in this country." I can offset that incorrect statement by a truthful assertion: Mr. Warlick's people have never produced a great scholar since the death of Alexander, the founder of his church. If he points to McGarvey affiliated with the Progressive wing of Campbell's followers and not with Mr. Warlick's little bunch of Non-Progressives. The Non-Progressives have never produced even one scholar. Where is boasting then?

Mr. Warlick says Paul referred to Mark 16 when he wrote Heb. 2. I deny it and call for the proof. He referred to Matthew's record.

But I can accept Mark 16:16 as being a part of the Gospel and still prove too much for Mr. Warlick. It distinctly says that the unbeliever only will be lost. But he calls this quibbling because he says the Bible says, "Except ye repent ye shall perish," and therefore nobody but a man who has not repented can be lost, and what of the man who has repented and yet not believed? The answer is there is no such man and never has been and never will be. Repentance, when completed, is faith. The repentance is not complete until it ends in faith. If Mr. Warlick can show that a man has not believed until he has been baptized then there will be some point to his attempt to answer. But when he shows (which he can not do) that a man can not believe until he has been baptized he will knock his doctrine, that one must believe before he can be baptized, in the head. Since nobody but an unbeliever can be lost then a believer, a believer who has not yet been baptized, can not be lost. So Mark 16:16 proves too much for my friend.

Mr. Warlick says that I said in the Landmark Sunday School Lit-

erature that repentance comes before faith. Exactly, and I still so affirm, but along with that I affirm that repentance always ends in faith and that so soon as the change of the mind (repentance) is complete the immediate result is a believer. **The repentance and the faith are inseparably joined together.** So you can not find a man who has repented who is not also a believer. With this point clear nearly all of Mr. Warlick's speech is answered.

But, says my friend, if repentance is a change of the mind that results in faith in God, then when a Christian repents he becomes a disbeliever. Not a bit of it. **A Christian does not repent as does an unsaved man.** An unsaved man "repents toward ("eis") God" (Acts 20:21). A Christian does not "change his mind (repent) toward ("eis") God." The Christian repents of his errors, and with reference to God. My friend does not seem to know a thing about the difference in the relation of a sinner to God and that of a Christian's relation to God.

When I showed that John and Jesus baptized "disciples" and the Commission commands that only "disciples" be baptized, and then showed that a disciple was a Christian, here comes Mr. Warlick and says that if this is true, that some of the "disciples" fell from grace for some of them "went back and followed the Lord no more," and that Judas was a "disciple" and he betrayed the Lord, and that, therefore, I must either go back on my idea of what the Bible says a "disciple" is or accept the doctrine of falling from Grace. That is too bad. I dislike to do either, and therefore, I am put to the necessity of once more calling my friend's attention to the fact that no one who was ever a true disciple ever was lost. I referred him to 1 John 2:19, where it says that "if they had been of us they would no doubt have continued with us," but he did not think to notice that. I will for good measure give another passage to show that none who were true disciples ever were lost. Read John 18:9: "Of them which Thou gavest me have I lost none." That was said after the so-called "disciples" went back and after Judas betrayed the Lord. Yet after all the going back and after the betrayal, Jesus said "Of them which Thou gavest me, have I lost none." This proves that no true disciples ever left the Lord. But Jesus and John both baptized "disciples" and the commission commands that only "disciples" be baptized. What is a "disciple"? As I proved by Luke 14:26-27, that a "disciple" is one who had "forsaken all" and was "bearing his cross," therefore a Christian, then it follows that only Christians were baptized under the Commission.

On Acts 2:38, my friend dies hard. He confesses that "repent" is the second person, a plural, and "baptize" is third person, singular. He does not even attempt to deny this. There is a rule in grammar that says. "Verbs must agree with their subjects in number and person." If this is true, it follows that "repent," which is second person, plural, can not have the same subject as "baptize," which is third person, singular. They can not be joined together, therefore, to secure the same result. Any tyro in grammar knows this. But, Mr. Warlick says that I am ^{LC} "silly" to take such a position. It is like this, says Mr. Warlick, a mother ays to her children: "Arise,

and each of you be washed for breakfast." Mr. Warlick wants to know if there are two sets of children. No but it happens that "arise" is second person, singular, and so is "be washed." There is a difference in voice only in the sentence my friend uses. So the sentence is not similar to Acts 2:38. Try again, Mr. Warlick. Get one with second person, plural, joined to a third person, singular, or grammarians will laugh.

Mr. Warlick says that his candidate for baptism is no more a hater of God when he leads him into the water to be baptized than is the Baptist man who has repented and has not yet believed. There you go again. There never was a man who had repented and had not yet believed. My repentant man is always a believer. But you say a man cannot love God till he is baptized. Then you baptize a hater of God to make a lover of God out of him. Absurd.

If Mr. Warlick says a man can't love God until after he is baptized he runs in the face of the experience of every Christian, for the true Christian knows he loved God first and was baptized because he loved God. Besides this he takes a hater of God into the water to make a lover of God out of him. If it is possible for a man to love God before he is baptized, it follows irresistibly that a man is born of God before baptism. (1 John 4:7.)

On whether the real comes first or the symbolic my friend is in the fog. The Lord's Supper is unquestionably symbolic of the suffering and death of Jesus Christ. Mr. Warlick says you must observe the symbol before you get the benefits of the fact. Then you must partake of the Lord's Supper before you can get the benefits of Christ's suffering and death. Thought you had been telling us that you claimed these benefits when you were baptized and before the Lord's Supper was eaten? The trouble with Mr. Warlick is that he is confused over the difference between a type and a symbol. A type, says the dictionary, in "Theology: An object, office, institution, individual, or action by which Christ, his life, death, atoning sacrifice was prefigured." So it was the types that come first, not the symbols. What is a symbol? Webster says: "An emblem or representation of something else. Thus in the eucharist the bread and wine are called symbols of the body and blood of Christ." This will, I trust, get my friend out of the fog on that point. That Baptism is a symbol he concedes. Then the symbol comes after the fact. My friend asks if the salvation spoken of in the commission is real or symbolical. It is a real salvation, and baptism is a symbol that proclaims the fact but it does not procure the fact.

Mr. Warlick says a man can not confess Christ before he is baptized, and he says that I am wrong on Rom. 10, which says that the man who confesses Christ shall be saved. He says all those who have such a promise had been baptized. Then he and his people are wrong when they have the candidate for baptism to make the "Good Confession" before the congregation before baptism. If the confession is a genuine confession it insures salvation. If it is false and spurious it is a sin, and thus you compel your man to commit sin before you will baptize him.

He says my talk about the sin against the Holy Ghost is "silly."

Easier to call it "silly" than it is to answer it. If there is no possibility of being forgiven for the sin of leaving off baptism then it is the sin against the Holy Ghost since there is only one sin of which there is no forgiveness.

John demanded fruit before he would baptize and Mr. Warlick can not deny it. But Jesus says you can't bear fruit unless you are in the vine and the vine we both agree is Christ (John 15). Then it follows that fruit bearing children of God were the only ones John baptized. Why did not my friend notice this?

I asked Mr. Warlick whether he baptized a child of God or the child of the devil. He dodges by saying that Baptists baptize children of the devil. Suppose we do? I deny it, but suppose we do? Does that answer the question? Baptist doctrine is not under review in this proposition. To say, "you are another" does not meet the issue. I charge you with baptizing children of the devil. If you say you do not baptize a child of the devil, then I ask whose child do you baptize? If you baptize a child of God, then it surely does not take baptism to make a child of God out of him. If you do not baptize a child of God, then you do baptize the other sort. Don't dodge. Answer, like a little man.

I charged my friend with baptizing a dead faith. If the faith is dead until it is baptized, as my friend had been contending, then it certainly is a dead faith that he baptizes on. So it follows that in reality, since a dead faith is not faith at all, he baptizes a man who has no real or genuine faith. This is a serious matter but he lands right there.

Isn't it funny how he has skipped over Cornelius? Acts 10:43-48 tells us that Cornelius "received the Holy Ghost" before he was baptized. But Jesus said "him the world cannot receive" (John 14:17). Then since Mr. Warlick, in the first proposition, said nobody but "sons" "received the Spirit" and I agreed with him, then it follows that Cornelius was a "son" when he received the Holy Ghost. If Balaam's ass received the Holy Ghost, then that ass was a Christian or Jesus misrepresented the facts. That is too absurd for anybody to accept. If Balaam's ass received the Holy Ghost, then it is not true, as Mr. Warlick and his people have been saying, that the church could not have received the Holy Ghost before Pentecost. Fix this some way, Mr. Warlick, or the people will think you can't.

One advance negative argument and this speech will close

Alexander Campbell is the father of Mr. Warlick's doctrine. Here are Campbell's own words: "When preparing for a debate with Mr. McCalla, I put myself under special instructions. I had some time before that discussion, been often impressed with such passages as Acts 2:38; and that providential call to discuss the subject with Mr. McCalla, compelled me to decide the matter to my entire satisfaction. It was in this commonwealth that this doctrine was first publicly promulgated in modern times." (Campbell-Rice Debate, page 472.)

Thus the doctrine of baptism being necessary to salvation was first proclaimed by Campbell. He made a new translation of the Bible to fit his theory, called the "Living Oracles," which is even now

in circulation among Mr. Warlick's people. On page 441, Campbell-Rice Debate, he says. "When I published my edition of the New Testament, feeling myself authorized by the original, I departed in this instance from all other translations then known to me."

I do not introduce this to tantalize or taunt my friend. I expressly agree not to call him and his people by Campbell's name as they take offense at it and to save their feelings I have refrained and will refrain from calling them a name they get mad about when so called. But I did not agree to fail to prove that their doctrine came from Campbell and not from the Bible.

MR. WARLICK'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE.

The unfortunate trouble with Mr. Bogard in regard to Mark 16:16 is, that he does not seem to understand one thing of what his authors mean when he quotes them. Not one of the men from whom he quotes ever thought for a moment that the passage was spurious. They only challenge its genuineness, not its authenticity. If Mr. Bogard does not know the difference between the two words, it is his misfortune and not my fault. I repeat, no man has ever challenged the authenticity of the passage. All that any one has denied is that Mark wrote it. They say it is inspired all right, but that Mark may not be its author. It is not found in two of the oldest MSS., but it is in two others as old, and in all the rest. The reader will remember that Mr. Bogard does not deny this. I made it plain in my last article. Let every reader remember that no man has ever questioned that the passage is inspired, but some have said it is not clear that Mark wrote it. Their explanation is that after Mark had written his narrative that far, some one got his copy and used it, and from that unfinished copy the two MSS., which leave it out were made, but that later Mark wrote the passage and was quoted as its author by the early writers. This I made clear in my last.

As I stated in my last article, Paul in Heb. 2:1 to 4, endorses as genuine Mark's account of the Commission. See following parallel:

MARK 16-14-20.

"Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and unbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.

He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.

And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues;

They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them: they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.

And they went forth and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."

HEB. 2-1-4.

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip.

For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward;

How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him;

(Here reference is made to the Lord giving the commission to the apostles, mentioned in Mark, verses 14, 15, 16.—Joe S. W.)

God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?"

(In this statement, Paul points to what Mark says in verses 17 and 20. Paul, in this passage, endorses Mark's account of the Commission.—Joe S. W.)

No one stole Mark's copy and forged this passage as Mr. Bogard tries to say in dodging. I have mentioned the fact that those who challenge it, challenge also the entire book of Revelation, and many other chapters and parts of chapters in the Bible. My friend can not defeat the charge that he is lined up with the Infidels. His readers will remember that he denies a part of the Holy Bible as being divine, and that he differs from all infidels only in the amount

of the book he denies. My friend's saying that he has seen Bibles with the Book of Mormon bound in them, and that he has seen other Bibles with the Apocryphal books which the Catholics use, serves him no purpose, for the Mormons and the Catholics made the Bibles he means, but the scholars who are undenominational in their work translate for us. There is not a Bible published which does not contain the passage I am defending, not one of them leaves it out, and no scholar would do it. Mr. Bogard has lined himself up with the infidels, and he cannot get away from this charge.

I quoted from Broadus in my last, in which that scholar said in a Baptist magazine in 1869 that a man was foolish to question the passage. Because my friend has never seen the magazine he thinks to deny that such a statement is true will pass with his readers, but if any of them have ever read any, they will laugh when they see what he says. In quoting from Dr. Broadus I incidentally said that he was the only scholar the loyal Baptists had ever had. I meant, of course the only real educator.

Of course everybody but Mr. Bogard will understand that I referred to Baptists who were not of the Higher Critics. Mr. Bogard, like a blind dog in a meat house, snapping at every noise he hears, thought I referred to the division among the Missionary Baptists on Boards and Conventions. Sure if I had had such a little thing in mind as Land Mark Baptists I should have made no exception, for they do not have one scholar in their ranks. Dr. Broadus did not belong to them. It is even hard for them to get a D. D. degree from their smallest schools. My brethren have a number of colleges. Some of the best. We have half dozen in Texas. At this point Mr. Bogard refers to "Alexander" as somebody's founder in religion. In this he does not only violate the rules of debate, but he goes back on a private promise. But what does he care when he is mad like he has been from the first of this discussion? He actually tickles me.

Now, if it were true that the man he has in mind did found a church, it would be not less than twelve years older than the oldest Missionary Baptist church in the world. It would be about a hundred years older than the faction with which Mr. Bogard tries to do business. I insist Mr. Bogard that you let those matters alone before it gets worse for you. We are debating the design of baptism, not the age of one's church. To say that A. Campbell started a church is one of the devil's lies. It is not true.

In this connection I shall refer to where my friend tries to represent A. Campbell in a quotation from the Campbell-Rice debate. Mr. Bogard shows as much competency here as usual, but no more, Campbell said that it was in this Commonwealth, the doctrine of baptism for remission was first taught in "these modern times." Mr. Bogard actually thinks that this statement means it was first taught here, and that for the first time in all the world, although he had Campbells argument before him, and the passages from the New Testament as used by Campbell which clearly teach it. How is it my friend is so careless? Did Campbell, Warlick or any one else ever say that baptism is for remission any plainer than Christ did in the Commission? "He that believes and is baptized shall be

saved." I should like to ask our Baptist readers what words they would use in an effort to teach that baptism is a condition of salvation which declare it more plainly than those of the Savior in Mark 16:16. Or, can you teach the doctrine more plainly than Peter did in Acts 2:38, when he said to believers: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Try to make it plainer and see how you will come out.

I have nailed Mr. Bogard to the wall on his criticism on the Master's language. If, as he says, the unbeliever only is to be condemned, and therefore baptism is not a condition, though Christ declares it is, then since repentance precedes faith as Baptists teach and only the unrepentant man is condemned, as in Luke 13, it will follow by their own logic that faith is not a condition. All of this has been made plain in other articles, and will no doubt come up again in the next proposition. Mr. Bogard thinks that all acceptable repentance results in faith. But when I show him that all acceptable faith results in baptism, and that it does not get the salvation until it is baptized, he fails to see even his own logic which ruins him forever. Mr. Bogard is an amusing fellow, and one so easy to trap. Surely no one but Mr. Bogard will so far depart from good judgment as to say that repentance, when done by the sinner, is one thing, and when done by the erring Christian is another. This he declares in trying to get out of the trap I put him in on the subject. He said repentance was a change of mind and so if a believer repents he becomes an unbeliever by so doing. But he now says the believers repentance is in regard to his sins, not to his faith. Well, then, what becomes of his first objection? Does he not teach that all believers are saved? I tell you discussing this matter with my friend is a picnic. I should like for the gentleman to tell us who told him that the repentance of the sinner is not relative to his sins, but to his faith, but that the repentance of the erring disciple is in regard to his sins and not his faith. I should like for my friend's readers to call upon him for an explanation. Never mind the new matter in the final negative, we shall have a come back at him on the next proposition. What sins does the believer have to repent of if the Baptist doctrine be true?

My friend's effort to get out of his trouble which he brought on himself by saying that disciple means a saved person is pitiful. I showed that many disciples went back and walked no more with Christ. I showed also that Judas was one of the Lord's disciples. He said these were not genuine disciples. That the Lord would sometimes make a failure in trying to make disciples, that He made a counterfeit sometimes, but that His disciples never made any other but the real sort, and that when Christ told them to make disciples, He meant for them to do a better job than He did. Of course everybody but Mr. Bogard knows that the word disciple simply means a learner, and that the Lord uses it in this sense only in Matthew 28:19. But the passages which my friend introduces here will come in their proper order. They belong really to the last proposition of the debate.

On Acts 2:38 is where Mr. Bogard subjects himself to the severest exposure. He says that when Peter said to the believers on the day of Pentecost, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," he addressed two sets of hearers. One class who were not saved and another class who were saved. Of course he is ridiculous in his appearance here. He says the two verbs are of different persons and number. He says verbs agree with their subjects in number and person. He goes to the Greek to get the number and the person of the verbs, and then comes back to the English to get his rule. His idea is really too silly to talk about.*

I reduced it to absurdity in my last, by giving him a similar sentence. The mother says to her children in bed, "Arise, and be washed for breakfast." Mr. Bogard says that these verbs are in the singular. Well, will he now give us the plural form of the verbs in such a sentence? If he were to say to his congregation, "Arise and receive the benediction," I suppose he would mean for only one person at a time to arise. Pshaw! What on earth's the matter with the fellow anyway?

Of course every reader with common sense will see that Mr. Bogard is only quibbling here. Every one knows that the passage, "Repent and be baptized, for the remission of sins" addresses the same people. Only those who are determined not to have the truth ever try to dispute this. In saying what they do about it, they subject themselves to the embarrassment of an unenvied exposure. But for the benefit of the readers who are really studying the matter, I here give some Baptist authority which is real authority. The men from whom I shall now quote are scholars, and they write as such. Their testimony is worth something, so we give it. But I must say that I feel like apologizing to our readers for even proposing to ask sensible men to explain as plain language as Acts 2:38. Just

*Not having the books by me when writing my article concerning the Greek with reference to Mr. Bogard's contention, I insert just a little of the authority which might be used here, only as a matter of reference for students who may have a desire to look further into the matter. I showed plainly that to use a rule in English Grammar as authority on the Greek was foolish. My opponent, not knowing anything about the matter, does this.

Now to show that the use of singular pronouns as well as plural pronouns in the Greek is not always easily understood, that sometimes one is used when the other is intended, I quote from that ripe scholar, who is standard in every university and every college in the country—Winers' New Testament Greek Grammar:

"9. In the same way, these Pronouns, when referring to a Singular noun are put in the Plural, if that noun has a collective signification, or is an abstract used for the concrete." Page 141.

Again, on page 174, the same author says, on Number and Gender of Nouns: "A Masculine noun in the Singular, with the Article, is often used collectively to denote the whole class. The Singular in all such cases presents the distinctive characteristic more exclusively and more forcibly than the Plural, designating, as the latter does, a multitude of individuals. Similar to this construction is the use of Singular to express, in reference to a plurality, an object which belongs to each of the individuals." And again, on page 176, he says: "Not a few nouns which are used by us ordinarily in the Singular, were employed exclusively, or at least predominantly, in the Plural; this is owing to the objects denoted by them having from a general or from a Grecian or Biblical point of view, some sensible or ideal manifoldness or comprehensiveness."

Thus do we explode by standard authority that late and very incompetent discovery on Verbs agreeing with their nominative case in number as well as person in the Greek. Real scholars, of course, or even men who know the alphabet of Greek, would not say such things, but in dealing with every class we have to meet them as we find them.

think of it. Peter said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Could anything be plainer? Some Baptists, however rather hear Baptists talk than to listen to Christ and his apostles, so we give some Baptist testimony on the passage.

In his comment on Acts Dr. Hackett says: "In order to the forgiveness of sins we connect naturally with both the preceding verbs."

In a letter to R. T. Mathews of Feb. 24, 1876, Dr. Harkness said: "Eis in Acts 2:38 denotes purpose and may be rendered in order to, for the purpose of receiving. Eis Aphesin Hamartion suggests the motive or object contemplated in the two preceding verbs." Poor Mr. Bogard who does not understand the matter says the two verbs are not joined to secure the same results.

But hear Dr. Wilmarth, another scholar among the Bapt'ists. In Baptist Quarterly for July, 1877, speaking of the foolish rendering of the phrase "because of," such as Mr. Bogard would like to give it in this discussion, Dr. Wilmarth says: "We are gravely told that if we translate it on account of, in token of, it will yet be possible for us to remain Baptists. Such methods of interpretation are unworthy of Christian scholars." Again in same Quarterly, page 306, Dr. Wilmarth says "Suppose we force Eis in Acts 2:38 to bear the unnatural, unauthorized meaning of "on account of." After all, we have gained nothing. Others passages there are which can not be explained away. Thus our Savior said, just before he ascended the heavens, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' We shall hardly dare to tamper with His royal word, and make it run, 'He that believeth, and is saved shall be baptized.' And unless we do thus change His saying, we have by the highest authority an important attribute to baptism, (It seems Dr. Wilmarth knows that Mark 16:16 is inspired—J. S. W.) certainly not less than that given to it in Acts 2:38, translated according to its obvious meaning. What then is the advantage of violently torturing EIS, the construction and context?" Let all Baptist readers take careful notice of the above testimony from their very best scholars. What these men say is not only the best scholarship, it is just what the Bible says on the subject. The Baptists may now decide between the truth and even Baptist scholarship on one side, and incompetent men among them on the other. But I give some other testimony from scholars who are not Baptists. Dr. Goodwin, the author of the Greek Grammar, in a letter to J. W. Shepherd bearing date of September 11, 1893, says: "EIS in Acts 2:38 expresses purpose or tendency and is rightly translated for, or unto in the sense of for."

Dr. Thayer, the author of the greatest of all New Testament Greek Lexicons, translates the phrase "EIS Asphesin Hamartion—"That your sins may be forgiven you."

To the above testimony we might add many others, in fact, there is not a scholar on earth who will say that the passage may read "because of," in Acts 2:38, but with these we close the matter for the present.

These scholars, who know all about it, stand with me and with

the Bible on the subject while Mr. Bogard who knows absolutely nothing about it, is in a class to himself.

In my third article I ruined my friend on the idea of baptism being a symbol or figure, and that we are only representatively baptized into Christ. He asks if we have to take the Lord's supper before we get the benefits of Christ's blood. I answer we have to eat the supper before we get the real blessing belonging to it.

All the types, shadows and pictures of the Old Testament point to the real Christ of the New Testament. If the symbol comes first and it does, then since faith comes before baptism, faith would be the symbolic salvation and not baptism. But this nonsensical twaddle about symbolic salvation and real salvation is only a recent discovery made to hide behind, when a Baptist preacher does not want the people to see the truth. I am ashamed of them for it, and sorry for those deluded by the stuff. Christ says "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Bogard admits this means the real salvation. Then baptism is a condition of it, so down he goes by this admission, and his readers will see it.

I said a man can not confess Christ until he believes in Him; I didn't say not until he is baptized like Mr. Bogard thinks I said. Now if he is saved before he can confess then this is not any point for him. But the text which Mr. Bogard uses in Rom. 10 puts the salvation after the confession, and so if it relates to sinners he has his man not saved at faith, but he must wait until he confesses before he obtains it. Mr. Bogard, you are in the hole here, and no one will fail to see that you are.

I have fully exposed him on his silly talk about baptism being the sin against the Holy Ghost. I have also shown that Baptists say they baptize children of the devil, by teaching that baptism is the act of the body which they declare is yet unregenerated, and that it will not be regenerated until the resurrection. The body is also the man who gets the communion and whom they baptize into the Baptist church. Thus we show that a Baptist church is made of unregenerated children of the devil, according to their own logic and teaching. Mr. Bogard is sick over this, but I can't help him any, for he is alone responsible for the predicament. Because Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Bogard thinks by putting baptism before salvation that Christ said the child of the devil is to be baptized. Well, the fight is between him and Christ, and they will settle the matter. I stand with what the Master said, and am not ashamed of the company.

Mr. Bogard says the faith at which he saves the sinner is a live faith, for it saves as soon as it comes. In that case then it saves a man who has not had time to love God before he is saved, neither has he had time to confess Christ, so his saved man is saved denying Christ and hating God. Mr. Bogard, you said it; now what will you do about it? It would also save before it had time to work, and so would be dead when it saved.

On Cornelius' case I have abundantly exposed my friend. Cornelius was able, like Balaam's beast, to speak in Tongues. Mr. Bogard thinks Cornelius was a saved man, but the beast was not saved.

The predicament is his, not mine. The miracle of Holy Ghost baptism was no more an evidence of his salvation than was the talk he had with the angel. He talked with the angel before he believed in Christ, and he spake with tongues before he was baptized. He was not yet saved in either case, for he was a creature, and Christ said to Peter as well as to the other Apostles, preach the gospel to every creature, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now Peter had only the authority of this commission. If he had told Cornelius that salvation came before baptism, he would have transcended his authority. If Cornelius, a creature, to whom the message went, was saved before he was baptized, Christ falsely instructed the apostles. Christ did not do this. Therefore Cornelius was saved when he believed and was baptized.

Concluding my argument on this proposition, I shall simply quote some scriptures without comment. Those who believe the scriptures will agree with me. Those who do not agree with me, and stand with my friend, will do it only by denying the scriptures.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16:16. "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Acts 2:38. "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Acts 22:16. "All the promises of God are yea and amen in Christ Jesus." "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 2 Cor. 5:17. The believer is baptized into Christ." Rom. 6:1-4, also Gal. 3:27. To these we might add others, but this will suffice for this time.

It is only a matter of believing the Bible or disbelieving it, that's all. I should like for my friend to try to answer the arguments. His reference to the experience of his brethren is no good in this case. Paul tells us in 2 Cor. 10:12 not to pay any attention to such evidence. "We dare not make ourselves of the number or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves, but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves are not wise." Just cut that evidence out, Mr. Bogard, and give us the Lord's word in the case. What God says and not how Baptists feel, is what we are after now.

MR. BOGARD'S FOURTH NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: My sinking friend says that I do not understand what the scholars mean when they tell us that Mark 16:16 is not a part of the Bible. I may not be able to understand plain English, but I think I am. I shall quote again exactly what they say and leave it to the reader to decide what they mean.

Phillip Schaff, the greatest of Bible scholars, said: "Additions from oral traditions, ancient liturgies, and explanatory glosses. Under this head we place the most serious interpolations, which are rejected by critics. They are as follows:

"The doxology of the Lord's prayer (Matt. 6.13).

"The concluding twelve verses of Mark (9 to 20) which were added after the first complete edition of the gospel had got into circulation.

"Tichendorf and Tregelles set the twelve verses apart; Wescot & Hort enclose them in brackets; the Anglo-American Revision properly retains them with a marginal note. (That note is: 'The two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other documents, end this gospel with verse 8. Some documents give an entirely different ending from verses 9-20' (B. M. B.)

"To maintain the genuineness of this passage is simply impossible"

As to whether the verses in question could be received as inspired W. N. Clark in his commentary said: "The question must be answered in the negative."

Alford says: "It would thus appear that, while this passage was appended as early as the time of Irenaeus, it was still absent from a majority of the codices as late as Jerome's day. The legitimate inference is that it was placed as a completion of the gospel soon after the Apostolic period."

Smith's History of the New Testament, page 704, says: "The passage is rejected by the majority of modern critics on the testimony of the manuscripts."

Wescot & Hort, Vol. 1, Appendix, says: "It manifestly can not claim any apostolic authority."

G. W. Clark's commentary says, page 8: "Since the appearance of Griesbach's second edition of the New Testament in Greek to the original gospel."

This would be sufficient for any reasonable man, but Mr. Warlick says I do not understand. Possibly the readers can understand plain English and if they can I shall be satisfied with the results. When Wescot & Hort say it "Manifestly has no apostolic authority" and when Schaff says it was "added after the gospel got into circulation," and all say it is not genuine, it ought to satisfy any who are looking for the truth. Mr. Warlick says they mean that Mark never wrote it. Well, who did? If Mark never wrote it, then it is not a part of his gospel. My friend continues to say, in spite of

the facts in the case, that the note at the bottom of the passage in the Revised Version only says that the passage is not in "two of the oldest manuscripts." The note says no such thing and Mr. Warlick knows it, and every one who has a copy of the Revised Version can turn and read it for himself. The note says it is not in "two oldest, not in 'two of the oldest'." The two oldest are the copies from which all others have been made, and since Mark 16:16 is not to be found in them, it follows that somebody added it later and thus the fraud was discovered. Nobody claims that somebody "stole Mark's manuscript" and then forged it. They did not have printing presses then and all copies of the Bible were written by hand, and some transcriber, in making a copy, added Mark 16:16. That is all and we know it was done for when we compare the copy that somebody made with the old original we find it has that much more in it than Mark put there. That settles it.

My friend says that those who deny Mark 16:16 also deny the entire book of Revelation. This is not true, for the authors I quote say no such thing. Schaff gives the passages in his edition of the Revised New Testament, which are called in question by the revisers, and Revelations is not included. He says I am lined up with the infidels so far as I go. Even so is Mr. Warlick so far as he goes. Infidels reject all the Catholics accept, and so does Mr. Warlick reject them. Is Mr. Warlick an infidel for agreeing with infidels in this matter? "Yes," says Mr. Warlick, "but the Catholics made the Apochraphal books." They did? How do you know? You found out in exactly the same way that scholars found that Mark 16:16 is also a fraud—none of it is in the original documents and therefore rejected. Thus we see that Mr. Warlick's stronghold, and the stronghold of his brethren is no part of the Bible. But we can let it stand and still it does him no good, for it distinctly says that only disbelievers will be lost and that is too much for my friend.

Mr. Warlick says that Broadus is the only scholar Baptists have produced. He said it in his last and repeats in the speech I am now replying to. Then he turns right around and says: "I here give some Baptist authority. The men from whom I quote now are scholars, and they write as such." Then after quoting Hackett, Harkness and Wilmarth, he says: "Let all Baptist readers take careful notice of the above testimony from their best scholars. What these men say is not only the best, but it is just what the Bible says." Now, Mr. Warlick, which time did you tell the truth? Baptists have never produced but one scholar and his name was Broadus and yet Mr. Warlick quotes three others as the best scholarship! There is about as much truth in this glaring contradiction as there is in anything else Mr. Warlick says. He will say anything in the world that comes to his mind if by that he can slur Baptists, or put their doctrine into discredit. In all the ranks of Baptists Mr. Warlick has found three who agree with Alexander Campbell's followers and, behold, they are the "best scholarship," when he had just been telling us that we never had but one scholar. If his first statement be true, the men he quoted as agreeing with him are not scholars. If his first statement is false, then what confidence can we put in anything

he may say? I leave it to the reader to decide. To clear the point, I will say that I can find so-called Baptist scholars who do not believe in the inspiration of the Bible and I can find so-called Baptist scholars who do not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Why did not my friend quote Broadus on Acts 2:38? If Broadus is the only scholar among us?

It hurts my friend for me to quote Campbell on him. Well, Campbell had the candor to confess that he was the first in modern time to preach Mr. Warlick's doctrine. Of course he claimed to get it from the Bible. So do all founders of new churches. Thomas claimed to get it all from the Bible when he founded the Christadelphian Church. So did Miller claim to get it all from the Bible when he founded the Seventh Day Adventist Church. Every heretic under the sun claims to be the first one in modern times to discover this doctrine, it means that he began a movement that resulted in the organization of a church, to which church Mr. Warlick and his crowd belong. A man-made institution. It matters not how young the Baptists are. We are not discussing that. It is your doctrine that is under fire and I brought this up to show that your idea of Acts 2:38 is a modern invention, and that Campbell made a translation of the New Testament to fit the new doctrine. True, we are not discussing the origin of the church, but we are discussing a doctrine and the question is: Did that doctrine come from God or men? I have shown it came from men, and that A. Campbell is its father. This hurts, I know, but that is what the debate is for, to bring out the truth.

In Acts 2:38 the same parties are not told to be baptized who were told to repent. Why? Because "repent" is second person plural and "baptize" is third person singular. Since verbs must agree with their subjects in number and person it follows that the two verbs do not refer to the same person, for they can not do so. Mr. Warlick says I "go to the Greek to get my number and person and come to the English to get my rule." I do no such thing. If friend Warlick will borrow a Greek grammar and turn (or rather get some one to turn for him) to "Syntax" he will find this rule: "A verb agrees with its subject nominative in number and person" (Hadley & Allen Greek Grammar, page 203). That is the rule in all written languages without an exception. Mr. Warlick's illustration about the mother saying to her children: "Arise, and be washed for breakfast" is not a parallel case, for the verbs are both in the same number and person. Then when he changes it to supposing that I might say to the congregation: "Arise, and receive the benediction," he does no better, for "arise" and "receive" are in the same number and person. He can not make a grammatical sentence to save his life where the verbs are of a different number and person and join the two verbs together to secure the same result. If it could be done I know friend Warlick would have done it. So Acts 2:38 is gone hopelessly from my friend. With Acts 2:38 and Mark 16:16, both gone from him, what has he left? It is noticeable that he did not bring up John 3:5. I have driven all of them so hopelessly away from that passage that they all avoid it after the first round on it.

Mr. Warlick assumes, without the shadow of proof, that "all ac-

ceptable faith results in baptism." What has he said to prove this? Nothing. If faith is a complete spiritual act before baptism, I have proved that a live, complete faith always brings salvation. Unless he can prove, I say prove, mark you, not simply assert, that a man does not have complete faith before baptism, then he is hopelessly gone on the entire question. But if he proves that, then he baptizes a man who has not completely believed. A faith that is not complete does not exist except in part and hence he baptizes a man who has never exercised faith, who has not reached the point of faith. Mr. Warlick continues to talk about the man who has repented and yet has not believed. Let him show such a man. He can not. Of course only the unrepentant man will be lost, because repentance complete is faith as has been abundantly proved. They are inseparably joined together. But such is not the case with faith and baptism. Hence the hole he is trying to put me in refuses to admit me. If the repentance of a sinner is not different from that of a Christian, why does not Mr. Warlick allow the sinner who repents to come to God as the repentant Christian does?

Disciples only are to be baptized under the commission and I proved that a true disciple is a Christian. When Mr. Warlick said I must accept the doctrine of falling from grace if this is true, for he found disciples who went back and followed the Lord no more, then I showed him that he was wrong again by quoting where Jesus said that none who have been given him of the Father went back (John 18:9) and then showed by John's epistle (I Jno. 2:19) that all who went out were not of them, a complete knockout for Mr. Warlick, here he comes and says that this properly belongs to the last proposition. Well, what did you bring it up for in this proposition, if it did not belong there? I am compelled to follow his lead in this part of the discussion as he is the affirmant.

Mr. Warlick says we Landmark Baptists have a hard time getting the title of D. D. from our little colleges. There is one better than Mr. Warlick's folks have because they have not even one college that can confer degrees of any kind. Mark you, the college at Lexington, Ky., and the one in Virginia does not belong to Mr. Warlick's crowd of Non-Progressives, but to the Progressives. Why do you bring up such stuff as that, Mr. Warlick? You know I can always head you at the like of that.

My friend says he ruined me on symbolic salvation. He says that the symbol must be observed before the benefits of the thing symbolized can be had. I asked him if one must eat the Lord's Supper before he gets the benefit of that which it symbolized, namely, the death and suffering of Christ. He answers that one must eat the supper before the blessing of the supper can be received. Certainly. But the blessing to be received by eating the supper is not the benefits of Christ's death. If this is so, then we do not have to observe the symbol to get the benefits of the thing symbolized. Mr. Warlick's confusion here is because he has not observed the distinction between the words, "symbol," that always points back, and "type," that always points forward. So when Saul was told to "arise, and be baptized and

wash away his sins" it was a symbolical washing, to represent the real which had already been accomplished in the blood of Christ.

All that twaddle about Baptists baptizing a child of the devil is like the boy who says "you are another" when he gets into a corner that he can't get out of. I deny it. But suppose we do? What has that to do with the question? We are not discussing Baptist doctrine now. That will come in the next proposition. But to help my friend, I will say since he confesses that his man is a child of the devil, he should not think all others do the same. However it is a good confession he makes and he shall have due credit for it. We baptize the kind of a man Paul describes, in Rom. 7th and 8th chapters, a man with two natures, the one contending with the other, one part redeemed and one part "waiting for the adoption, to-wit, the redemption of the body." (Rom. 8:23). The trouble with Mr. Warlick is that no part of his man is saved before baptism. He goes down into the water a hater of God and an alien, and that dip into the water transforms him into a lover of God and a full fledged citizen.

Mr. Warlick says that the Baptist idea saves a man before he can love God. No, no, Mr. Warlick, the Baptists did not invent that idea, because we find in the Bible that repentance is that change of the mind that results in love and the moment a man loves God he has proof that he is a child of God, for "He that loveth is born of God and knoweth God" (I Jno. 4:7). A man can't love God before he repents, for then he would be a saved man before repentance. But says Mr. Warlick, he can't love God before he is baptized. Then a hater of God, a man whose mind has not changed to love toward God, can by a magical dip, by the assistance of another man, become a lover of God! If the man loves God before baptism he is saved as certain as the Bible is true. See I John 4:7.

We have seen that Cornelius (Acts 10:43-48) did receive the Holy Ghost before baptism. Jesus said that no body but saved people can "receive the Holy Ghost" (John 14:17). Jesus said that, and I have still another witness. Mr. Joe S. Warlick said it in his argument on the first proposition. I told him then that I would use it on him in this proposition. I am doing it. But says Mr. Warlick, Cornelius received a message from an angel before he was baptized. Did that prove him to be saved? No, for the Lord never said that to talk with angels was proof of salvation. But the Lord did say that to "receive the Holy Ghost" was proof of salvation. Then I know Cornelius was saved before baptism else the Lord was wrong about it. But says Mr. Warlick, Balaam's donkey received the Holy Ghost too. Indeed! Two things follow if that is true. One is that the Holy Ghost was received before Pentecost, and the other is that that donkey was a Christian, for Jesus said that only the saved received the Holy Ghost. That is too manifest. Of course, that donkey had a miracle worked upon him by the power of God, but the donkey did not receive the Holy Ghost, for that would prove the donkey to be a Christian as sure as you live.

In conclusion of his feeble effort my friend says we must not put our experience up against the Word of God. I have not done that. But whether a man loves or not before baptism is wholly within the

realm of experience. Love is not a mechanical thing that can be worked out by rule. It is a matter of consciousness as to whether a man loves his wife, his friend, or his God.' But if he loves God he is saved. How do we know? Not by his consciousness, but because the Bible says that when one loves he is saved. He is conscious of love and the Bible then assures him that he is saved. Millions are conscious of the fact that they did love God before they were baptized they did love God and did it as an expression of their sincere love. Then we know that if the Bible is true, they were saved before baptism.

Christ commanded that only "disciples" be baptized (Matt. 28: 18-20). "A disciple is a Christian" says the Saviour in Luke. But since this is true nobody but Christians should be baptized. Nobody can meet this argument. But Mr. Warlick quibbles about the Lord making a failure on some of the disciples he made, and I think the apostles would beat the Lord at disciple making and never make any failures. I suggested no such thing. All the disciples the Lord made were genuine but some joined themselves to him who were not true. He did not make them hypocritical. So there would be some such under the ministry of the apostles, but they would not be of the apostles' making. But the Lord certainly did not command the disciples to make false disciples. If he did not, then he did not command any to be baptized except true disciples and a true disciple is a saved person. Thus everything my opponent has produced has been turned against him.

To briefly sum up we see the following facts in this discussion:

1. A man loves God before baptism, hence saved before baptism. 1 John 4:7.
2. A man works righteousness before baptism and such an one is saved. Acts 10:35.
3. A man confesses Christ before baptism and such as confess are saved. Matt. 10:32.
4. According to Mr. Warlick leaving off baptism is worse than murder or rape, since we can get forgiveness for murder and rape but not for leaving off baptism. Matt. 12:31.
5. If Mr. Warlick is right, a man's salvation is in the hands of another man and another man's permission must be obtained before a man can be saved. Priestcraft.
6. Mr. Warlick's doctrine makes God dishonest. After telling a man he can have salvation at faith, and the man accepts, the Lord then comes up on the price as it were and demands baptism in addition to the original offer.
7. The strongest argument he has made is based on a spurious passage. Mark 16:16.
8. His doctrine forces him to say an ass received the Holy Ghost, and that, too, before Pentecost. Selah!

Third Proposition

(The Scriptures teach that the sinner obtains remission of his sins in answer to prayer before baptism.)

MR. BOGARD'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen, Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The terms of my proposition are defined as follows. By the "Scriptures," I mean the Old and New Testaments. By "teach" I mean the Scriptures say so in plain words or such words are used that the idea is conveyed. By "sinner," I mean a natural, unredeemed man. By "remission of sins," I mean present salvation and acceptance with God. By "in answer to prayer," I mean in response to a request made for salvation. By "before baptism," I mean salvation or remission of sins precedes baptism. With the terms of the proposition so plainly defined that all may easily understand them, I now shall prove by the Bible that the proposition is true.

Rom. 10:12-13. "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."

I could rest the case on this passage alone. One unmistakable passage is enough, and this says exactly what my proposition says, that the sinner is saved in answer to prayer, in response to a request for salvation. Unless Mr. Warlick can show that an unbaptized man cannot call upon God for salvation, then my proposition is proved. The word translated "call" in this passage is "epikalesetai" and means "to invoke in prayer; to appeal to" (See Hinds & Noble Lexicon). The Lexicon refers us to Acts 7:59, as a sample of the use of the word, where Stephen when he was stoned: "Called upon the name of the Lord." If the martyr, Stephen, was really praying when he was being stoned to death, then the unsaved are really praying when they call upon the Lord to be saved. The very same word is used in the Greek and if one means prayer, so does the other. The Greek Lexicon says the word means to "invoke in prayer" and if it does, then the passage really says that "whosoever shall invoke the name of the Lord in prayer" shall be saved. Certainly this does not mean that whosoever is already saved shall pray, but the very opposite. James, writing to the "Twelve tribes, scattered abroad" says: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him" (Jas. 1:5. Certainly, all of the twelve tribes were not saved. In fact, only a small part of them were saved, as most of them rejected the Lord. James was writing to them as his Jewish brethren, some of whom were also brethren in the Lord, but most of them were not, and he told all of them that if any of you, some of whom were murderers (See Jas. 4:2), and some

of them were adulterers (See Jas. 4:4), some of them were expressly called "sinners" (See Jas. 4:8), and yet he said if "any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God and it shall be given him." Language could not be plainer and if it means anything, then a sinner may call upon God, and by invoking the name of the Lord in prayer receive salvation.

I think all will concede that confessing sin is prayer. Do we confess to men? No, that would be Catholicism. The sinner must confess his sins to God before he can be saved. If he does, he prays. But what of it? Much, every way. Prov. 28:13: "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." Does the sinner confess his sins to God before he is baptized? If not, then we have the spectacle of a sinner who has not even acknowledged his sin to God going into the water for baptism. If he has confessed his sins, he has the promise of mercy.

Faith in the existence of God is all that is necessary for an un-saved sinner to have to come to God in prayer for salvation. Heb. 11:6: "But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." When a sinner who believes in God's existence comes to God in prayer, he has the assurance that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. God, in His mercy, will hear the prayer and by the power of His Spirit, show him Jesus Christ, whom to know aright is life eternal.

To believe in Jesus Christ is to trust Him for salvation. The Greek word translated "believe" in the New Testament is "pisteuo" and the Lexicons say it means "to have confidence in," to trust, to intrust something" (See Liddell, Scott and Hinds & Noble). In Acts 16:31, the apostle tells the jailor to "believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Trust the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. When a man trusts Jesus Christ he has salvation. Do we trust Him before baptism? That is the only question worth while in this connection since salvation is assured when we trust. Let us notice a number of passages on this point:

The believer has everlasting life, John 3:36; the believer has a pure heart, Acts 15:8-9; the believer is not condemned, John 3:18; the believer is a child of God, Gal. 3:26; the believer is justified, Rom. 5:1; the believer is born of God, I. John 5:1; the believer is saved, Eph. 2:8. Since all concede that the man believes before baptism, then it follows that he has all the blessings aforementioned before baptism. If so, then he has salvation before baptism.

Saul of Tarsus was saved before he was baptized, as is seen by the following evidence: Paul was a praying man before he was baptized, Acts 9:6. And he trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, arise and go into the city and it shall be told thee what thou must do." That was a prayer, and it was heard. If Mr. Warlick says he was a Christian at that time, it follows that he was a Christian before baptism. If he was not a Christian at that time, then the Lord heard and answered a sinner's prayer. If he was a sinner it illustrates the doctrine that if a sinner will call upon the Lord he will be unerringly

guided to Jesus for salvation, and my proposition is established. If he was a Christian at that time, then he became such before baptism, and my proposition is established. Either way you take it, we see that baptism is not necessary to salvation. To prove beyond doubt that Saul was a Christian before baptism, we have only to observe the following facts:

He was a "chosen vessel" before he was baptized; Acts 9:15; he was a fit subject for the reception of the Holy Spirit before he was baptized: Acts 9:17, and since no man who is unsaved can receive the Holy Spirit (See John 14:17) it follows irresistably that he was a saved man before he was baptized. When he was told to "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins" it was evidently meant that he was by baptism not to literally wash away his sins but to symbolically wash away his sins, as they had been really and literally washed away by the blood of Christ.

Cornelius and his household were saved before they were baptized. Acts 10:47; "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Here we see that Cornelius had received the Holy Ghost before he was baptized, Jesus said of the Holy Ghost: "Him the world cannot receive" (See John 14:17). Since nobody but Christians can receive the Holy Ghost and Cornelius did receive the Holy Ghost before he was baptized, it follows to a certainty that Cornelius was a saved man before he was baptized. Besides this, we find Cornelius was a praying man before he was baptized (See Acts 10:4). If he was not a Christian before he was baptized, then the Lord heard and answered a sinner's prayer and my proposition is established. If he was a Christian before he was heard in prayer, then he was a Christian before baptism and still my proposition is established.

Jesus told the woman at the well (John 4:10) that if she would ask of Him He would give her living water, which he says is eternal life, and of which if a man drink, he shall never thirst again. Did Jesus tell the truth? If so, then salvation is for the asking. The thief on the cross asked for salvation and the Lord instantly responded: "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (See Luke 23:42-43). If he meant what he said, the thief was saved without baptism.

That we are not saved by baptism is evidenced by the fact Jesus said baptism is a work of righteousness (See Matt. 3:15). But we are told in Titus 3:5, that we are not saved by works of righteousness. Thus we find both positive and negative assurances that all who by prayer invoke the name of the Lord shall be saved and not by baptism nor by any other good work. By grace are ye saved through faith and that not of ourselves. Eph. 2:8.

MR. WARLICK'S FIRST NEGATIVE.

I am not so much concerned about the terms of this question, as I am about the real issue in the debate. As I take it, we are not to discuss the question of whether the sinner has the right to pray, or whether he gets an answer to his prayer. The question is, does the sinner get pardon or remission of sins in answer to prayer before he is baptized? It will be in order for Mr. Bogard to find an unbaptized sinner commanded to pray for salvation, and with the promise of his obtaining it, while he lingers still in disobedience. If the Pharisees rejected the counsel of God, when they refused to be baptized of John, and Christ said they did, (Luke 7-30). I should like for Mr. Bogard to tell us, what of his praying, unsaved man, who rejects the gospel, refusing to be baptized as the Lord directs. Will God hear the prayer of the man who deliberately turns away his ear from hearing the law of the Lord? Solomon says the prayer of such a man is an abomination in God's sight. But I shall not undertake to lead the witness. I simply want my friend to come up to the question he has engaged to prove. It is better that he show where the sinner is saved, under the gospel in answer to prayer before he is baptized. I will state the matter as it now appears to me.

Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." My friend demurs, and says: He that believeth and prays, shall be saved without baptism. It is not hard to see that he and the Savior are not at an agreement, and so we shall have to reject one or the other of them.

It is amusing to a student, to see Mr. Bogard go to Romans 10 to begin his argument. Here Paul, talking to Christian people, said: "He that calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved," but he adds: "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" This is too strong for my friend, for he says, as soon as one believes he is saved. Granting for the argument's sake that he is correct about this, he has his sinner saved at the point of believing, and before he has time to pray for pardon, for he teaches, as do all his brethren, that salvation comes at the point of faith, that the very moment one believes he is saved, and if this be true, then where is the space to be occupied by the prayer after one believes and before he is saved? Paul says he cannot pray until he is a believer, and Mr. Bogard says, he cannot believe without being saved in believing, and so I shall insist that my friend cannot have an unsaved praying man at all. It will not do to say that this man only believes in the existence of God. He believes in Him, in Paul's language, and this is all the faith the Baptists require for salvation. So the matter stands thus—How can he pray unless he has Baptist faith, and how can he have Baptist faith without being saved? I shall insist that my friend loses Roman 10 to begin with.

Take his reference to the Lexicons, and he is wrong again. The word for call, in the passage, means oftener than otherwise to have the name of one called upon another, as the calling of the step-son, by

his step-father's name, and that by legal enactment. It would be better that the gentleman take more pains in handling Lexicons.

Take the quotation from James, and if my friend had given the entire passage, he would have certainly discovered his own mistake. He quotes—Jas. 1:5, but in the 6th verse his position on the 5th verse is overthrown. "Take the passage in full: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask God, who giveth to all men liberally and unbraideth not, and it shall be given him. **But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering**, for he that wavereth, is like a wave of the sea, driven with the wind and tossed; let not that man think that he shall receive anything of the Lord."

In the first place. This is addressed to church members, who were of the twelve tribes of Israel. In the 5th chapter James says: Brethren, if any be sick among you let them call for the Elders of the church," showing that only church members are addressed in the letter. No difference if some of them had gone wrong, and committed adultery, and had stolen. Paul said to the Ephesian brethren: "Let him that stole, steal no more. "There are men in the church today guilty of sins named by James in this epistle, and there were members of the church in the days of the Apostles just as guilty. It will be observed also, that while James says, the person here addressed may ask for wisdom, he says that he must **ask in faith** nothing wavering. Does this look like Mr. Bogard's unsaved sinner? Why, he says that when a man has faith, he is saved, but the men to whom James writes and of whom he speaks must have faith to begin with, and this says they were saved to start on if Mr. Bogard be right, and that before they had any time to pray at all. So my friend loses this case also.

Mr. Bogard says that to confess sins is to pray. He is wrong here as usual, but if he were correct, he cuts off his head, for who would, or even could confess, that he was a sinner but a man who already believes? But if he be a believer, he is saved, for Baptists say, that with the coming of faith salvation comes. Now, since no one but a man who believes that Christ is his Savior, and that he has sinned against Him, will, or even can confess his sins, then no one but such a man could pray according to Mr. Bogard, and since every such person has been saved by the faith he had, and which enabled him to make such a confession, then it follows that the man was saved before he prayed, so this case is also lost to the gentleman.

My friend's effort to hedge, by referring to Heb. 11:6 is not sufficient for him. He thinks to sidetrack the case by saying that only faith in the existence of God is necessary to prayer. In this he is woefully wrong. Anybody knows that a sinner, who believes no more than that God is, but who does not believe that God is his Savior, and that He will save him if he approach Him aright, will ever make the approach. He must, and will, first believe that he is a sinner, and that his sins are against God, and that he must have the sins cancelled before God will take him to heaven, and that his only hope is through Christ, before he would or could pray. But Baptists say when he thus believes he is saved already, and that before

he could find time in which to pray. This case is gone from you, Mr. Bogard, and so you will have to try something else.

My friend goes wrong again on his reference to the Lexicons. He says that "pisteuo" to believe, simply means to trust in Christ. Dr. Thayer says the word means "a conviction, full of joyful trust, that Jesus is the Messiah—the divinely appointed author of eternal salvation in the Kingdom of God, conjoined with obedience to Christ." Again I insist that he get an unabridged Lexicon. The little abbreviated thing he has continually misleads him.

My friend thinks the disobedient believer has everlasting life, and he proposes to prove it by John 3:36. Wrong again; for in the 21st verse of this chapter, Christ said a man must do the truth, to be accepted of God. Mr. Bogard quotes Acts 15:9, to show that the disobedient believer has a pure heart. But Peter, who used the language Mr. Bogard recites, said the soul is purified in obeying the truth. I Pet. 1:22-25.

He tries to show that the unbaptized believer is a child of God by reference to Gal. 3:26, when, if he had read the next verse, he would have discovered that it is the baptized believer who is the child of God. The 27th verse says, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Only the baptized believer is in Christ, Mr. Bogard. Paul says so.

The believer is justified, says Mr. Bogard and recites Rom. 5:1. But Paul here writes of believers who have been baptized for several years before this was stated of them. Paul himself had no peace until after he was baptized. He would not even eat or drink until he was baptized. 1 Jno. 5:1. The believer is born of God—just so—but what kind of a believer is it that is born of God? In John 2:29, John says it is the believer that does righteousness, and not the believer who is only a disobedient believer. I wish here to state that salvation, or its equivalent, is no where ascribed to faith that does nothing. It is always a faith that acts, that does something. If it be in a former age, it is a faith that does something and not a dead faith like the devils have. Will Mr. Bogard rely upon this kind of faith?

The cases of Saul and Cornelius are not in any sense in harmony with Mr. Bogard's proposition and practice. Saul was not saved until after he was baptized, for Ananias said to him: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Acts 22:16. Do you suppose Paul was saved in a literal sense and did not know it? If Paul were a saved man when Ananias went to him, he must have known it, and would have, from the moment of his salvation, left off his fasting and praying. Ananias did not know it if Paul was saved, for he told him to arise and be baptized that he might be saved. His being a chosen vessel was no evidence of his being a Christian, for Jeremiah was a chosen vessel before he was born.

All this twaddle about a literal and a figurative salvation is "buncomb." Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." I want my friend to tell us whether the salvation here named is literal or figurative? If he says the salvation is literal, then he has baptism connected with it, and if he says it is figurative, he

has faith connected with it, so there you are. The Bible says nothing about being actually saved in one way, at one time, and then figuratively saved in another way and at another time. Away with such foolish talk and accept what Ananias said, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Of course this will do away with my friend's proposition and with Baptist doctrine, but what of that? It is all of men anyway. It is worthless; throw it down. You lose nothing and gain all.

The fact that Cornelius prayed before he was baptized is nothing. He prayed before he believed in Christ. His faith came by the words of Peter's mouth. Acts 15:7-9. The Angel told him that Peter would tell him what to do to be saved. Now it happens that the only thing he was told to do, was to be baptized. Cornelius was saved just like all others were in those days, Mr. Bogard. He had to obey the truth to obtain pardon, the same as the rest of us mortals. Now you find the command to an unbaptized man to pray for pardon with the promise of obtaining it, will you? Here is where your proposition cries out most piteously for aid—will you render it? We shall see.

The woman at the well had to believe in Christ before she could ask for the water. This would place her inside the promise of salvation by faith only. Your dodge on salvation not being by works of righteousness that we do, is no good to you. Baptism is a thing to which we submit, but to repent and believe are something we do. You must be careful or you will cut off the limb you try to sit on. You know faith and repentance are both called works. You will not deny this. Baptism is not called works in the same class with repentance and faith. But enough.

MR. BOGARD'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Mr. Warlick's effort to dodge the issue avails him nothing, as I shall hold him to the question. If God will hear and answer a sinner's prayer, then my proposition is proved, and Mr. Warlick knows it. It is true, as he says, that if a man turns away his ear from hearing the law, his prayer is an abomination to God, but if a man is turning to the law and prays, his prayer is acceptable to God. True, a man who rejects the Gospel will not be heard nor answered, but when he accepts the truth of the Gospel and prays his prayer is heard. This sets aside his quibbling on this point.

He demands of me that I show where a sinner is told to pray for salvation. I accept the challenge, in John 4:1-10, Jesus told the profligate prostitute at the well that if she would ask Him He would give her the water of life. No matter about the quibble about her having faith before she asked, the fact remains that she could get the water of life for the asking.

Mr. Warlick says that Rom. 10:13 has reference to Christians when it says that "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Then he turns right around and says that the Greek word (epikelesatai) which is translated "call means to "call the name of the step father on the son." Then when Stephen was dying he called upon God—that is, he called the name of the step father on a son. If Mr. Warlick does not know it, he should get him a Greek primer and learn it, what the word means "to call"—just that and nothing more as far as its primary meaning is concerned. When one calls for another it has the idea of calling the name of the step father on a step son. But when one does his own calling it has the idea of prayer—"to invoke in prayer." Liddell & Scott's Unabridged Lexicon lies before me as I write, and it says. "To call on, call to, appeal to." Liddell & Scott is the highest Greek authority in existence. So the apostle meant what he said: Whosoever shall call ("invoke in prayer") the name of the Lord shall be saved." If so, my proposition is proved.

His dodge, that Baptists believe that so soon as a man believes he is saved, and since one must believe before he can pray, therefore he would be a child of God before he could pray, is refuted by the fact that Baptists do not believe that a man is saved so soon as he believes in God's existence. A man must believe in God's existence and that God will reward him if he comes to Him in prayer, before God will hear him, for salvation. Heb. 11:6 says that this is all the belief required for a sinner and Baptists so teach. God says it and Baptists believe it and teach it and Joe S. Warlick and his company of spiritual goats deny it. Let the reader choose his company. Mr. Warlick says that Paul said, in Rom. 10, that those who called believed in Christ. It simply does not say it. The word "in" is not found in the Greek ^{as} Mr. Warlick well knows, for in the oral debate I showed him and others the Greek, and "in" was not

there. So if a man believes that there is a God and that He will reward those who call upon Him, he may "invoke the name of the Lord in prayer," and he has the promise that he shall be saved.

James says that if any of the "twelve tribes" asked for wisdom that they would get it. Mr. Warlick says that he only meant the part of the twelve tribes who were church members. Then, to bolster up his idea, he actually said that the murderers, adulterers, etc., were in the church and that some such are in the church now. I thought Mr. Warlick and his people thought that "to be in Christ is to be in the church and to be out of Christ is to be out of the church." It seems to me I have heard this statement over and over again. Is a murderer in Christ? If not, then a sinner was told to pray. If a murderer is in Christ, then our idea of a Christian must be revised.

Mr. Warlick denies that confession of sin is prayer. Well, Webster says prayer: "Is a solemn address to the Supreme Being." When a man confesses before he is baptized, does he confess to God or men?

If he confesses to God, then it is a solemn address to the Supreme Being and is prayer. If he does not confess, he cannot be saved. Thus we see that prayer is necessary to salvation. Prov. 28:13 says: "Whoso confesseth and forsaketh (his sins) shall have mercy." Put in different words this means: Whoso makes a solemn address to God acknowledging his sins shall have mercy. This comes before baptism and therefore the promise of salvation is reached before baptism.

Mr. Warlick says my abbreviated lexicon misleads me. Well, I have before me Liddell & Scott, the Unabridged Standard used in all the colleges and universities. He says that the Greek word for believe means: "To trust, trust in, put faith in, rely on a person or thing." That is exactly what the Bible says a person does before he is baptized, he relies on Jesus Christ to save him. He first believed in God's existence and then he called upon God for mercy and then he exercised faith in Jesus Christ for salvation. There is one faith to a Christian—trust in Christ—but no man can trust in Christ who does not first believe in the existence of God and repent of his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. Mr. Thayer's definition of "pisteuo" does not contradict Liddell & Scott, nor does it deny my position. Of course faith is "conjoined to obedience." A faith that does not obey is not saving faith. But Mr. Warlick's trouble is that he thinks there is no obedience at all unless one is baptized. I grant that one does not perfectly obey unless he is baptized, but neither does he perfectly obey when and after he is baptized. Perfection is not found in the world. The faith that obeys is the saving faith, but men obey by faith before they are baptized and that proves they have saving faith before baptism. If it takes baptism to complete faith, then a man is baptized before he has faith—baptized on a piece of faith, which is absurd.

Mr. Warlick says that I think a disobedient believer has everlasting life. I think no such thing. I think all believers are obedient, but since perfection is not found in men, they are not perfectly obed-

ient. The faith that saves is an **obedient faith, but it saves first and then obeys.** It does not have to obey first and then save, but it saves first and then obeys. The tree is first made good and then the fruit becomes good (Matt. 7:16-20). The good works are fruits of a good tree and not the cause of the tree being good. John 3:21 does not say that a man has to "do the truth" to be accepted of God. It simply says that a man who does the truth does not live in the dark but comes out into the open light and does not hide in the dark like evil doers. Wrong again, Mr. Warlick.

My opponent concedes that the believer who "**does righteousness is already accepted of God.** This is good. Is confessing Christ a work of righteousness? If so then faith has acted, obeyed, has "done a work of righteousness" and therefore accepted of God. Jesus said: "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father in Heaven." Do we confess Jesus Christ before we are baptized? Certainly. Then we have the promise of a home in Heaven before baptism.

Mr. Warlick says that Cornelius prayed before he even believed in Jesus Christ and therefore this proves nothing for me. Is this not just what I have been saying? He **first believed in God's existence** and then he prayed and then he was directed to **Jesus Christ and when he believed in Christ he was saved.** So say I to all sinners. Come to God by prayer and it will result in your salvation, for God has guaranteed salvation to all who call upon Him and since salvation is in Christ, the promise is equivalent to a promise to infallibly direct the sinner to the only name given under Heaven whereby men may be saved. Cornelius also had the Holy Ghost before he was baptized and Jesus said: "Him the world can not receive" (John 14:17). Therefore he was saved before he was baptized.

To call my comment on Saul's conversation "buncomb" is easier than to answer. I again ask Mr. Warlick to say whether the baptism literally saved Paul? If not, it follows that the "washing away of sins" was figurative.

As to the Galatians, who were told that those who were baptized had "put on Christ" (Gal. 3:26-27), will say that they were already saved by faith. The Romans were told to "put on Christ" and they were already Christians (Rom. 13:14). This cannot be denied. Then what is meant by "put on"? It evidently means to imitate Christ. Those who were already Christians, as we know the Romans were to whom Paul wrote, could not become Christians and yet were told to "Put ye on the Lord Jesus." As one passage interprets another, it must be that Gal. 3:27 means that those who had become children of God by faith in Christ Jesus (see verse 26) should, after becoming children of God, "put on" or imitate Christ. That is exactly what we did when we were baptized—we imitated Christ.

There is only one difficulty to clear away and this matter will be perfectly plain. What does it mean when it says we were "baptized" into Christ? The word "into" in the Greek is "eis" and while its primary meaning is "on account of" or "with reference to." For instance in Matt. 3:11, "John baptized with water unto repent-

ance." "unto" in the Greek is "eis," so John baptized with water "eis" repentance. If "eis" means into or in order to here, it follows that repentance comes after baptism, which is absurd. It evidently means that John baptized with reference to or on account of, repentance. In Matt. 12:41, we read that the people "repented at the preaching of Jonah." "At" in the Greek is "eis" and they did not repent in order to get Jonah to preach and it follows that "eis" here means they repented on account of Jonah's preaching. I could quote fifty other passages on the same line where the word "eis" is used in the sense of "with reference to" or on account of. Then giving that meaning to Gal. 3:27, it would read "As many of you as have been baptized with reference to Jesus have imitated Him." That is exactly what it means and such a translation is in perfect accord with the Greek. If "put on Christ" means to become a Christian, in Gal. 3:27, then what does it mean in Rom. 13:14? Since undoubtedly the Romans were already Christians when Paul told them to "put on Christ," then we may reasonably conclude that the Galatians were too, since the Greek will bear that construction, and especially since the 26th verse says they were the children of God by faith in Christ.

"Eis" is the word used in Acts 2:38, where it says baptized for ("eis") remission, that is on account of or with reference to remission.

Rom. 6:3-4, has the same Greek word "eis". "So many of you as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death. Therefore we are buried with Him in baptism." What does it mean? To translate the word "eis" as we have done it, would read: "So many of you as were baptized with reference to Christ were baptized into His death. Therefore we are buried with Him in baptism." That brings the passage into harmony with all the other passages which tell us that we get salvation when we believe. To put the interpretation that Mr. Warlick wants, makes it contradict many passages. If the Bible is to be a harmonious whole, the passages must be used in the sense I have given.

MR. WARLICK'S SECOND NEGATIVE.

Mr. Bogard says he is going to hold me to the question, as if I were in any way disposed to leave it. I think the readers will see if they have not already discovered, that I am staying too closely after him for his comfort. Does he not affirm that the sinner is saved in answer to prayer before baptism? Is this not making him responsible for the issue? Does any one fail to see that the discussion is not so much about whether the sinner can pray, or may pray; all of this might be admitted and yet the claim that he is saved in answer to that prayer until after he is baptized is the question. Suppose Mr. Bogard were to prove that God heard an unbaptized sinner pray; he would have to prove, that that sinner prayed for salvation and obtained it before he was baptized. Can he show such a case? I call upon him to do it. Let him find where God ever commanded an unbaptized sinner to pray for pardon with the hope of getting it in answer to such a prayer. God heard Cornelius pray before he believed in Christ, but will Mr. Bogard say this means, that Cornelius was saved before and without faith in Christ? I think he is not ready for such a conclusion. I wish my friend would take time to show, when he mentions such cases as the woman at the well, to whom the Savior said: "If you had known who it is that speaks to you you would have asked of Me and I would have given you living water," that such asking is prayer for salvation. Is it a prayer at all? How does he know but that the Savior had in mind an asking, different from any prayer Mr. Bogard ever offered in his life. But James says when people ask amiss, it is because they do not ask in faith. This woman could not have asked for the water unless she had believed the Savior had the water and that he would give it to her. But if she should believe that, she would be saved before she had time to ask, for Mr. Bogard says "salvation comes with faith."

If the Baptist idea of salvation by faith is true, then that woman could not have prayed until after she was saved. In fact Paul says this is true in every case. The 10th chapter of Romans is against my friend. If I were to grant that which is not true, that the calling on the name of the Lord here mentioned, is prayer—Paul says—"How can they call on him in whom they have not believed? In whom they have not believed? Not simply believed in His existence, but believed in Him. Now Mr. Bogard says that when one believes in Him, he is saved. But all of this is before the calling or prayer. I have turned the Greek against him on this passage already, but I shall again expose him. He says the expression believe in Christ is not in Rom. 10—asserted of those who call. Let every reader who has a Greek Testament turn to Rom. 10:14 and you will find in the phrase "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed," that the word "in" is from *eis*, and this all Baptists take as an evidence of salvation.^L Again I suggest to my friend, that it would be well that he let the Greek alone.

The expression "Warlick and his spiritual goats" is inelegant undignified and ungentlemanly.

The passage from James has been taken from him already. We only have to call attention to the fact that James was writing to Church members, for he said: "If any be sick, let them call for the elders of the Church." Moreover, James says: "Let him ask in faith," speaking of asking for wisdom. But if he ask in faith, he is a saved man already, according to Mr. Bogard, for he says with the coming of faith, salvation comes. I wonder if my friend can not do better for his cause than to quote James to prove his practice of unbelievers praying for salvation and obtaining it before baptism?

Mr. Bogard will never make any sensible person believe that when a man confesses before men, that he believes that Jesus Christ is God's Son, he is praying. The idea is silly.

My friend thinks that while a man is saved at faith, unless faith obey it will not save. Now, I should like for him to tell us what faith does in obeying, after it comes and before it saves? He has been saying all the time, that salvation comes with faith. Now he says he is wrong about that, for faith must obey before it can save. Well, Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Bogard says, he that believes and obeys shall be saved but Mr. Bogard says Christ was wrong in "conjoining baptism to faith as the obedience necessary to the saving. Well, I believe Christ is correct about it, so I shall let my friend Mr. Bogard pass on, and accept what Christ said instead.

But Mr. Bogard says, no man is perfect in his obedience. So I suppose he thinks no man gets a perfect salvation in this life, where he does not render perfect obedience.

I find these two expressions in Mr. Bogard's article within eight lines of each other. "The faith that obeys is the saving faith but not that to be saved they have to be baptized, that proves they have saving faith before baptism." See the next—The faith that saves is an obedient faith, but it saves first and then obeys." Now we shall let Mr. Bogard tell in which he speaks his real sentiments? But this is about the fate of a man who like my friend, tries to defend a false position, and deny the truth.

Mr. Bogard thinks that to confess Christ, is a work of righteousness—I suppose he knows that repentance is as much a work of righteousness as confession? But he says when a man works a work of righteousness, he is saved. Therefore he believes a man is saved, before he can repent.

Mr. Bogard's effort to save Cornelius for his cause will do him no good. Cornelius not only prayed before he believed in Christ, but his prayer was heard. If this be proof at all for Mr. Bogard it saves his sinner without faith in Christ, but he will not allow this. Cornelius worshipped according to the old Jewish idea, and that is why he prayed and gave alms. His is not an example for sinners now. While he was a Gentile, he was trying to worship as a Jew. The fact that he received the Holy Ghost in its miraculous measure has no more to do with the case in hand than the fact that he saw an angel before he believed in Christ. God put

His spirit in false prophets and gave it to Balaam's beast, but I hardly think that the beast was regenerated.

Mr. Bogard thinks that to put on Christ means to imitate Him. I wonder if Christ put Himself on? Pshaw! Again my friend says to be baptized into Christ means "on account of Christ" and this, he says, amounts to being "saved before you are baptized." Well, I suppose to believe in (eis) Christ, means also on account of Christ, and thus one is saved before he believes, eh!

The truth is, the word has no such meaning in either Greek or English. Dr. Ditsler says the word eis has in all cases a "prospective meaning." The people simply repented into the benefits of Jonah's preaching. John baptized people into a state of reformation. The Baptist idea of eis is not in the word. Again I wish to suggest to my friend, that until he can find something in the Greek that will help his case, he had better let it alone.

Having answered all of his quibbles in his very futile trial at fixing up his former article, giving about all of this one to the work of reconstruction, I shall note some of the plain discoveries the reader will easily make between the teaching of the New Testament and Mr. Bogard's proposition and doctrine.

Beginning with the Commission we read: "Go preach the Gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Bogard's propositions and practice, would change this and would have it read: "He that believes and prays, shall be saved before and without baptism I don't care what Christ said."

Peter said to the believers on Pentecost: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins."

Mr. Bogard changes this and says: "Hold on there, Peter, you are wrong. Here is what you should have said. Repent and pray for salvation and get it before and without baptism. You should learn Baptist doctrine and practice a little."

Phillip went to Samaria and preached Christ, and when they believed Phillip's preaching they, were baptized, both men and women. Acts 8:12. Mr. Bogard says, "Now, if I had been holding that Samaritan meeting, the report would have been different from the way Luke gives it. See our reports in our papers. Here is what should have been said: When they believed the preaching they came forward for prayer, were saved, and afterward were baptized. Phillip acted too hastily in that case.

Paul went down to Corinth, and testified that Jesus was the Christ and many of them believed and were baptized. If that had been Mr. Bogard's meeting instead of Paul's—we should have had—"Bogard went to Corinth, and preached Baptist doctrine, and some of the Corinthians believed and prayed for religion and got it, before and without baptism. Read Acts, 18:7 and note the difference between Paul's work at Corinth and the practice of those who believe my friend's proposition.

In Acts 22, we have the account of Paul's conversion. In verse 16 it is said, that Ananias came in to where Paul was. He found him praying. Ananias immediately began to instruct Paul, telling him to "Arise and be baptized and wash away his sins." If Mr.

Bogard had been the man in the case in the place of Ananias, he would have said: "Saul, you have it down just right. Pray on, my brother, the darkest hour is just before day. You must wrestle with God, like Jacob did with the angel. Maybe the Lord will speak peace to your soul after awhile. Pray on, my brother, and we will pray for you." I ask the reader if this is not about the way we have it in this country at their revivals. Then I want to ask why it is, that Baptist preachers are not allowed to tell sinners what to do to be saved, using the language of the New Testament? I cannot understand why they do not teach and practice just as did the inspired apostles.

But this article is perhaps lengthy enough. I close, calling again for the example of where God, Christ, or any inspired apostle since the death of Christ and therefore since His will was in force, for Paul said in Heb. 9:16, that Christ's will could not be in force until after His death. Get the thought. Find one case, this side the cross of Christ, where any unbaptized man was ever commanded, advised, or even requested to pray for pardon with the promise of receiving it before he was baptized. If you can't find the case, then cease advocating the thing and proceed at once to doing like the New Testament directs.

I wish also to suggest to Mr. Bogard that when he proposes hereafter to quote me in the discussion, that he do so correctly. Give what I say, and all I say on the matters quoted and not a garbled extract from the statement. The readers will catch up with you if you do not. Do not get angry and talk ugly. Come up to your work like a good fellow and if there is anything in the Book in favor of your proposition let us have it. I deny that there is a hint, an allusion, toward the shadow of a show of a shade of a reason, for any one having the right to imagine the possible possibility of the likelihood of a chance to guess correctly that there is a chapter, any part of a chapter, a verse, or any part of a verse, that suggests the idea contained in your contention in this discussion.

MR. BOGARD'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlement: Marks of defeat for my friend stand out in almost every line of his last effort. I have driven him to acknowledge that a sinner may pray and be heard and answered, but he says that is not the issue. Whether it is the issue or not, let all his brethren know that Mr. Warlick has conceded that God will hear a sinner pray. Now what about his statements in his first reply to me on this subject? Here are some of them: "Solomon says that prayer from such a man is an abomination to God," and "James says for them to ask in faith. Does that look like Mr. Bogard's unsaved sinner?" Flatly denying that God would hear a sinner pray in his first reply, now he comes and says: "Mr. Bogard's effort to save Cornelius for his cause will do him no good. Cornelius not only prayed before he believed in Jesus Christ, but his prayer was heard." Which time did Mr. Warlick tell the truth? But even in the last article he flatly contradicts himself.

My friend continues to call for a passage where an unbaptized sinner was told to pray for salvation. I gave him the case of the woman at the well (John 4:10). Jesus told her that if she would ask Him, He would be in her a "well of water unto everlasting life." "unto" in the Greek is "eis". So the Lord told the woman that if she would ask He would give her the water that would be in her a fountain unto ("eis"), or into or on account of everlasting life. Anyway you take it we see she was told that salvation is for the asking. To quibble over whether the woman had saving faith before she asked is to quibble over the plain word of God. Mr. Warlick says that maybe this was not prayer such as I may have prayed at any time in my life. That cuts no figure. If the Lord promised salvation for the asking I intend to pass the promise on to all men where I preach.

Mr. Warlick's chief delight is to try to find something inconsistent with the Baptist doctrine. He can make a show of apparent inconsistencies better than he can walk up like a man and answer the argument. He continues to repeat that Baptists claim that a man must have saving faith before he can pray. How often must I tell him that we believe with the Bible that faith in God's existence ("that God is") is all the faith necessary for a sinner to have to be heard of God. (Heb. 11:6). With that faith in God's existence and believing that God will answer, is all a sinner needs to come to God in prayer. So says the book, and we believe it. Rom. 10 does not say that in order to call on the name of the Lord a man must believe "in" him. The word "in" is not in the Greek and Mr. Warlick knows it. He says the word "in" is taken from the word "eis" and "eis" is there. The preposition "eis" is not in the clause at all with "believe." It literally reads: "How shall they call on ("eis") him whom they have not believed." "Eis" is not joined to believe. It means, How shall they call unto ("eis") him whom they have not believed. They call "eis" him; not believe "eis" him.

Mr. Warlick wants me to prove the "practice of unbelievers pray-

ing for salvation." I hold no such practice for I have repeatedly said with Heb. 11:6, that for a sinner to pray he must believe that God is and that he will reward those who pray to him. But that is a different thing from believing in Christ—trusting Christ as a personal Savior—believing from the heart, that is with joy, that God has raised him from the dead. Mr. Warlick can't meet my position. Hence he quibbles and tries to ask hard questions. The reader will judge whether I answered them.

My amusing friend says: "Mr. Bogard will never make any sensible man believe that when a man confesses before men that he believes that Jesus is God's son, he is praying. The idea is silly." Well, I should say so. I have never in all my life tried to do such a thing. **But I have said that when a man confesses his sins to God which he must before he is saved, he most certainly is praying.** Does a man have to confess his sins to God before he is saved? Answer, like a good little fellow. Webster says "Prayer is a solemn address to God." Is the confession of sin to God a solemn address to God? If so, then every man must pray before he can be saved. Why did not my dodging friend notice the argument I made on that in my last address, instead of changing it in this way so as to try to make the people forget it?

Mr. Warlick still says that James told nobody to pray except Christians—Church members—and you notice he did not answer my question which I put to him in my last address. If they were church members then church members were murderers, adulterers, etc., and if so then Mr. Warlick is wrong when he says, as all his folks do, that to be in Christ is to be in the Church and to be out of Christ is to be out of the Church. I ask again: Is it possible for a murderer to be in Christ? If he says no, then, according to his idea, those murderers James addressed were not in the Church. If he says yes, then we must revise our idea of a Christian. Let him come up on this. As surely as a murderer is not in Christ, James told some who were not in Christ to pray for wisdom (see Jas. 4 for the fact that some were murderers).

My friend is much puzzled about what I said about obedient faith. He does not understand how I can say that the faith that saves is a faith that obeys and yet does not have to obey first before it saves. Perhaps he may understand if I tell him that **faith saves a man first and then puts the saved man to work. Faith brings life to a man and then puts the man made alive to work. The faith that saves always puts a man to work after it gets him saved.** That is what the Bible says about it. We were "created in Christ Jesus unto good works" (Eps. 2:10). Mr. Warlick thinks the sinner works himself into creation instead of being created unto good works. That is the trouble with him and his deluded followers, they always reverse God's order and thus wrest the Scriptures. That explains what Mr. Warlick thought was a contradiction in me.

That we had a live working faith, a faith that expresses itself in action, before baptism, proves that we are saved before baptism. That is why I said faith obeyed before baptism and thus proved Mr. Warlick being witness, that the man is saved before baptism, for

Mr. Warlick has repeatedly said that "faith saves when it acts." I am sure it saves and then acts, but take it either way it gets the man saved before baptism. Show one action of faith before baptism, demands Mr. Warlick. The demand is met. Does not a man, even Mr. Warlick being witness, confess publicly that Jesus Christ is God's Son? He does. Is that an act of faith or of unbelief? Of faith certainly. Then faith has acted, expressed itself in action before baptism. This proves it to be an obedient faith—a faith that obeys. **The faith does not save by obeying but the faith saves and then obeys.**

But says my amusing friend: Is not repentance an act of faith? No. Repentance is that change of mind which when complete is faith. But if it were, and it comes before baptism, then faith acts before baptism—obeys, if you please—and my point is proved.

Cornelius received the Holy Ghost before baptism. Jesus said the world cannot receive the Spirit (John 14:17). This proved that Cornelius was a saved man before baptism. But Mr. Warlick says he saw an angel also before baptism. Certainly, but the Lord never said they whose angels are saved. If he had, it would be double proof that Cornelius was saved before baptism. Balaam's ass received the Spirit says Warlick. This is not true for (Numbers 22) the record does not say one word about the Spirit. A miracle was wrought on the ass but it was not a reception of the Spirit. When Mr. Warlick wants to prove his Pentecost theory, he he says nobody received the Spirit before Pentecost. Now to get out of a hard place on Cornelius. he even has a donkey receiving the Spirit before Pentecost! The legs of the lame are not equal. There is no getting out of the fact that if Cornelius received the Holy Ghost before he was baptized (Acts 10:43-48), and he certainly did, then he was saved before he was baptized for Jesus said: "him the world cannot receive."

"Put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27). Mr. Warlick thinks means to become a Christian. Then what does it mean in Rom. 13:14 where Paul told those who were already children of God to "put ye on the Lord Jesus?" Did that mean for them to become Christians when they had been Christians for years? Why did not he answer this question? I put it to him in my last. If we let Paul explain we see that it was only the Christian who must "put on Christ"—that is imitate Him. Properly rendered it would be: "As many of you as have been baptized on account of ("eis") Christ, have imitated Christ." My amusing friend says: "I wonder if Christ put himself on." No, Mr. Warlick He was baptized to fulfill all righteousness (Matt. 3:15) and when we were baptized we imitated Him.

Being unable to prove his doctrine by the Bible or standard lexicons, my friend resorts to Dr. Ditzler. Well, he can make a better case with Ditzler than he can with the Bible or lexicons either. "Eis always is prospective," says Ditzler. Then when John baptized "eis" repentance it was in order that the people might repent! But, says Mr. Warlick, that means they were baptized into a state of reformation. Who said "mentanoian," the Greek for repentance, means a reformation? No lexicon on earth so defines it. Where did Mr. Warlick get it? Evidently out of his great imagination.

There it still stands: John baptized "eis" repentance. Matt. 3:11), and if "eis" means in order to, then people must be baptized in order to repent, an absurdity too glaring for any one to accept. Evidently they were baptized on account of repentance. I had rather have one such Bible illustration of the word than a thousand Ditzlers. So with the people who "repented at ("eis") the preaching of Jonah." Certainly not in order to get Jonah to preach, but on account of his preaching. But, says Mr. Warlick, they "repented into the benefits of Jonah's preaching." Alas! for you, my friend, since the Bible did not happen to say that. Thus you change the Bible to suit your convenience. They repented at the preaching not at the benefits of the preaching.

All that perversion of the Baptist position in the latter part of his article is burlesque and not argument and I deny that Baptists do as he describes.

A few advance arguments and this address will end.

Saul being a praying man was recognized by Ananias as evidence that he was a fit subject for baptism. Acts 22:16; "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." We have already discussed whether this was a figurative washing or real washing, and I shall not repeat that here. The Greek for "calling" is "epikalesamenos." It is the word used in Rom. 10:13, where it says: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." It means according to Liddell & Scott to "invoke in prayer." Hinds and Noble give the same definition. Since writing the other address in which I gave these definitions, I have consulted a Robinson's Unabridged Lexicon and he says it means: "To call upon for aid, to invoke, to pray to, an invocation addressed to Christ for aid, Acts 7:59." I have quoted him verbatim. Then when Paul said "Whosoever shall call shall be saved," he meant that whosoever shall pray to the Lord shall be saved. He had two means of knowing this. One was because he was inspired and the other was his own experience. He had prayed before Ananias came to him and the Lord heard him. True, Mr. Warlick says that if he was saved he did not know it. That is true. Salvation is one thing, and the assurance of salvation is another thing. John wrote that those who believed might know that they were saved (1 John 5:15). Paul prayed and Paul believed in Christ and he knew that, but he did not know that this made his salvation certain. But when Ananias came and saw he was a believer and besides this the Lord had assured Ananias that Paul was already a chosen vessel, he therefore said: "Arise and be baptized calling ("epikalesamenos") upon the name of the Lord." The word ("epikalesamenos") is in the Aorist and the Aorist form means completed action in the past, but which did not stop in the past, but continues in the present. So the word must be translated by a phrase in order to bring out the full sense, and it will be: "Arise be baptized and wash away (figuratively) your sins, since you have prayed and are a praying man." That is the thought as sure as the Greek Aorist can bring it out. So one evidence that Paul was a fit subject for baptism was that he was a praying man. Mr. Warlick may make sport of this but he can not answer it.

MR. WARLICK'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

I am sure the readers will laugh at Mr. Bogard's suggestion about my showing signs of defeat. Why, I never felt better nor had less to do in my life. It is a real picnic to play with my excited friend.

I shall not take the gentleman's advice about how to debate, until I am forced to defend an unreasonable proposition like he does in this discussion. If I did not know that I knew more about debating than my friend, Mr. Bogard I assure him that I should not be mixed up with him now.

He thinks I have lost something by saying that God heard the prayer of Cornelius before he believed and was baptized? Does my excited friend think that in hearing the prayer, God saved Cornelius? If he does, then he is in the attitude of thinking that Cornelius was saved before he was a believer, for it is certain, that he did all of his praying before he was a believer, and if this shows that he was saved before baptism, it shows also that he was saved before he believed. Is my friend so muddled that he can not see this? Cornelius prayed as a worshipper of God, not like the alien sinner of Mr. Bogard's proposition. What my friend wants, and just what he cant find, is a case of an unbaptized man praying for salvation, and obtaining the salvation before and without baptism. The question is not as to whether such a man can pray, but may he pray for salvation and obtain it before he is baptized? If he can then Christ misleads every soul of man on the earth, for He said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Christ did not say He that prays and then believes, shall be saved, and afterwards he may be baptized, provided the Baptists will permit it? Mr. Bogard why can't you get some things right?

Mr. Bogard is not certain whether the woman at the well, (John 4:10), had saving faith before she asked for the water. Well, now he has fixed it. In a former article he said that this water for which she was to ask, was salvation. Now he does not know about it. She might have had saving faith and therefore had the water before she asked for it; if so, then she did not pray as an alien but as a saved person; he has already said that salvation comes with faith, and if this woman had that before she sked for the water which he thinks was praying, then she was saved before she prayed, and so I should like to know what he will do with his proposition, and with this case to prove it? My friend is an amusing little fellow. He has this woman praying for salvation, but possessed of saving faith before she prayed, and therefore saved before she could or did pray, and all simply to deny the plain statement of Christ. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Let all the Baptist readers especially note this contradiction in their man.

After all, every reader of the New Testament understands that this woman's case is no example for the sinner today, for Paul says in Heb. 9:16, that Christ's Testament was of no strength at all while He was yet living, and they know also that Christ was not dead

when He had this conversation with the woman at the well. Let our Baptist readers look at Heb. 9:16, with this argument before them.

Just why my friend denies that *eis* is in the Greek translated in, in the passage "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed." I cannot understand. I wish he would get some one to show him the word, and spell it out for him in English so he can understand it. This Scripture kills all he can say on the subject, for Paul here declares that a man cannot call upon God, until he believes, and that is too late for Mr. Bogard's sinner, for he says the fellow is saved at the point of faith which Paul says must precede the calling. But I have shown that calling in this passage is not prayer, and so Mr. Bogard loses at two points.

Mr. Bogard complains because I show the inconsistencies of Baptists on this question. Let him complain, I shall do that thing certain. I do take a delight in it for it is so easy to do. Besides in doing this I answer my friend's quibbles, which he calls arguments. Mr. Bogard you may imagine a man praying before he believes and is baptized like Cornelius did, all you wish, but until you can find that such a man prayed for salvation and obtained it in this way you gain nothing. **Find the case**, or admit like an honest man should do that it is simply not there. Again, I challenge you to find one case of where an unbaptized man was commanded to pray for pardon this side the Commission? Here is where your proposition cries out for your aid. Try to relieve it in your last, you have not done so yet.

Mr. Bogard at last gives up his proposition, when he says he does not hold that unbelievers shall pray for salvation? Then he does not hold that unsaved people can pray for he says "**with the coming of faith salvation comes.**" So down he goes again. His effort to dodge by saying that he may believe that God is, will not do for him, for Infidels believe that God is, would Mr. Bogard promise to give an infidel salvation for the asking, who has no more faith than this? Shame on you, Mr. Bogard. I am sure your own people feel sorry for you.

Mr. Bogard says an unbaptized man confesses his sins and this is prayer. I deny it. But if it were so, it would ruin him, for no man will confess his sins with strong faith in Christ, against whom he has committed sins, without a full recognition of what his sins will do for him unless forgiven, but when he reaches this point he says he is saved by repentance and faith, for he says repentance results in faith, no place for praying between them therefore, but all this must be true of the man before he can and will confess his sins, so he is saved in spite of fate before he can pray. Mr. Bogard himself being judge. This makes Mr. Bogard mad, but he need not doubt but that I take delight in provoking him to anger in this way. I am determined that his readers shall see how foolish a man will argue when trying to deny the truth, and when disputing the word of the Lord like he has to do in this discussion. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," is the statement of the Savior. Every word of my friend is an effort to show that this is a falsehood.

The more my enraged friend says about the passage in James, the worse it is for him. Those whom James commands to pray, must pray in faith, else he says they need not think they will receive anything of the Lord. This is too late for Mr. Bogard's sinner, praying for salvation, for he says he has this as soon as he believes. The people of whom James speaks had no doubts, but according to Baptist doctrine on this subject, they were saved before they could have time to even think about doubting, for with the coming of faith the Baptists say salvation comes. The fact that some of them had sinned in a very pernicious way, is not in Mr. Bogard's favor, for he will not deny that he commits sins himself. James says he wrote only to the church, when he gave instruction to church members about praying for the sick in the fifth chapter. James does not command sinners to pray, Baptists themselves being judges.

I laugh out loud when I read what my friend says about the faith that saves. In a former article he said that only the obedient faith saves. Now he wants to take that back and say, that it saves before it becomes obedient. He says it saves first, and then obeys. Is this the idea now. Well, I suppose that if he were to say that only married women should be called wives and bear children, he would mean that they should be wives, and bear children first, and then get married. Reader this is a fair sample of the logic of every man who denies the truth as taught in the Bible.

But I am not through with my friend. He says a man is saved by faith before he can obey. Now he who repents, obeys, for Paul in Acts 17:30, says "God commands all men every where to repent." So now we have it, Mr. Bogard has every sinner saved before he can repent, and since he says repentance precedes faith, he has a man saved before he can either repent or believe. This is funny, but it is just the predicament of my angered friend. It hurts him to show him up in the light, but loyalty to the truth which I am defending, requires it of me, and therefore I am delighted to have the chance to perform the very easy task. Again I ask the reader to remember that Mr. Bogard has to do all this, simply to sustain his contention in which he declares that Christ falsified about the matter when He said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." If Christ told the truth, Mr. Bogard is wrong and Baptist doctrine is false, as false as can be.

My friend dies hard on the case of Cornelius. He now says that Balaam's beast did not receive the Holy Ghost. But he is wrong as usual. He received it the same as Cornelius. Christ said the Holy Ghost should reprove the world when it came. The Holy Ghost did reprove Balaam, when it spake to him through the beast. Does Mr. Bogard not know that it was the Holy Ghost that spake to Balaam? The expression, "Him the world cannot receive" had no reference at all to what Cornelius received. Christ was talking to the Apostles about their being inspired with the Holy Ghost which was soon to come upon them. The angel talking with Cornelius was one miracle, and the gift of tongues was another miracle, and neither of them had anything to do with the personal salvation of Cornelius further than to bring together the influences and the conditions

necessary to his being saved. Cornelius was a creature. Christ said "Preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." This shows that when Mr. Bogard says that Cornelius was saved before and without baptism, he simply disputes the plain word of Jesus Christ as given in Mark 16:16.

When Paul says in Gal. 3:26-27, that when a believer is baptized into Christ he puts on Christ, he shows that baptism, the same as faith is necessary in the case, and therefore Paul endorses the Savior in the commission. Mr. Bogard quibbles, by quoting Romans where Paul said "put you on the Lord Jesus Christ." Then I suppose he thinks that since the Christian is commanded to repent, therefore in every place where repentance is named it refers to the duty of a Christian. I tell you it is fun to discuss these matters with a Baptist.

Dr. Ditzler, like all scholars do, says, that the word *eis* has only a prospective meaning. John did baptize people into a state of reformation, and the people repented into the benefits of Jonah's preaching. According to Mr. Bogard, the people of Ninevah repented because they had already been saved at hearing the preaching. If my friend does not know that "*metanoian*" means a change which amounts to a reformation, he should be ashamed. Instead of denying this the Lexicons all affirm it to be true.

But the most complete somersault and fall down my friend has yet shown us, is in his advance on Paul's case in the conclusion of the article to which this is a reply. He says that Paul prayed, and that he prayed for salvation, and that he obtained it before he was baptized. Now it is not a fact that he prayed for salvation. He prayed evidently, not for salvation, but for the coming of the man who was to tell him what to do to be saved. He was told "Arise and be baptized and wash away his sins," which shows that when Mr. Bogard says he was saved before he was baptized, he actually contradicts Ananias. This is plain, but it is the plain truth. Why on earth will not my friend believe some things he finds in the Bible? Ananias said unto Paul, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." If Mr. Bogard, or any Baptist preacher in this country were to say this to a penitent praying man, he would be excluded from the Baptist church for heresy. Baptists will not allow their men to teach the truth on the plan of salvation. If Mr. Bogard had been there instead of Ananias, he would have said, "Pray on Saul until you get religion, and then, if the brethren will permit it, I will baptize you because your sins have been washed away already." But listen to Mr. Bogard again. He says that Paul was saved, but that he did not know it! WHOOP PEE here is a "Corker." Paul who had seen Christ on the way, talked with Him, had been repenting and believing and praying for three days, being on the ground, and knew the whole circumstance, did not know he was saved, but my friend, Mr. Bogard "away down South in Dixie," eighteen hundred years later knows it he thinks. Reader what do you think of this? Mr. Bogard thinks that the Holy Ghost, in a direct way had been operating on Paul, and that he had repented and believed, and if he had known what Baptist doctrine is, he would

have known he was saved, but he did not know Baptist doctrine and this is so, for the Baptists were never heard of for nearly sixteen hundred years after Paul was converted, yet I suppose some one had to write to him to let him know he was saved. Mr. Bogard says this is so. Well, we stop and take a good laugh at Mr. Bogard's predicament. I tell you it is funny.

I have already worn the ground out with my friend on his actual and symbolic foolishness on Paul's case, so I will only say that no one who has any knowledge about the facts in the matter, will feel otherwise than sorry for him on the subject. When Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," He did not mean actual salvation for faith and figurative or symbolic salvation for baptism. There is no such thing as a figurative or symbolic salvation any how.

In conclusion, I want again to ask my friend to come to the suffering, sighing, sorrowing proposition which he has engaged to discuss. Show where Christ or His apostles ever commanded any unsaved man to pray for salvation with the promise that he should have it before he was baptized? Show where in the New Testament and this means since Christ died on the cross, that any unbaptized man was ever told to pray for pardon?

Why is it, that in every case of conversion, recorded in Acts, the believer was told to be baptized, for remission, not to pray for it? I challenge my opponent, and all other Baptist preachers to say that they would have told believers what Peter told the Pentecostians, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you for the remission of sins." I dare you to say you would give that answer? Would you tell every creature to whom you preach, just what Christ said in the commission, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved?" Would you say to a penitent as Ananias did to Saul, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins?" Would you not rather have told them in each case to pray for salvation with the hope of obtaining it before and without baptism, and thus deny the words of both Christ and His apostles?

Baptist readers, why do you not compel your preachers to teach the truth in preaching to sinners on what they should do to be saved? If you would have truth on this subject, you cannot afford to stand with my friend, but you will quit supporting the unscriptural doctrine which you have been deceived into thinking has some truth in it, for I tell you that on this subject, especially the Baptists are wrong, woefully and fatally wrong. And it has been clearly shown, they contradict themselves at every turn.

Come up to the work my friend, you have failed signally on the baptism question on both propositions, try to redeem yourself in your last article if you can. I shall be glad to see you try it anyway.

MR. BOGARD'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: When a debater seeks to make the impression that his opponent is angry, when there is not the slightest indication of it, as Mr. Warlick has done in his last speech, it bespeaks defeat as nothing else can. There is nothing in anything I have said that would indicate anger and I only notice his six flings along this line, lest some of his sorely defeated admirers should take advantage of it and tell that I was angry because I never denied it. Mr. Warlick may be judging me by himself and if he is, I pity him.

Much of our controversy has clustered around the case of Cornelius (Acts 10:43-48). That case settled and this controversy is settled, for God does not have two different ways of saving people. What have we learned about Cornelius? First we learned that he prayed and the Lord heard and answered his prayer before he was baptized. Mr. Warlick denies that he prayed for salvation. What was he praying for? For good crops that year, I suppose. If he was a sinner, then God heard a sinner pray, and answered his prayer. Good. If a Christian, then he was a Christian before he was baptized. Good. Second, we learn that he did "Receive the Holy Ghost." Peter said it plainly in the 48th verse. But Jesus said the "world can not receive the Holy Ghost" (John 14:17). But Mr. Warlick says "receive the Holy Ghost" does not mean "receive the Holy Ghost." Sic! He says that the "gift of tongues and seeing the angel had nothing to do with the personal salvation of Cornelius, further than to bring together the influences and the conditions necessary to his being saved." Sakes alive! I thought you labored through four speeches on the first proposition to prove that there is no influence brought to bear on the sinner to bring about his salvation except the word! Now, in order to get out of a hole, you tell us that other influences besides the word were used in the case of Cornelius! Lands sakes alive, that is good. On that first proposition, you argued as strongly as you could that when the influence of the Spirit is brought to bear on a sinner that would be "receiving the spirit" and when I told you that the Spirit could influence a sinner and bring power to bear on him and still it would not be receiving the Spirit you made sport of it and said I had got myself into a predicament. Now comes Warlick and declares that the Spirit did work a miracle, bring to bear a powerful influence on Cornelius "to bring together the influences and conditions necessary to his salvation," and yet Cornelius did not receive the Spirit." Gentlemen and fellow citizens, what do you think of that? If what you say now about Cornelius is true, then you were wrong when you said what you did in the first proposition. Which time did you tell the truth? If Cornelius really received the Spirit before he was baptized then I have proved that he was a Christian before he was baptized. If he did not receive the Spirit but only had the miraculous influence of the Spirit to bring about his salvation, then I

have proved the first proposition which Mr. Warlick so vigorously denied. Really now, don't you see, Cornelius is my man any way you take him. But Peter settles it in the 15th chapter of Acts, verses 8 and 9: "God, which knoweth the hearts bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us; and put no difference between them and us, purifying their hearts by faith." Now Mr. Warlick says very plainly that the statement of Jesus, in John 14:17 means the promise of the Holy Ghost to the Apostles to inspire them to speak, and Peter says God "Put no difference between them and us" and that "He gave them the Holy Ghost even as He did unto us." Now, what do you mean, Mr. Warlick, when you say that the family of Cornelious did not receive the Holy Ghost the same as the Apostles did at the beginning? Peter flatly contradicts you. But Jesus said that the Holy Ghost could not be received by the world as the Apostles received Him. But Cornelius did receive the Holy Ghost, just as the Apostles received Him, or Peter told a falsehood about it when he said, "God gave them the Holy Ghost even as He did unto us." Now, who are you going to believe, Mr. Warlick or the word of the Lord. But, says Warlick, Balaam's ass received the Holy Ghost. Let the reader turn to Numbers 22, and read, and he will see that not a word is said about the Holy Ghost in the chapter. Besides that, why has not Mr. Warlick answered me when I have called his attention time and again to the fact that if Balaam's ass did receive the Holy Ghost, before Pentecost, then what marvel of the Lord's disciples had the Holy Ghost before Pentecost? On the Church question, Mr. Warlick and his people are very insistent that if the Church existed before Pentecost, it was a dead Church, because it had no Spirit, for the Spirit was not given to it until Pentecost. Have you ever heard such talk as that? Of course you have if you have ever heard them preach or debate. Now to save himself on the design of baptism, Mr. Warlick goes back on all that and actually has a donkey receiving the Holy Ghost before Pentecost. Then he goes back on his insisting that there is no Spirit influence in addition to the word in order to keep Cornelius from receiving the Spirit. So you see I have this battle won any way you take it.

But says Mr. Warlick, "Cornelius prayed as a worshipper of God, and not like the alien sinner." Please tell us how he ceased to be an alien and yet not be a saved man? If he was not an alien before he was baptized, then what did his baptism do for him? Do you baptize people who are not aliens? The fact is, you don't baptize any except those you regard as aliens and yet you say Cornelius was not an alien when he was praying before he was baptized. What was he? If he was a child of God, it certainly did not take baptism to make him a child of God. If he was not a child of God, then he is an instance of God hearing and answering an alien sinner's prayer. If you say he was a proselyte Jew and was under the Jewish covenant, the answer is, that the old Jewish covenant was taken out of the way when Christ was nailed to the cross. What do you mean by saying Cornelius was not an alien when he was praying, and yet needed to be saved?

Mr. Warlick says, according to Baptist practice, a man can't be baptized unless the "Baptists permit it." Well, it is no worse (if it be a crime for Baptists to permit it) than it is for just one man to decide the matter, as is the case with Mr. Warlick and his people. It is a matter of record that some of Mr. Warlick's people have actually refused to baptize those who made the good confession. For proof I refer you to Elder Bynum Black and Elder Joe Blue, your preachers, who did the refusing. No matter what reasons they had for refusing. Their reasons might have been good. Even so, Baptists may refuse if they have good reason to do so. I even think Black and Blue did right in refusing to baptize the parties, who appeared not to be sincere. But will you claim a privilege for your individual preachers which you declare is a crime for Baptists?

As to the woman at the well (John 4:1-10) it is enough to say that she was told that she could have salvation for the asking. **Meta-physical hairsplitting** objections to that plain statement of the Lord amount to nothing. She believed in the existence of God and believed that Jesus was the Messiah, but believing the facts of the Gospel is not the faith that saves. "Pisteuo," the word for believe, means to "trust, to rely upon" and this was what the woman was not doing, yet she was told to ask for the water and it would be given. She soon believed—trusted—and was saved without baptism. But, says my friend, turn to Heb. 9:16, and read that the new covenant was not in force till after Christ's death. Certainly. But how did Christ make his will? Did He write it? No. He made it by what He did and taught while here in the world, and no man had a right to add to that will nor take from it after He made it. All the Apostles could do was to record that will and proclaim it. They did not change it in any way. The Holy Spirit was only to bring to their remembrance what Christ did and taught while on earth and that was His will. So we see that what Christ did while here on earth was His will, which was the will also of God the Father, whose will He came to execute, for He and the Father are one. Since He left no written will, His disciples only put into writing that which they saw Him do and heard Him speak. What they heard Him teach and saw Him do was His will and their writing it out did not change it. Then what He did was nothing different from what the Apostles carried out after His ascension. Then why all this jabber about the plan of salvation being different now from what it was during the personal ministry? The subject is to get rid of the fact that Jesus did save people during His personal ministry, without baptism. There was the wicked woman (Luke 7) to whom the Lord said: "Thy faith hath saved thee. Go in peace; thy sins, which are many, are all forgiven." Then, there is the impotent man (Luke 5) who was saved without baptism. Then there is the case of Zacheus (Luke 19) who got salvation without baptism. Then there is the thief on the cross (Luke 23:42-43) to whom the Savior said in answer to his prayer for mercy: "Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise. Then there is the woman at the well (John 4) who was told salvation is for the asking. No wonder Mr. Warlick wants to rule out Matthew, Mark, Luke and John as a rule of faith and

practice. He tells you plainly that the New Testament does not begin until after we pass these books.

"How shall they call on (eis) Him in whom they have not believed?" is a passage that can not be settled by Mr. Warlick and me. He says that "in" is a translation of "eis" and I dispute it. Those who have Greek Testaments will please look for themselves and see. Those who have no Greek Testament will have no way of finding out for themselves. But one question may help. Mr. Warlick, will you please tell us what is "on" a translation of? "How shall they call on (eis) Him in whom they have not believed?" Is it a fact that "on" and "in" are both from that one word "eis"? Is "eis" in the passage twice? If you say no, then tell us if "on" is not the word which comes from "eis" in that passage? If so, then the passage will read: "How shall they call on (eis) Him whom they have not believed." Get you an interlinier Greek Testament and see if I have not given it correctly. So I still maintain that to believe in God's existence is all the faith necessary for a sinner to call upon the Lord for salvation.

Mr. Warlick denies that it is prayer for a sinner to confess his sins to God. Well, what is it if it is not prayer? Webster says that prayer is "a solemn address to God." Is confessing our sins to God a solemn address to God? If so, a sinner is praying when he confesses his sins and he must thus confess (pray) in order to be saved. So prayer is necessary to salvation.

Mr. Warlick asks if I would allow that an infidel could pray and get salvation. Certainly. If an infidel who believes that there is a God sincerely prays to God he will be saved. I know of at least two infidels who prayed to be led into the light, if there was such a thing, and they were both saved. The light came. Their infidelity went and they became believers in Jesus Christ as their personal Savior. The name of one of them is Conley, and he at this time is a rural mail carrier at Springdale, Ark., and he was caused to stop and consider his ways by a debate I held at Elm Springs, Arkansas, with John T. Hinds, who, like Mr. Warlick, disputed the truth on this question and when Mr. Conley put it to the test as I had taught, he found it true. How long will Mr. Warlick scoff at God's truth?

Mr. Warlick still contends that all to whom James wrote were in the Church. I asked him a fair question and he has refused to answer. Mr. Warlick's people say that to be in Christ is to be in the Church and to be out of Christ is to be out of the Church. Now, some to whom James wrote were "murderers, adulterers" and such like. I ask: Is it possible for a murderer to be in Christ? If you say yes, then you render yourself ridiculous. If you say no, then some who were not in Christ were commanded to pray: "if any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God and it shall be given him." There is no dodging this unless a murderer may be in Christ. Don't squirm. Com out on this. If a murderer is not in Christ, then James commanded some out of Christ to pray.

Mr. Warlick can't understand how faith can be obedient before it obeys. He can not understand how a tree can be an apple before

it bears apples. He can not understand how a thing can have the essence of truth and right, before the truth and right are manifest. He says, "Suppose a woman should marry and then bear children, would she have to bear children before she had the ceremony said?" No, that is what I have been telling you. The woman marries and then she bears the fruit of marriage, which is the birth of a child. Even so, a man has living obedient faith, and then he bears the fruit of obedient faith, which is an obedient life.

My friend continues to harp on Mark 16:16. I took that away from him on the last proposition and he is evidently badly dissatisfied with what was said about it, for he continually reverts to it. Once more let me say that Mark 16:16 says too much for Mr. Warlick, for it distinctly says that only those who disbelieve will be lost. **He that believes not shall be damned.** Then it follows that no believer will be lost. But we believe before baptism, hence saved before baptism.

But Dr. Ditzler says that "eis" is always prospective. Well, I do declare. It is too bad that Mr. Warlick must resort to Dr. Ditzler to establish his doctrine. I gave him Bible illustrations, where the word is used in a retrospective sense—looking back—and he seems to prefer to take Ditzler instead of the Bible. He does tell us that Matt. 3:11 where it says that John "baptized unto (eis) repentance" that this means John baptized into a reformation. I do declare. I thought you taught that a man must reform (repent) before you would baptize him. Did you ever? Then when the people repented "at the preaching of Jonah" Mr. Warlick says, not so, Lord it was not the preaching, as you would say they repented at (eis) but it was the benefits of the preaching. Who are you going to believe, Mr. Warlick or Jesus Christ? Then, since "eis," the word used in Acts 2:38 and Rom. 6:3-4 and Gal. 3:27, is used in a retrospective sense it does not necessarily mean into or in order to, as Mr. Warlick contends. Therefore, we must always, when this word is used, determine its meaning by the context and by comparing with other Scriptures. By comparing with other Scriptures, we find that none of the passages quoted teach baptismal salvation really nor prove it, for that would make them contradict other passages.

In the case of Saul (Acts 22:16) Mr. Warlick ignored my argument based upon the fact that "epikaleo," meaning "to call" in that passage, is in the aorist which would make Paul's praying a proof of his fitness for baptism. It would necessarily read: "Arise and be baptized, since you have prayed and are praying." Was prayer a proof of fitness for baptism? It was if Ananias knew what he was talking about. But Mr. Warlick let that argument pass. I do not blame him since there is no answer to it that scholars will accept.

But Mr. Warlick ridicules me for saying that Paul was saved and did not know it. What is there so funny about that? He says Mr. Bogard by this claims to know more than Paul. I know more than Paul knew at that time for he was wholly unlearned in spiritual things at that time. He had to be taught and Ananias did teach him that he had the evidences of salvation and he rose and was baptized, figuratively washing away his sins.

Mr. Warlick says that in every case in Acts the converts were told to be baptized in order to the remission of their sins. They were not told to do it even one time, much less every time. They were not even told that in Acts 2:38.

A few words in conclusion: I showed by the Scriptures that "whosoever shall call upon the name^o of the Lord shall be saved" (Rom. 10:15). The Greek word for "call" is "epikalleo" and it means to "invoke the name of the Lord in prayer." See Liddell & Scott and Robinson and Hinds & Noble and in fact all lexicons without an exception. It sometimes means when one calls for another, something like the conferring of the name of the father on a stepson. But where one does it for himself, as did Stephen (Acts 7) who was undoubtedly praying, then it is prayer. Well, this is exactly the thing an unsaved man is told to do. To confess and forsake sin insures salvation, says the word. To confess sin to God is prayer. If we do not confess our sins, we can never be accepted by the Lord. Hence, prayer is necessary to salvation. There is no need to repeat about the case of Cornelius which un**o**uboubtedly proves my doctrine, no matter which way you take it. Mr. Warlick's bragging on himself about knowing more than I do, can be taken for what it is worth. I am a mere weakling, but it does not require great strength when one has the truth as I have on this proposition. Mr. Warlick is a great man and a great scholar, but all his greatness and scholarship can not defeat the plain Bible truth which I have given in this discussion. So mote it be.

MR. WARLICK'S FOURTH NEGATIVE.

My friend Mr. Bogard says, my repeating the statement that he is angry indicates defeat to me. I wonder if it does? Then what does his repeated, and unfortunately silly statement that I am defeated indicate upon his part? Why, really, I knew all the time that he would fail in the written debate, just as he always does in oral discussion. I frankly acknowledge that he has done even poorer work than I could have expected. Guide readers are all surprised and say, that my friend should not have undertaken the job of conducting the debate, if he could do no better than he has in this case. Now, I know, and so do all the readers, that Mr. Bogard is out of humor and has been since the first of the discussion, but I am not complaining, for anger is a sure sign of conscious defeat.

Mr. Bogard says the discussion now hinges upon the case of Cornelius. I think not, but I should be willing to fight the whole thing out on this one case. In fact, I should be willing to discuss the design of baptism with any Baptist preacher in the world and let the debate hinge upon any one case of conversion recorded in Acts, or in fact, upon any case anywhere, for I know the Bible is absolutely silent on what Baptists believe and teach on the subject. But to Cornelius, now.

Mr. Bogard says Cornelius prayed. Sure; but did he pray as a sinner or proselyte to the Jewish religion? Every one knows that he prayed as one converted to the Jews idea of religion; that he worshipped God as a proselyte, not as an alien. He simply prayed as a servant of God, and Mr. Bogard knows it. He prayed also, and was heard before he was a believer in Christ. Will Mr. Bogard say his prayer before he was a believer in Christ shows that he was a saved man when God heard his prayer? The angel told him, four days before Peter saw him, that his prayer had been heard. Does Mr. Bogard believe this? But the angel told him that Peter would tell him what to do to be saved. Now his prayer was heard four days before he learned what to do to be saved. Is the hearing of his prayer evidence of his salvation? How silly. Again, Peter said in Acts 15:7, that Cornelius believed in Christ after he heard Peter's discourse. Does Mr. Bogard believe this? Pshaw! It makes one feel like apologizing to himself for having to deal with just such silly child's play as Baptists have to use in this case. But, again, I ask the question, and since Mr. Bogard cannot answer it I leave it up to every Baptist preacher in the world. Why was the fact that Cornelius received the baptismal measure of the Holy Ghost, before he was baptized, evidence of his being saved before he was baptized, and yet his seeing and talking with an angel, who told him that his prayer had been heard, that his alms were held as a memorial before God, all before he believed in Christ, not evidence that he was saved without that belief. I should like to see the color of the hair of the Baptist preacher who can talk sensibly in reply to this question.

Again I raise the question, and ask: Since Cornelius received the Holy Ghost in the same sense as Balaam's beast received it, enabling both of them to speak in tongues wherein they were not born, why do Baptists take one as a genuine case of conversion, and refuse the other? Again, I should like to know why Mr. Bogard and the Baptists all refer to Cornelius' case, when not one of them ever saw a case like it? Not one of them ever received the Holy Spirit as he did. They do not speak with tongues. They know this was simply one of the miracles wrought in connection with the case, and that such things do not happen now. What do they mean by thus howling about a thing they never had and never can get? The idea is ridiculous. I shall in a very few words take the case away from them as I have before done, and then go to something else.

Mr. Bogard says the truth when he declares that God does not have more than one way to save folks. Cornelius was saved, therefore, just like all others were saved under the commission. In the commission, the Lord said: "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." So he was not saved before baptism. The angel said Peter would tell him what to do to be saved. Does Mr. Bogard believe the angel told the truth? If he does, he knows that Cornelius was not saved until after Peter preached to him; moreover, this would have to be true, even if the Baptists are right about salvation coming with faith; for, he did not believe until he heard Peter preach. But again. The angel told Cornelius that in telling him what to do to be saved, Peter would tell him to do something, and since Peter told him to be baptized, and did not tell him to do anything else, it follows that to be baptized was necessary to his salvation. This is the way the Savior gave it in the commission (Mark 16:16). But Mr. Bogard says, when I admit that there were other miracles wrought in connection with the conversion, I go back on what Paul and I teach when we say that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, and that faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God. I wonder. I suppose that since a child must be born of its father and mother to be a descendant of Adam, and therefore to be a subject of salvation, Mr. Bogard thinks that such a begetal and birth are influences in the conversion of the sinner. The miracles were one thing and the power that effected Cornelius was another thing altogether. He was converted by the Gospel which Peter preached to him, not by the miracle. Balaam's beast had the same miracle wrought on him but it did not convert him. The expression: "Put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith," has no reference to what the Apostles received by the Holy Ghost baptism at Pentecost. It referred to the Jews and the Gentiles in a general way. I am surprised at the blunder my friend makes here. He thinks Peter in that remark had reference to Holy Ghost baptism received on Pentecost. Mr. Bogard, what is the matter with you? Don't you know a little bit about a few things?

I am glad that Mr. Bogard refers again to his failure on the

first proposition. The readers all know he was sorely defeated on that question and now he wants to patch it up.

While debating the question of the direct work of the Holy Ghost in conversion, he said that when Cornelius received the Holy Ghost, it did not simply come upon him and act on him as it does in conversion. This he said to screen himself from the exposure of a contradiction, when he used the case of Cornelius on the design of baptism, saying that Cornelius could not have received the Holy Spirit while yet a sinner. But it so happens that in speaking of the case, the Book says the Spirit "came upon them." This Mr. Bogard now says is its work in conversion. He also takes the position in his last article in his dying jump, that the miracle was evidence that the Holy Spirit does operate directly on the heart in conversion. In this claim he surrenders Cornelius to me on the design of baptism, saying as he now does, that the Spirit came upon him miraculously to convert him and not to show that he was saved before he was baptized. I tell you my friend is an easy mark. He will say anything in God's world that happens to come into his mind to save himself from an emergency.

He says that if Balaam's beast received the Spirit, then the Spirit was in the world before Pentecost. As if any one had ever questioned that. The body, the Church of Christ, did not receive it until the day of Pentecost, the day upon which the Church was established, but the Prophets were inspired by it. Is it not strange that Baptist preachers have to misrepresent the people of God every time they try to speak of them? Mr. Bogard knows that no one ever said there was no Holy Ghost until Pentecost. He knows that we all know the Prophets were inspired of the Holy Ghost, but this was not the sense in which it dwelled in the Church. I am sure the Baptist readers will be disgusted with the silly twaddle of the gentleman.

Mr. Bogard now tries to defend the very unscriptural practice of the Baptists voting on the experience of candidates for baptism. A thing that never did occur by Divine authority. The practice of the Baptists at this point is an open insult to every act of the inspired Apostles. But he says one of us sits in judgment. This is simply not so. When Phillip said: If you are a believer, I will baptize you. Was this setting in judgment on the eunuch? No Baptist will say it was. Well, this is precisely what we do. Do we, therefore, set in judgment any more than Phillip did? Now I find, word for word, authority for what I do. Don't you Baptist preachers, who read this, wish you could do half as well for your practice? I challenge any Baptist preacher on earth to find any case of conversion recorded in the New Testament that even favors their teaching and practice, or any case of Church membership where the person entered the Church as Baptists now practice. **One case will do—only one.** The truth is, the Baptists cannot find any of their doctrine and practice in the Book.

That old story of Mr. Bogard about Joe, Blue and Bynum Black has been turned against him so many times in debate, until a man of self pride would be ashamed to revert to it again.

Mr. Bogard now says that the woman at the well was told she might have salvation if she asked for it. But in his third article, he

said he did not know but what she had saving faith before she called for the water. Which time do you mean to tell what you really think about it?

Mr. Bogard actually thinks that the Apostles taught nothing after Christ left the world that He did not teach while he was here. Now, if I had a boy ten years old who did not know more about the New Testament than that, I should chastize the boy for woeful ignorance. Did not Christ say to His disciples: "When the Holy Spirit comes, He will show you things to come, as well as to remind you of what I have shown you?" Does not Peter say the Apostles preached the Gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, and taught things which even the angels had not looked into. Paul, in Ephesians says, that certain mysteries were kept from the world until they had been revealed to the Apostles by the Holy Spirit. Why on earth can't Baptist preachers learn a few things about the alphabet of Gospel teaching, anyhow? All of this Mr. Bogard has to say to get rid of what Paul says in Heb. 9:16, in which he declares that Christ's will could not be of any force at all until after his death; and that therefore, the cases referred to by Mr. Bogard during the personal ministry of Christ, have no more to do with what people must do to be saved now, than does the fact of the translation of Enoch and Elijah without death, promise us that we, too, shall be translated, just because God translated them. We are under the will of Christ now, not under the law. Christ lived and died under the law, and he said the law would be in force as long as it lasted; that not even a jot should pass from the law until it was all fulfilled. It was not fulfilled until it was taken out of the way when it was nailed to the cross. Come this side the death of Christ, Mr. Bogard, to find the opening and enforcement of the will of Christ, and act with some sense one time in your life. A Testament is of force after men are dead, Paul says. Mr. Bogard says I know better than that Paul, for the wicked woman of Luke 7, the thief on the cross and others, were saved by the will of Christ before he was dead. Pshaw! Mr. Bogard, get away.

I regret to say more by way of exposing my poor, deluded friend and very incompetent exegete on Romans 10: "How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?" He still thinks that "Eis" in the passage is the word in the Greek for "ON" in the English, and not the word "IN." If any of our Baptist readers can read Greek, they will be sorry for and ashamed of him. The word *on* in the passage is a part of the word *call* in the Greek. *Epikaleomai*. "Call upon." The word *eis* is the word for *in*, in the passage: "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed." Poor fellow. He should not have mentioned the matter unless he had been able to at least spell out the Greek words in the passage. Here, as I have shown before, the man who called, consenting that this means prayer (which it does not), was a believer in Christ before he could call, and this is too late for a sinner, according to Mr. Bogard and the Baptists, for they say, when he believes, he is saved, therefore this man had to be saved before he could pray, themselves being judges.

Mr. Bogard says an infidel can pray for pardon and get it. My answer to that is, Paul's language in Rom. 10: "How shall they

call on Him in whom they have not believed?" I don't know. Paul did not know and said they could not, but Mr. Bogard says he knows, and that he can prove it by two men over in Arkansas. Now we have it. How sad that Paul did not happen to live in Arkansas—and know these fellows. If Paul had known the witnesses, he never would have raised the question: "How can they call on him in whom they have not believed?" Now, Paul—You come to Arkansas and learn Baptist doctrine. We deal out the pure article over there, and we have the witnesses in Arkansas, even though we do not have them in the Bible to prove Baptist doctrine. Ha! Haven't I got a picnic?

Although James says expressly that his epistle was to the Church members, and everybody but Baptists say that they know it, Mr. Bogard says it is not so. James does not tell the truth about it, because he said some of them were murderers and adulterers. Many of God's people commit these sins. Baptists, even, do such things. What is the matter with you? On the obedient faith my friend goes down and he can't save himself, if the faith must be obedient before it saves. The woman bears children after she marries, but she does not marry until her relation and name has been changed by the ceremony. This ceremony is baptism, so Mr. Bogard surrenders here also.

I have so completely whipped my friend on Mark 16:16 it will be only necessary to say that his last reference to it, is as it should be, a faint allusion. This is also true of Acts 2:38, Acts 22:16, and other like references. I wish to call attention to the fact, that all any Baptist preacher can do in denying the teaching of Christ and the Apostles on the design of baptism, is simply to quibble on it. Take one position in one article and another in the next, like Mr. Bogard has done in this case. And one astonishing thing is, that they do not take the same position. No two of them say the same thing altogether. On Acts 2:38, each man has a position of his own, and no two the same. This is true of every one of their quibbles.

On the use of the word *eis* they do not agree. I have shown by such scholars as Dr. Ditzler and others, some of whom are Baptist men, who are scholars, that the word *eis* has a prospective, not a retrospective meaning, and this is its significance in Acts 2:38. Mr. Bogard says that since John baptized people *eis* into a state of reformation, it could not have this meaning unless baptism came before repentance. Poor fellow. He does not know that the reformation here, is a state, and not something which took place with the person baptized. Now to the summary. I shall simply quote without comment the teaching of Christ and the Apostles, and place it side by side with Baptist teaching and Mr. Bogard's proposition.

Mark 16:16: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

Christ: "He that believes and prays shall be saved, and afterwards may be baptized, if the 'coroner's inquest' vote to receive him."
—Mr. Bogard and the Baptists.

Acts 2:38: "Then Peter answered and said unto them, 'Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for

the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost'."—Peter.

"Repent and pray for remission, and then be baptized on account of it."—Mr. Bogard and the Baptists.

Acts 8:11-12: "When they believed, Phillip preached the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women."—Phillip at Samaria.

When they believed Baptist doctrine, prayed at a Baptist mourners's bench, got religion, and were voted on as genuine by a Baptist Church, they were baptized, both men and women.—Mr. Bogard and the Baptists.

Acts 8:37: "And the eunuch said, 'See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?' Phillip said, 'If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he said, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God' and he baptized him." Phillip and the Eunuch.

"And the mourner at the bench prayed, and when he came through he said, 'Why may I not be baptized and become a member of this Baptist Church? And the preacher said, Go to work now and in your own way, tell what the Lord has done for your poor soul, (here gives his experience), and is asked: do you feel that God for Christ's sake has pardoned your sins? and he says I do. And the preacher bade the brethren to take notice and said, You have heard the brother's experience. What do you do with it? And they moved, seconded and voted him in."—Mr. Bogard and the Baptists.

Acts 10:48: "And he commanded them to be baptized, in the name of the Lord."—Peter.

"And the preacher commanded them to pray for salvation and then be baptized with the permission of the Church."—Mr. Bogard and the Baptists.

Acts 16:30-31: "And he brought them out and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house. And he took them the same hour of the night, washed their stripes and was baptized, he and all his, straightway, and when they come into the house, he sat meat before them and rejoiced, he, and all his house."

"And he came in and fell down before the Baptist preachers, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said unto him, come to the altar and pray and thou shalt be saved and thy house. And he came the same hour of the night and prayed long and earnestly and the whole Church, led by the preachers, prayed with him, and after thus praying for many days, perhaps weeks, months and years, he came through and then it was that these same preachers with the permission of the Baptist Church, expressed by a vote, took him in, after he had rejoiced much, with all his house, and baptized him into a Baptist Church," (a human institution)—Baptists and Mr. Bogard.

Acts 18:6-7: "And many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized."—Paul at Corinth.

"And many people believed and prayed, some of them got religion, and a few of them who preferred that Church, were baptized

by a Baptist preacher after they were voted on by the Church.—Mr. Bogard's meeting with the Baptists.

Acts 22:16: "Ananias came in unto him and said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who hath appeared to thee in the way, has sent me that thou mayest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins."—Ananias to Saul.

"And the Baptist preacher said, 'Brethren, here is the chief of sinners down here praying. Let all of you come into the altar around him, and all pray. Let Sister Smith lead the prayer. Here Sister Smith leads in a very unscriptural prayer, which is an insult to God, showing they think God is careless about his business and not willing and ready to save every one who comes to Him by Christ. And after long prayers, much singing and shouting, the worn out mourner gets through, and then they vote him a candidate for baptism, and the next month at the regular meeting, they baptize him.'—Mr. Bogard as pastor of a Baptist Church.

Rom. 6:4: "So many of you as were baptized into Christ were baptized into His death."—Paul.

"So many as prayed into Christ and desired it, were baptized after the usual vote, and received into the Church, after they were in Christ, before and without baptism."—Mr. Bogard and the Baptists.

Gal. 3:27: "So many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—Paul.

"So many of you as were brought into Christ in answer to prayer, before and without baptism, and whom the Baptists, by vote, accepted, were baptized into the Baptist Church, a thing the Bible knows nothing about."—Mr. Bogard and the Baptists.

1 Peter 3:21: "In the days of Noah, there were few, that is, eight souls saved by water, even so in the like figure, doth baptism now save us."—Peter.

In these modern days, and especially in Arkansas, there were at least two souls saved in answer to prayer before and without baptism, and upon the confession of their feelings, may be received by baptism into the Baptist Church.—Mr. Bogard in this debate and Baptists everywhere.

Now the Baptist readers who are not able to see the difference between the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, and that of the Baptists in their teaching and practice on this question will certainly be saved without baptism, faith or anything else. It is too plain to be missed. I am sure you can see it, my friends, and if you refuse to accept it, it will be your fault, not mine.

Fare you well, Elder Watkins, Mr. Bogard and all Baptist preachers in the world.

Fourth Proposition

(The Scriptures teach that a saint or child of God may so apostatize as to be finally lost.)

MR. WARLICK'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE.

There is no need of defining any of the terms of this proposition, except to say, that I am to prove by the Bible, the possibility of apostasy. Not that any one has ever apostatized, so as to be cut out of the promises of Heaven, but that one may do such a thing. In short, that one may, after conversion, so conduct himself in this life, as to be finally condemned.

I shall begin the argument by referring the readers to Christ's language in John 10:28: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish."

The difference between me and my opponent, his brethren and Jesus Christ at this point is, Mr. Bogard thinks that Christ gives eternal life to goats, to make sheep out of them. This he believes, because he thinks, that eternal life is the first blessing of salvation, and that it transforms a goat, into a sheep, or goat-life, into sheep life; whereas Christ teaches that one must become a sheep first, and that he must follow Him before he gets eternal life. The doctrine of Christ is, that He gives eternal life to sheep, not only after they become sheep, but even after they have followed Him. This is an important point in the discussion of the apostasy question.

Our next question is, how far, and how long, must the sheep follow Christ, before they get eternal life? The answer is in Mark 10:28-30. Christ said: "He that forsakes all and follows Me shall have an hundred fold in this world, and in the world to come, eternal life." Paul in Romans 2:7 says: "Those who seek for glory, honor, immortality, shall be rewarded with eternal life," and in First Timothy 6:19, he tells Timothy to teach other Christians, to "lay up for themselves a good foundation, against the day to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." In Rom. 6:22, Paul says: "The Christian has had his fruit unto holiness, then he will get, as the end, everlasting life." Christ emphasized the same doctrine in Matthew 24:13, when He said: "He that endures to the end, the same shall be saved." These Scriptures teach very clearly, that eternal life is to be obtained in Heaven, not in this world. Indeed, the apostle says, in Titus 1:2, that the Christian lives in hope of eternal life.

It may be, that you are thinking just now of a few passages of Scripture which seem to teach that we come into the actual possessions of eternal life in this world? Space forbids noticing each and every passage that might be named, so we shall take confessedly the strongest ones in the whole catalogue. John 5:24: "He that heareth these sayings of mine and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation, but is

passed from death unto life." Now, because the Savior said he shall not come into condemnation, they imagine that the believer is in actual possession of eternal life, and since the Savior said he shall not come into condemnation, they imagine that he can never, under any condition, be lost. Their mistake, is found in the fact, that they do not seem to understand the Bible use of such terms as hath, is and shall. In Isaiah 9, beginning with the first verse, we have such language as the following : "They that dwell in darkness have seen a great light, and to them that dwell in the shadow of darkness light hath shined in." Here is a passage referring to the time and mission of Christ, written more than seven hundred years before He was born. It is a case in which God "sometimes speaks of things that are not, as though they were." Paul says he does this sometimes, Romans 4:17. This term hath, in the above passage, though present tense in form, relates only to something to be enjoyed, yet future. Just so in John 5:24. If the Savior be interpreted to mean that the believer has eternal life in this world, the interpretation misrepresents Him. When in Mark 10:28 He says very plainly, that we do not have eternal life in this world, in an actual sense, and when Paul states unequivocally, that we do not have it here, as he does in Romans 2:6-7, also, first Timothy 6:19, it is very unfaithful to both Paul and Christ, for one to teach that we come into possession of eternal life in this world. Our conclusion, therefore, is, that the sense in which Christ intended to teach that the believer has eternal life in this world, is only by promise, and spoken of as a thing that is not, as though it were.

If you still contend that the Christians cannot apostatize and be lost, because Christ said the believer shall not come into condemnation, I ask upon what does your contention rest? You answer, perhaps, upon the declarative statement, "He shall not come into condemnation." You think, I suppose, that Christ intended to teach by this statement, that it is impossible for a believer to ever become an unbeliever and be lost? Now to show that such a claim is un-scriptural and wholly out of harmony with the Savior's teaching where such expressions are employed, I refer you to His language in John 3:36: "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." Now, I shall contend that since the Savior uses the same shall not in both cases, if He meant in the first case to say that the believer cannot become an unbeliever and be lost, he meant in the second case that the unbeliever cannot become a believer and be saved. This would put the world to the bad, and condemn every person, for Paul says: "God hath concluded the world in unbelief." If the unbeliever who shall not see life as per John 3:36, can never become a believer and be saved, then we would have universal condemnation. But perhaps you are ready to say to me, that Christ only meant to teach that as long as one abides in unbelief he cannot be saved. Cannot see life? I answer, just so, and so also does He teach in John 5:24, that as long as one abides in the faith, he shall not be lost, shall not be condemned.

The only answer I have ever heard to this argument, and to the above Scripture was, the contention, that the soul of the Christian has

eternal life in this world, but that the body will not obtain it until it is raised from the grave; this objection to the truth, or our position on the subject, is advocated by those only who deny that the body is in any sense converted, or that it is even a subject of conversion. When this much is acknowledged, then the objection is lost; for Christ said in Mark 10:28: "He that hath forsaken all, and followed Me, shall have an hundred fold in this world, and in the world to come eternal life." It will be observed that this promise is to the man who hath forsaken all and followed Christ. If the body has been in no sense converted, then the body has not forsaken all and followed Christ; therefore, the body, apart from the soul, cannot be contemplated in this passage. Since it is claimed by those who raise this point that only the soul is a subject of conversion in this world, then the soul only has forsaken all to follow Christ, but the man of whom this may be said, will not have eternal life until he gets to Heaven. So says Jesus in Mark 10:28-30.

We now tie the two ends of our argument together. When Christ, in John 10:28, said that we must first become sheep, and after becoming sheep, must follow Him, in order to obtain eternal life; or, that we must endure to the end that we may be saved, He meant that the real, or actual possession of eternal life, was not a blessing belonging to this world, but that as Paul teaches, it is to be obtained in the world to come, after a life of faithfulness. Under this view, Peter could say, and did say: "We receive the end of our faith, even the salvation of our souls." First Peter 1:9. The apostle could also exclaim, after several years of faithful service in the Lord's vineyard: "Now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed." When we remember that eternal life is a promise to the Christian, and that he lives in hope of it, also, that God sometimes speaks of things that are not as though they were, the matter is cleared of all ambiguity, and the truth of each and every passage relating to the question easily discovered.

I have tried to be plain in this matter, because I believe that my friend and his people, are greatly at fault in what they propose to teach with reference to where, and when, one comes into the actual possession of eternal life; and that because of a misunderstanding of the subject, upon their part, they have fallen into the unfortunate error of believing in the impossibility of apostasy.

When our Savior, in His matchless sermon on the Mount said: "Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father in Heaven." (Matthew 7:21). He certainly contradicted the Baptist idea on the subject of apostasy. He also disputes what they teach in John 5:29, where in speaking of the resurrection, He said: "The dead shall come forth, they that have done good unto a resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto a resurrection of condemnation." John, in Revelations, also takes issue with our Baptist friends. Revelations 14:13: "Write blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, yea, saith the spirit, they rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." And in Rev. 22, John, instructed by the angel, said: "Blessed

are they that do His commandments that they may have a right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city.

Our conclusion is, therefore, that the Christian must live right in this world, in order to die happy, go home to God, and obtain eternal life in the world to come, and if he does not do this, he may die as an apostate and be finally lost.

MR. BOGARD'S FIRST NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen, Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: My opponent attempts to darken counsel by mis-stating the issue. It is not a question whether we obtain eternal life in this world or not. Mr. Warlick will concede that a Christian has the "sheep life" he talks about in his speech. Can we lose that? He will confess that a Christian is a "saint." Can he cease to be a "saint?" He will confess that a child of God is on the road to Heaven. Can he ever get off that road and get into the broad way that leads to hell? That is the issue and he knows it. Why, then, all the argument about the Christian not getting eternal life until after death? It was an effort to side-track the discussion. I shall follow him on his side track only so far as is necessary to expose his error and then return to the main line and discuss the issue.

What is meant by the several passages which he quotes to show that eternal life begins after death? They mean eternal life for the body. Paul says in Rom. 8:23: "We groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to-wit: the redemption of our bodies." It is the spirit of man that is born of God (John 3:6) and the spirit is received by the Lord at death, but the body is consigned to the grave with no salvation for it until the resurrection. Paul said that there was a conflict between his outer and inner man, so that he did not do the things he wished to do (Rom. 7:15-23). The spirit that is born of God receives God's nature and that implies eternal life, but the outer man does not get the new birth, and hence does not have eternal life. This explains the apparently contradictory passages, one saying that the child of God has eternal life and another saying that eternal life will come in the world to come. This answers all that my opponent says about eternal life being in the future. It is future as to the body, but the soul gets eternal life when it is born of God.

All that talk about God giving eternal life to a "goat" to make a "sheep" out of him is twaddle. No Baptist teaches that. We teach that God makes a new creature out of the sinner and in doing it, he obtains eternal life. Mr. Warlick here made some arguments for me and then answered them. I prefer to make my own arguments and shall therefore present the following negative arguments:

The following passages fully upset Mr. Warlick's doctrine of apostasy:

(1) "The Lord has mercy on our unrighteousness." Heb. 8:12. If he has mercy on our unrighteousness we certainly shall not be lost on account of it.

(2) "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." John 6:37. This evidently means that He will in no case cast out those who come. If this is true, how say some that there is danger of being cast out?

(3) "Depart from Me, I never knew you." Matt. 7:23. If He never knew those who shall be cast off at the last day, how say some that He did not know them and they fell from grace and He forgot them?

(4) "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins. Matt. :21. If He saves His people from their sins, how say some that His people may not be saved from their sins and may come under the power of their sins so as to be forever lost?"

(5) "I give unto them eternal life and they shall never perish." John 10:27. If they have eternal life, how can eternity end so that they may perish?

(6) "And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him, for they know not the voice of strangers." John 10:5. How say some then that the Lord's sheep will take up with false men and adopt false teaching and follow the devil to ruin? Did Jesus tell the truth when He said "a stranger they shall not follow?"

(7) "They shall never perish." John 10:28. "**Shall never perish**" in the Greek is in the Middle Voice, and must therefore mean: Shall never cause themselves to perish. If this is true, then it follows that spiritual suicide, that some talk of, is out of the question.

(8) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. John 3:36. If so, unless that which is everlasting shall come to an end then a Christian can not be lost.

(9) "He that believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death into life." John 5:24. If so, how can the Lord's word be true and a Christian get back under condemnation?

(10) "The steps of a good man are ordered of the Lord and he delighteth in his way. Though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down for, the Lord upholdeth him with His hand." Ps. 37:24. If a child of God cannot be utterly cast down, tell me how he can ever be cast into hell? Since the Lord has made a Christian so secure, out of gratitude we obey the injunction in the 27th verse: "Depart from evil and do good, and verily thou shalt dwell in the land."

(11) In Rom. 8:38-39, We read that nothing shall separate us from the love of God. In hell we would be separated from God's love. Eternal death means, not eternal annihilation, but eternal separation from God. God is love and separation from God is separation from His love. But nothing can separate us from God's love. Hence it is impossible to fall from grace and be lost in hell.

(12) Rom. 4:8, says: "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Are there such people who are in such a blessed condition that He will not count their sins against them? Certainly. "He that knew no sin became sin for us that we might be made righteousness of God in Him." II. Cor. 5:21. Those who accept Christ have Him as a substitute and He bears their sins for them. How then can a Christian's sins be counted against him? If not, then he is perfectly safe.

(13) "Sin shall not have dominion over you." Rom. 6:14. If a man fall from grace, sin would have dominion over him. Then

a Christian can never fall so as to lose the grace of God, since sin shall not have dominion over him.

(14) "All things work together for good to them that love God." Rom. 8:28. If all things work together for a Christian's good, he can never fall from grace, for that would not be for his good. Neither can he be stopped from loving God, for that would not be for his good. Even the devil's work is overruled for the Christian's good.

(15) Peter says we are "kept by the power of God." I Peter 1:15. If so, the devil will have to have more power than God, if he ever gets us.

(16) "Whoever is born of God overcomes the world." I John 5:4. Then the world will never cause a Christian to apostatize so as to be lost.

(17) I John 3:3 says: "Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure." If this is true, there are none left to pollute themselves so as to apostatize and be lost. If a single one ever polluted himself and is lost, the statement is false.

(18) Those who seem to fall and be lost have an explanation in I John 2:19: "They went out from us, but they were not of us, because if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us. But they went out that it might be made manifest that they were not all of us." Remember, the Book says that "If they had been of us they would have no doubt continued with us." That which inspiration has no doubt about should satisfy us.

These unmistakable passages can not be set aside by may-be so's, and conjectures, and hypothetical cases. God's people will be punished for their sins but they will be punished as children and not as criminals. "Whom the Lord loveth He chaseth and scourgeth every son that He receiveth." Heb. 12:7-8. But there is a world of difference between the punishment God gives His children and that which is received by the lost in hell. God deals with us as with children and not as aliens.

Mr. Warlick's twaddle about the use of "hath," "is," and "shall" is ridiculous. He says that in prophecy these words, "hath," and "is" are sometimes used in the future sense, as for instance in Isaiah's prophecy, where "unto us a son is born and a light hath shined," referring to Christ, and He had not yet come. Yes, this is true. But you can not make part of a sentence prophecy and part history as he must do to make his point stick. If, for instance, John 5:24 is prophecy, then it would mean that "He that shall in the future hear my voice and shall in the future believe on Him that sent Me, may have everlasting life." That is putting faith off the same as it puts eternal life off. This makes the idea absurd, and to reduce an idea to an absurdity is to refute it.

Mr. Warlick says that the "unbeliever shall not see life" is just as strong as that the believer shall not come into condemnation. Perhaps so, if it were not for the fact that all the power of God is used to keep the saint in the faith. The cases are not, therefore, parallel. Mr. Warlick must get some passages if he succeeds in proving his God dishonoring doctrine.

MR. WARLICK'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

I think the readers, even the Baptist readers, would rather that Mr. Bogard would at least undertake to show that I am only "seeking to darken counsel," instead of simply asserting without one syllable of proof.

I proved beyond quibble in my former article, that we do not have eternal life in any actual sense in this world. It is a promise, and we hope for it; it will be given as a reward for faithfulness, and is something to be laid hold of. The only answer we get to what I said, is, to accept it, but to assert that the Scriptures cited, refer only to the eternal life of the body, not soul. Mr. Bogard says the body is not a subject of conversion, and remains unregenerated until raised from the tomb. But in Mark 10:28-30, Christ says, the man who is to have eternal life in the world to come has forsaken all to follow Him." This Mr. Bogard says, is not true of the body, therefore the body is not the man who is to have eternal life in the world to come. Again, Mr. Bogard's idea is, that the devil, still holds the body, the outward man, and that God has possession of the soul, or inward man. In that case, the devil has God's man "bottled up" and with this advantage I think he may get both, later on. I challenged Mr. Bogard to answer the argument I made on "When and Where We Get Eternal Life?" I wish he would try it.

After denying what the Baptists teach, that God gives eternal life to sheep to make goats of them, my friend acknowledges that I am correct, by saying, that God makes a new creature out of the sinner, and in doing it he obtains eternal life. Now, what is this new creature but a sheep? And what was the old creature but a goat? Then is it not a fact, that God gives the sheep life to a goat, and that this act changes the goat into a sheep, and thus is it not true that the life is given to a goat? You may deny it, but it is a fact, that the Baptists think God gives eternal life to goats to make sheep out of them. Christ said He gives eternal life to sheep, and that, after they hear His voice and follow Him. John 10:28-30.

If the soul has eternal life here, and can't lose it, but if the body has to continue faithful in this life to get eternal life in the world to come, then the body may fail of obtaining the life, so in this case, you would have a bodyless spirit in Heaven, and spiritless body in hell. This is Baptist doctrine according to Mr. Bogard.

My friend, like he did on the other affirmative I made in this discussion, takes the lead and tries to save his doctrine of "Apostasy Impossible."

Well, I am as willing to work behind as in front. It is a picnic to discuss the question any way you take it.

I shall show that every argument the Baptists can make or do make, and everything Mr. Bogard can say on his side of this question, proves either universal salvation, or universal damnation,

just as it proves what he tries to prove. Take his first—The Lord has mercy on our unrighteousness; therefore, we can't fall, but will be finally saved. The Universalists say, just so, but the Lord has mercy on the unrighteousness of all men, so all will be saved and no one lost.

2. "Him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out," refers to the sinner coming to Christ. After they come, He says if they do not live right, they will be broken off. John 15:1-4.

3. "Depart from Me, I never knew you," correctly rendered is, **I do not approve you.** This will include those in the Kingdom who do iniquity, mentioned by Christ in the parable of the tares.

4. "He shall save His people from their sins." He also came to seek and to save those who are lost. He will not compel either saint or sinner. But if He forces one, He will force all, and hence save all.

5. "They shall never perish." Yes, when we get into the world to come, where Christ said, we would get eternal life, we shall not perish. Mark 10:29-30.

6. "A stranger will they not follow." This my friend thinks refers to all children of God, and so no one will go astray. If he be right here, then when one sins, which he says all Christians do, in committing the sins they are following Christ, and not a stranger. Shame on you, Mr. Bogard.

7. "They shall never cause themselves to perish." A foolish translation, but it all refers to the life to come, as we have shown. See Mark 10:28; also 1 Tim. 6:19. When the sheep get to Heaven, I think they will be safe from falling.

8. Hath everlasting life, and can't lose it, says my friend. We have seen that the believer has the life, just as the unbeliever has the condemnation, and that if one cannot make a change, neither can the other. John 3:36.

9. "Shall not come into condemnation." But in John 3:36. we are told that the unbeliever shall not see life. The same shall not, is in both cases and is as impossible in the one as in the other. If the believer cannot ever become an unbeliever and be lost, the unbeliever cannot ever become a believer and be saved. The world was concluded in unbelief, and so the world can't be saved and Christ died in vain, if the Baptists be right on this proposition.

10. "The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord, and if he fall he shall not be utterly cast down." The last verse tells upon what condition this may be hoped for, "Depart from evil and do good and dwell forever more." If we do not do this, we shall fall, of course.

11. Nothing shall be able to separate us from God's love so we will be finally saved, says Mr. Bogard. But God loves the world, and gave His Son to die for it; therefore the world will be saved according to this logic.

12. "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin," refers to all people under the Gospel, as contradistinguished

from the condition under the law, so all will be saved, as per Mr. Bogard's reasoning.

13. "Sin shall not have dominion over you," is as true of one as the other, Saint or sinner. Under the law, it did have dominion, but this is not true now, where sins are forgiven now, they are not simply rolled forward one year, but are remembered no more. This does not say, though, that all men under the Gospel shall be saved, "whether or no."

14. "All things work together for good to the Saint." If Mr. Bogard's logic on this be true, then it is good for the Christian that all men are not saved, and so Christ was foolish to try to save all, and God was simple also for making the effort.

15. "We are kept by the power of God," but it is through faith, and we must keep the faith, otherwise we shall not be kept.

16. "Whosoever is born of God, overcomes the world." But John says it is our faith that does the overcoming, and if we do not keep it, we will not overcome. See?

17. "Every man that has this hope, purifieth himself." Sure, but he has only the hope, and not the thing hoped for, and so you are wrong to begin with, and then we must purify ourselves. This makes us active in the matter, and therefore it is conditional, so you lose this passage at once.

18. "They went out from us, because they were not of us." But they went out that it might be made manifest that they were not all of us. Here some who went out, were of the saved, so you lose this point clear.

Mr. Bogard says that you cannot make one part of a passage prophecy and the other part present tense, then he quotes John 5:24. "He that believeth on Me, hath everlasting life" which he says is present, but the rest of the verse "Shall not come into condemnation," he says is future. Mr. Bogard is an amusing fellow indeed. But Baptist preachers, trying to defend the foolishness of Baptists, will contradict themselves on every turn.

My friend says the reason the unbeliever may become a believer and be saved, while the believer cannot become an unbeliever and be lost, is because God has more power than the devil. Well, then; God, having the greater power, and desiring that the whole world should be saved, will certainly bring it to pass, in spite of the devil. I told you, that a Baptist could not make an argument in favor of their idea on this matter, which the Universalists cannot use with equal propriety, and with as much truth, too.

Before leaving Mr. Bogard's present article, I beg him again to take up the arguments offered in my first, and handle them in the order in which I gave them to him. Tell us about what you think of each one of the passages in its turn.

Continuing my argument, I wish to say to all honest students who may read this discussion, that I have never been able to see why the Baptists are so tenacious for what they teach on the question. It is certainly at variance with every sentiment of truth as given in the Bible, and is so foolish and unreasonable. God has given about three-fourths of the New Testament to Christians, teach-

ing them how to live, that they may be finally saved, and yet we are to be insulted with the foolish claim, that God knew all the time, that no one was in any danger of being lost.

Ezek. 18:24-26, says: "If the righteous man turn from his righteousness, and does as do the wicked, in his sin he shall die and not live." The Baptists deny this, and say it is not true. It is true, however, and shows that Ezekiel stood with me on this issue.

In John 15:1-6 Christ said that His disciples were branches of the true vine, and that if they did not bring forth fruit, they would be broken off. Baptists say, there is no danger of being broken off, for you cannot fall from grace at all. Christ was an advocate of my side of this question, as sure, as you are born.

Christ said His Kingdom was like a man, who called unto him his own servants and delivered unto them his goods, then took a journey into a far country. Upon his return he found an **unprofitable servant**, and that such a servant was cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. Baptists insult us by saying that no such a thing is either possible or probable. Read the passage in Matt. 25:14-30.

Paul says: "The spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith." 1 Tim. 4:1. Baptists say No, there is no danger.

2 Tim. 2:17, Paul declares that the faith of some of God's children had been overthrown. No man can believe this and believe my friend's position at the same time.

2 Thess. 2:14, Paul says that Christ will not come, except there come a falling away first. Baptists say there will never be even one to fall away, therefore, if you believe Baptist doctrine at this point, you cannot believe in the second coming of Christ.

Gal. 5:14, Paul says: "If we seek to be justified by the law, we are fallen from grace." Baptists make no hesitancy in denying this and declaring that there is no danger at all. Under no condition do they think one could fall from grace and go to hell.

"Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into that rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." Heb. 4:1. Baptists say: Ah, don't be afraid. You will not fall to enter if you have only started.

Paul said in 1 Cor. 9:27, that he had to labor, to keep his body under, lest he, after preaching to others, a thing he continued to do, down to the day of his death, would be at last cast off. Baptists say you may become unpopular with the people but God will stick to you, I do not care what you do you will be saved finally.

After enumerating the Christian graces, in 2 Peter 1:5-11, Peter says: "If you do these things you shall never fall." Baptists say you will not fall anyhow.

Reader, which do you prefer to believe—the Bible, or Baptist doctrine? I say: "As for me and for my house, we will serve the Lord."

Peter informs us that God did not spare the angels that sinned

and gives us to understand that He may not spare us, so he advises caution.

Paul said: "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." 1 Cor. 10:12. Paul thought he might fall, and he knew other Christians could fall and Peter says angels have fallen, but Baptists say they cannot. Well, we shall have to change the old song, and instead of singing as we once sang:

"I want to be an angel, and with the angels stand,

A crown upon my forehead, and a harp within my hand,"

We shall sing, I suppose—

I want to be a Baptist, and with the Baptists stand,

Total depravity in my soul, and election in my hand.

But I shall wait now for my friend's blundering reply.

MR. BOGARD'S SECOND NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Why does not Mr. Warlick acknowledge, like a good fellow that the issue is not whether a Christian has eternal life in this world, but whether a Christian can cease to be a Christian, no matter what he has. Everybody knows that this is the issue. But my opponent can make a better show discussing something else and therefore he dodges. But as I am able to meet his dodge, I do not seriously object to it.

Mr. Warlick says he and his people do not have everlasting life in this world; that he and his people are not saved in this world, but that they hope to have life in the world to come and, if no bad luck happens, to be saved in the world to come. I am sorry for them. Hear the word of the Lord:

1 John 3:14: "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." Mr. Warlick says he has no evidence that he and his people have that life in this world. Alas!

1 John 5:11-12: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in the Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son hath not life. These things I have written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eternal life." It is unfortunate for Mr. Warlick that he thus confesses that he and his people are without Christ. I had thought so all the time, but hardly expected this confession. As surely as we have Christ, we have eternal life in this world, else the Bible has told it wrong.

These passages, unmistakably referring to what we now have, are sufficient to show that my friend is wrong in his interpretation of the passages where we are said to have eternal life. It is true that in one sense we will get eternal life in the world to come. Paul tells us that it is the body that is yet to be saved. Rom. 8:23: "We groan within ourselves waiting for the adoption of our bodies." Did Paul know what he was talking about? If so, Mr. Warlick is wrong in his idea of the soul having to be saved in the future—an idea which rules out present salvation entirely, thus confessing that all are yet unsaved.

My opponent says that the man who forsakes all and follows the Lord is the man who will get eternal life in the world to come. Certainly. If Mr. Warlick is a Christian, he, the man Warlick, has forsaken all and is following the Lord and there is eternal life for him as to his body in the world to come. My friend failed to notice my reference to Paul's argument about his double nature, in Rom. 7th chapter. That chapter explains how Paul the *man Paul*, could forsake all and yet be waiting for his body to be redeemed. Paul said he had to "keep his body under and bring it into subjection," 1 Cor. 9:27. If the body is redeemed here in this world, why did he have to keep it under? Why this conflict between his outer and inner man, if there is not a dead nature?

It seems hard for Mr. Warlick to understand that Baptists do not teach that God gives life to a goat in order to make it a sheep. Of course that is thrown in to darken counsel. What of it if this be true? It is not true, but what of it even if it be true? If in the change the goat ceases to be a goat and becomes a sheep, what of it? The Baptist position is that the Lord first kills the goat; that is, the sinner dies to sin. Then it becomes a live sheep, and the sheep life is eternal life, because it is the life of God, imparted in regeneration. Mr. Warlick seems to think that the order of mention is the order of occurrence in John 10:27-30. If so, then the sheep were the Lord's before they even heard Him, for He says: "My sheep (No. 1) hear my voice (No. 2), and I know them (No. 3) and they follow me (No. 4) and I give unto them eternal life (No. 5)." So Mr. Warlick, in order to save his doctrine, has turned Hard-shell and has sheep first, then the sheep hear, and then He knows them, and after all this they follow him. Not being able to see an inch past his nose, he has given up his doctrine that a man must first hear and then become a sheep. Not only this but he has given up his doctrine that he contended for in two propositions in this debate, that a man must first obey the Lord—that is, follow him—before he can be a sheep. But now he has him a sheep first, then he hears the Lord and is known of Him and then he follows! Sakes alive, what next? And all this to save an impossible interpretation and thus save a God-dishonoring doctrine.

Mr. Warlick asks: "If the soul has eternal life and can't lose it, and the body must be faithful in order to get eternal life, then may not the body fall and go to hell, while the spirit may go to heaven and thus have a bodiless spirit in heaven and a spiritless body in hell?" Wonderful question! If the salvation of the body depended on its good behavior, this would be true. But salvation for neither soul nor body depends on good behavior, for if it did, then no man could get to heaven, as there are none who are perfect in this life.

Mr. Warlick says my doctrine teaches Universal Salvation or else Universal Damnation. Wonderful to tell! However does he make that out? Why, just this way, of course. Says Mr. Warlick: If the Lord has mercy on our unrighteousness, then all men will be saved. Sic! That would be true if that promise was to all, but it so happens that the promise is only to those who have accepted Christ. Try again, friend. (Heb. 8:12).

Then says Mr. Warlick: The Lord will save His people from their sins (Matt. 1:21), but he came to seek and to save the lost, too. If he is going to do it whether or no, then he will save all men. Exactly. If the promise had been that He would save the lost, Universalism would be true. But there is no such promise. He came and offered salvation to the lost and to all who accept the offer and becomes His, He makes safe, for he came to save His people from their sins. It does not say he came to give them an opportunity to save themselves. Try again.

Again, quoth Mr. Warlick: Of course it is impossible to sep-

arate us from the love of God. But God loves the world and if this is so, then the whole world will be saved. That would be true if it only said that the "world" could not be separated from God's love. But it did not say it. It says nothing can separate us from God's love. **Us who?** Evidently not the world, but the ones to whom Paul was writing—"the beloved at Rome called saints" (Rom. 1:7). So in the 8th chapter he says that nothing could separate us—**us saints**—from the love of God. So good bye universal salvation. Try again, Mr. Warlick.

"Depart from Me, I never knew you." Matt. 7:23. Mr. Warlick says it means, I do not approve you. Where did you get that, friend? The Greek word is "egnon" from the word "gnosis," to know. So those who are turned away at the judgment are those whom the Lord never knew, not those whom He once knew but had fallen from grace. Try again, dodging friend.

Mr. Warlick says that when the Savior said His sheep should never perish, He meant that they would be safe after they got to heaven. Yes, I see. But before he finished his address he said **angels had fallen from heaven.** It does not seem that it is even safe in heaven, Mr. Warlick. If the angels fell from heaven, and you think we are no safer than they, how is it that we shall be safe in heaven? There is a contradiction here sure. Try again.

Mr. Warlick thinks that the Savior was mistaken when He said: "A stranger they will not follow," for, says he, if this is true, if a man sins he is following the Lord. Wonderful man! Paul says he served the Lord and yet he sinned. That is how a man may be following the Lord and not refuse to follow a stranger, yet sin (Rom. 7th chapter).

My friend says that I make a foolish translation of John 10:27-30, when I say it is in the middle voice and should be rendered: "Shall not cause themselves to perish." Well, that is what it is. I did not make that middle voice. The Lord made it and if it is foolish, charge it up to the Lord and don't blame me. It is much easier to call it foolish than it is to answer.

Ps. 37:23-24, says plainly: "Though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down, for the Lord upholds him with His hand." Mr. Warlick says this is conditional on his departing from evil and doing good. Nonsense. If a man lives right all the time, as this implies, he would never fall. To fall means to do wrong, to sin. If he sins, does wrong, "he shall not be utterly cast down." Try again, friend.

"Sin shall not have dominion over you" (Rom. 6:14), friend Warlick says applies to the unsaved, as well as to Christians. But Paul happened to be writing to the "saints" at Rome, not the unsaved. What is the matter with the man?

"Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (Rom. 4:7-8), Mr. Warlick says that this is intended to contrast the Law with the Gospel. But it happens that the reference is to Abraham, who lived four hundred and thirty years before the Law was given. Try again.

Mr. Warlick thinks that because we overcome the world through faith that it sets aside my argument: "He that is born of God overcomes the world." The point is that the inspired writer says they all overcome. No matter how. We are not discussing the how, but the positive fact.

John says: "Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself" (1 John 3:3). Mr. Warlick says: Yes, but the man is active in it. No matter whether he is active or passive, the book says that he purifieth himself. It does not say that nearly every man does this, nor that nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand do it, but every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself." If there is a Christian in all the world who fails to do this, then the Bible is mistaken. It therefore follows that none will pollute themselves and fall from grace.

Mr. Warlick says that 1 John 2:19, says, that some who went out were of us. Not so. It plainly says: "If they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us." Mr. Warlick says there is no doubt about those who are with us continuing,, hence he contradicts the Bible here as in other places.

Continuing his new argument he says that about three-fourths of the Bible was written to teach Christians how to be saved. I deny it and call for the proof. Not one line of the Bible was written for such a purpose. A part of the Bible was written to show the unsaved how to be saved, but three-fourths even for that.

Ezek. 18:24 simply shows what will become of a man who is standing on his own righteousness and then commits sin. The man who proposes to save himself by his own righteousness must live a perfect life, for if he sins at all, he will have to pay the penalty, which is death. But if a man stands in the Lord's imputed righteousness he will not have to die for his own sin, for the Lord has died for him (see Isaiah 53, and II Cor. 5:21, a passage which Mr. Warlick failed to notice in his last).

John, 15th chapter, simply teaches that we must abide (that is, live) in Christ, if we bear fruit. It does not say, when rightly understood, that any branch in Christ shall be cut off. Matthew Henry, the greatest of commentators, says it should be rendered: If any branch bear not fruit in Me, He taketh it away. Not "every branch in me," as King James has it. That would seem to teach apostasy. But Henry says the passage simply means that to be a fruit bearer you must be in Christ and that out of Him you can not be fruitful. In other words it cuts out the so-called moral man who hopes to be saved out of Christ.

Christ said His Kingdom was like a man who called his own servants and found one who was a wicked servant and he was cast into outer darkness (Matt. 25:14-30). But the Kingdom here does not mean the church or spiritual kingdom. It is the world kingdom. The kingdom spoken of in 1 Chron. 29:10-12; Ps. 22:18; Dan. 4:17. If the church or spiritual kingdom is meant, it came too early for Mr. Warlick's theory, for if Christ left His Kingdom and left His servants in charge when He left the world then we have the church

before Pentecost as sure as you are born. Ezek. 18:4 says: "All souls are mine and that includes the wicked, and such was the "wicked servant" who was cast into outer darkness. He was never a child of God.

Paul said some shall "depart from the faith," but he did not say any should fall from grace. It means some should, after having the faith presented to them, refuse it and leave it.

Paul also said that there must be a falling away "before Christ shall return." True, but not a falling from grace. It means that the Church would become small and it will be when Christ comes as it was in the day of Noah—only a few who are waiting for Him.

True, Paul said that whoever is justified by the law is fallen from grace. But who are justified by law? Gal. 3:11: "But that no man is justified by the law is evident, for the just shall live by faith." Then no man falls from grace.

True, Paul said that we should fear lest some should seem to come short of salvation, but seeming to come short is one thing and coming short is another.

Paul did keep his body under lest after preaching to others he should be a castaway. To be cast away means to be disapproved. Paul wanted the approval of God and good men and he therefore was careful of his conduct. He did not say he was afraid of being lost, for a man may be disapproved without being damned.

Peter says, indeed, that if we live right, we shall never fall. We all teach that. But in case a man fails to live right and "falls he will not be utterly cast down for the Lord upholds him with His hand." (Ps. 37:23-24).

Angels sinned and fell, says Mr. Warlick. Yes, but they were standing on their own merits and not on Christ's righteousness, as a Christian does. Angels are compelled to live a perfect life as Christ did not die for them. But Christ died for a Christian and he stands in Christ's righteousness. If Mr. Warlick ever expects to be an angel, I wish he would give us just one verse of Scripture where good men become angels when they die. Chapter and verse, please or take it back. A few more negative arguments and I am done.

David sang of Christ in Ps. 89:29-35: "His seed shall endure forever * * * If his children forsake My law and walk not in My statutes and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgressions with the rod and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless My loving kindness will I not utterly take from him nor suffer my faithfulness to fail." This is a flat contradiction of Mr. Warlick's doctrine. God will not send His people to hell, where they will be beyond His kindness and love, but He will chastize them when they do wrong, as a father does his wayward children. I made this point in my first address, but Mr. Warlick failed to answer.

Jer. 32:40: "I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put My fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from Me." If Mr. Warlick is right, this statement is false. Whom will you believe?

In Isaiah 54:6-10, we are told that as the Lord swore to Noah that there should never be another flood, so He swore to His people that He would not allow His covenant to be removed from them. If this is true, then no child of God can ever be in hell, for there he is out of reach of any covenant of peace.

Heb. 7:22-25 says Christ is the surety of a better covenant and He is therefore able to save to the uttermost, for He ever lives to intercede. Will He intercede in vain? Will His appeals in our behalf prevail?

MR. WARLICK'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE.

I have all personal respect for Mr. Bogard, but absolutely none for his doctrine, and so I shall not admit that which he so piteously begs me to do, when he asks me to admit that the matter of when and where a Child of God comes into the actual possession of eternal life, is not an issue in this discussion. The Baptists declare that they have eternal life actually in this world, and that they can never lose it. Therefore they say they cannot apostatize.

Christ said in John 10:28-30, that the sheep must first be sheep, that they must follow Him, and that after they have done so, they will get eternal life. In Mark 10:28, He said they would get it in the world to come. Mr. Bogard so much wishes this was not in the Book; but it is there, and there is nothing in the Bible to dispute it, either. What my friend thinks is an offset to the statement of Christ, is in his misguided brain, and comes of his having accepted Baptist doctrine on the question. Baptists think that Christ gives eternal life to the goat to make a sheep out of it. My friend would like to dodge this also, but it is too plain on them, it cannot be denied. Mr. Bogard says he is sorry for me, because I do not have eternal life in actual possession in this world. I thank him very much, but I do not need his sympathy, for Paul said I would get eternal life in the end of the race. Rom. 6:22; also, Rom. 2:6-7. Poor Mr. Bogard; he starts out with the guess that every where he sees the word life it means eternal life. When John says we know we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren, he did not mean to give the lie to Jesus, who says we shall not have eternal life until we reach the world to come. The same is true of the passage which he gives next. This is the record that God has given eternal life. And this life is in His Son. This will not do for Baptists, for the Son is in Heaven, and the eternal life is there also; not here on the inside of people on this earth. When the Son shall appear, or at least when we shall see Him, then we will get the eternal life, not before. Read Mark 10:28-30. Mr. Bogard says that my people and me are without Christ. He is wrong again. The sense in which Christ dwells in us, is by faith. Paul says He dwelled in him and his brethren the same way. Mr. Bogard says that the life (Christ) does not dwell in his heart by faith, but actually. But what does Mr. Bogard care for differing from Paul and his brethren, who are the same as Warlick and his brethren?

I suppose if Paul were to speak personally to my friend and say as he did to Timothy: "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. 6:12, Mr. Bogard would say: "Paul, I am sorry for you and your brethren. I have laid hold of that already and I can not lose it." Pshaw! But this is the Baptist way, which means to dispute the Bible at every turn.

Again, I wish my friend to remember, that the Baptists say, and he has tried to show the same to be true, that the body is in

no sense converted in this life; he has said that no one, who has not been converted and become a true Child of God, can follow Christ. But it happens that Christ said in Mark 10:28-30, that those who had forsaken all to follow Him would have to wait until they reach the world to come to get eternal life." Mr. Bogard, you can't say that the unconverted body is the one contemplated here. You expose yourself when you quibble thus. Your own readers see your tie-up. Just confess it and save yourself from further exposure.

Paul's lesson on what Mr. Bogard says is his double nature, is not what he seems to think it is. Does he think that Paul himself served the law of sin in his flesh? Paul says he kept his body under. 1 Cor. 9:27. Mr. Bogard says: "No, no, Paul, you did not. You served sin with your body." Paul used this parable as a lesson on the contrast between law and gospel, and Mr. Bogard thought he was talking about himself personally and about all Christians in general.

Mr. Bogard is right when he says that the sheep are sheep, before they hear the voice contemplated in John 10:28. But the voice here mentioned, is not to be confused with the Gospel which the sinner must hear to be saved. The sheep (Christians) hear Christ's voice, and then they follow Him and then He will give them eternal life. Read Mark 10:28-30, and hush.

Reader, what do you think of a man, who professes to be a Christian, and to love the Lord, who will call the very words of Christ in the above passages "God dishonoring doctrine? Mr. Bogard does this, but he does not care for disputing a thing he hates like he hates the truth.

My friend says that if I say the sinner must hear the Gospel, believe it, and obey it, to become a sheep, then I can't say that a sheep, as a sheep, must hear the voice of Christ and follow Him to get eternal life. I wonder. Mr. Bogard says a sinner must repent to be saved, and therefore, I suppose according to the nonsense of his reasoning here, he thinks a Child of God is not to repent at all; that the same thing cannot be said of both a sinner and a Christian? Is that it? Oh, I tell you it is a picnic to show up Baptist inconsistencies.

Hear Mr. Bogard in his wild excitement! He says that salvation of neither soul nor body, depends upon good behavior. Then it makes no difference what a man thinks, believes, or does, if he just happens to be a Baptist, he will go to Heaven. Talk about your "God dishonoring doctrine." Such statements are enough to cause the very devils in hell to laugh. But I ask, is he correct about the matter? Let us see. Christ said: "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me." Again: "He that heareth these sayings of Mine and doeth them, is like the wise man." "Not every one that saith, Lord, Lord, shall enter, but he that doeth the will of my Father." Many passages might be offered, but I shall give one other and then ask the Baptist reader to get him a ten-cent New Testament and read it, to see how every word in it denies the slanderous statement of Mr. Bogard, which is in reality genuine Baptist doctrine on the subject:

Rev. 22:12-14: "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates, into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers and whoremongers and murderers, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." Mr. Bogard says, "Hold on, Christ and John, you are wrong there. It does not depend on your good behavior. When you say that a man must be something and must do something to get in, you are preaching a 'God dishonoring doctrine.' You should learn the Baptist way about it. We have a better thing than that. Salvation does not depend upon one's character or good behavior, if he has been in once, he is in for good and always." Pshaw, Mr. Bogard, be ashamed.

Mr. Bogard says that Christ will not have mercy on the unrighteousness of any except those who have accepted Christ, and so he says I am mistaken when I say his doctrine is universal salvation logically. Well—But, I thought Baptists said that the same plan of salvation offered in the Gospel to the sinner was also to the erring Christian? So, Mr. Bogard, try again.

Mr. Bogard thinks that no Christian can cause himself to perish. I have shown him up here, but suppose I shall have to again. Christ said, in Matt. 5: "If a disciple call his brother a fool, he is in danger of hell fire." Mr. Bogard says "not so, Christ. He is in no danger, for he can't cause himself to perish." David says, in Psalms 37, that the good man, whose steps are ordered by the Lord, must depart from evil and do good to dwell forever more. This statement is in verse 27. Mr. Bogard says this is nonsense. Let all the Baptist readers get the Bible, turn to the passage and read it; only they will need to do so, for Bible readers know it is there.

John did say, they went out from us, that it might be manifest that they were not all of us. This shows that some went out that were of us. Mr. Bogard, why do you try to dispute this statement? Again, how could they have gone out unless they had once been in? While the idea of not imputing sin was said in an argument concerning the Abrahamic covenant, it simply confirms what I said, that under the law, the Lord remembered sin against those who were of His people, unless they offered their annual sacrifice. This is not the case under the Abrahamic covenant. Not understanding the matter, Mr. Bogard thinks Paul was discussing Baptist doctrine on apostasy. Pshaw! Paul never thought of Baptist doctrine on this subject in his whole life-time.

It is a fact that a man who has a hope purifieth himself. But when he casts off his first love, like Paul says, in Timothy he may do, then he loses his hope and his consequent ability to purify himself. This is my Scripture, not yours, Mr. Bogard. All the overcoming and purifying is by faith, and this is enough to show any reasonable person that the Baptists, as usual, are wrong on the passage.

The man who does not know that nearly all of the New Testament was written to Christians to show them how to live in the Church, in order to obtain eternal life, is in inexcusable ignorance of the plainest possible things taught in the Book. Read the prelude

to almost every one of Paul's letters to the Churches and see. He said he wrote to Timothy that even Timothy might know how to behave himself in the House of God. Mr. Bogard says: "I deny it." But who cares if he does deny it? It is so, anyhow. But when a man is 'driven to the extremity of having to say, or lose his doctrine, that a man entering Heaven at last, or being saved, does not depend upon his good behavior, that man is liable to say anything.

Ezekiel says that if a righteous man shall turn from his righteousness, he will be lost. Mr. Bogard says that this is a man's own righteousness and not the righteousness of God to which we submit. If this were true, then such a man would be a saint if he remained in his own righteousness. But the Prophet finds only the two classes, one the sinner, and the other the righteous man. He says if the sinner turn, he will be saved, and if the righteous man turn away from his righteousness, he will be lost. Mr. Bogard does not deny that the sinner means a sinner and that the Prophet knew what he was talking about in the case of the sinner, but that he did not know what he wrote, when writing about the righteous man. I am sure the Baptist readers will be surprised at my friend here.

Christ said: "Every branch in Me, that does not bring fruit, shall be cut off." Mr. Bogard says this means the branch which does not bear fruit in Christ. But on a former proposition, he said: "No one out of Christ could bear fruit"; quoting Christ's language, "Ye cannot bear fruit, except ye abide in the vine." Now he says one can bear fruit outside. Which time did he tell the truth? Christ said: "The branch that does not bear fruit is broken off and burned." This is enough to prove my proposition and to show that every sermon my friend ever preached on this question is false and that any thing he can now write on his side of the question is not of God.

The lesson which Christ gave on the possibility of apostasy in Matt. 25, where He says, the unprofitable servant was cast into outer darkness, and that this one was as much a servant as the others, thereby proving the absolute certainty of my proposition, Mr. Bogard answers by saying that this would get the Church before Pentecost. Suppose it did, that would not answer the argument made on the passage on the question we now have before us, but it does not teach that the church was set up before Pentecost. It is only a parable, used prophetically, like many of the Savior's illustrations on the Church question. Let Mr. Bogard try to answer my argument made on it. "The Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter time, some shall depart from the faith," is Paul's statement. It means what it says. A man cannot depart from his wife unless he has one. You could not depart from your home unless you had a home. It is out of the question to think of a man departing from this world who had never been born into it. This is too plain to be misunderstood.

Paul says that a man who thinks to be justified by the law is already fallen from grace. Paul said this to people who had received the Spirit by the hearing of faith. Read Gal. 3:1-4.

The passage in Thess., teaches with emphasis, that a man cannot believe Baptist doctrine on the apostasy question, and at the same time believe in the second coming of Christ. "Christ will not come except there come a falling away first." If Paul is right, the Baptists are wrong.

When Paul told the Hebrew brethren to fear lest some should seem to come short of the rest in Heaven, my friend thinks he was teasing the saints, by making out like they might fail to obtain the rest; that he did not mean for them to believe it. Pshaw! Another piece of Baptist foolishness.

Paul said he kept his body under lest after he had preached to others, he should be a castaway. Mr. Bogard says he was not afraid of being lost, no matter what he did in his body, he was only afraid that God and good men would not approve of him. I wonder. If this be his idea, then a man can do as he pleases, just so he does not let it be found out on him, eh? Paul was not such a man as that. He preached up to the hour of his death and it was after that he was afraid he would be a castaway, so he kept his body under, to be safe.

Mr. Bogard thinks, when Peter taught, that if we live right, we shall never fall, he only means a part of it; that he knew we would live right and that if we fall, we should not be lost, for God will uphold us. But David said, as has been shown already, that God will uphold only those who depart from evil and do good. Psalms 37:27.

Mr. Bogard says that the child of God is better off than an angel, and that he is even better than the angels. Well—now we have it. It is better to be a Baptist than to be an angel. Excuse me. Mr. Bogard thinks that the angels are under a law of works. I wonder how he found that out? Peter's argument is, that since God did not spare the angels that sinned, we had better be very careful else he will not spare us.

In the 89th Psalm, David writes of the preservation of the Jews as a people. Baptists, as shown by my friend's argument on the passage, think he is talking about the security of the believer. My friend seems to think that if the child of God sin, it is good for him, for he will only be chastized in a way that will be a help to him.

In the last verses of Jer. 23, the prophet said, that if God's people do not live right, God will utterly forget them. This replies to Mr. Bogard's silly quibble on Psalm 89.

The passage in Jer. 32:40, is my passage, not Mr. Bogard's. Here we are told that God puts His fear in the hearts of His people, that they shall not depart from Him. This cannot mean the Baptists, for they say they have no fear of departing. Suppose God's people are not exercised by that fear. Some of God's people so apostatized, that the fear of God passed from before their eyes. This passage declares very plainly for my proposition, and our Baptist readers will discover it. Others can see it and not half try.

Mr. Bogard thinks that the covenant with Noah concerning the flood is a pointer in his favor. God promised not to destroy the earth any more by water, but this does not mean that a man can-

not stay out in the rain until he drowns. God's covenant of peace only promises salvation and eternal life to those who obey him and live right in the world. "He that endures to the end, the same shall be saved." If God saves Mr. Bogard, whether he endures to the end or not, He breaks His covenant, and then He might send another flood. See? Christ is the surety for a covenant which says that we must be faithful until death to get the crown. Now, if we get the crown anyway, it will be by a covenant of which Christ is not the surety. Is it possible that Baptists do not have one passage on their side of this matter? It is not only possible, but it is a fact, that not one passage in all the Bible even hints in the direction of their doctrine on the subject.

The doctrine of the possibility of apostasy is so plainly taught in the Bible, it seems the height of foolishness to think otherwise,

In the sermon on the mount, the Savior taught the importance of obedience and right living, if we would be saved at last. "He that doeth the will of my Father," said He, "shall enter at last." The wise man is the man who hears and does, is one of His lessons. Again, "If any man will be My disciple, let him take up his cross daily, daily, daily, and follow Me."

Baptists think that a man can not take up the cross to begin with, and begin the walk with Christ, without being in some way compelled, and then they say, God forces him all through life to take his cross, or rather to hold on to it. Christ taught that the Christian life was a struggle in every day, and that if we would at last reach Heaven and obtain eternal life, we must follow Christ, forsaking all in this world, until we get to Heaven, and then we shall have eternal life.

The Savior said in John 5:29, that those who have done good, will be raised to everlasting life. John in Revelation said that those only who do His commandments shall enter in through the gates into the city. Rev. 22:14.

In Heb. 6, Paul said, if a man fall away, it is impossible to renew him again unto repentance. Baptists say that he cannot fall in the first place.

In Heb. 10, the same writer says that the apostate child of God shall be punished with a punishment sorer than death without mercy, which can mean only a punishment after death. Baptists say he can't apostatize in the first place, and if he sin and fall, it will only be good for him. But if we believe the Bible, we shall discard what Baptists teach and stay with the Book itself. In conclusion, I beg to request my friend to do his best in his next, putting in all his arguments if he has any, and I will show the readers what an easy job it is to again take all his Scriptures from him.

MR. BOGARD'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

Gentlement Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Mr. Warlick says I have begged piteously for him to be easy on me, but there is as much truth in that statement as there is in any of Mr. Warlick's statements. Let the reader look back through my speeches and see for himself if I have begged any. When a debater tries to make it appear that his opponent is angry, excited, or begging, he shows weakness that is, indeed, to be pitied. Nothing else could so plainly spell defeat.

Mr. Warlick says I misunderstand him when I quoted the passages showing that a Christian has life in this world. He says, of course, we have life, but it is not eternal life. Well, there would be nothing but nonsense in the apostle telling us that we had our natural lives now, provided we have Christ. We know that already. Certainly a Christian has his natural life, but in that he is not one whit better off than is an infidel, for the infidel also has his natural life. So Mr. Warlick and his people do not even profess to have anything more than an infidel has! As surely as we have Christ we have eternal life for John said so. "He that hath the Son hath life." But, says Mr. Warlick, we do not really have Christ in this world, for Christ is not on earth, but in Heaven. Exactly. I thought he did not have Christ and here he confesses it and gives his reason why! When we press the fact on Compbell's followers that they are not saved and that they do not have Christ, they get angry and say we are misrepresenting them, but here comes Mr. Warlick and relieves the situation by frankly acknowledging that they do not have Christ and are therefore unsaved. The words of the Lord stand out plain and strong: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life." (1 John 5:12-13). Mr. Warlick says he and his people do not possess eternal life. Then answers the Lord from Heaven that they do not have the Son. They are without Christ and without God in the world. Alas! But, says Mr. Warlick, nobody has Christ in reality. Indeed? Read Col. 1:27: "Christ in you the hope of glory." Again read Rom. 8:10-11: "If Christ be in of righteousness. But if the spirit of Him that raised Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Read again: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

So it is settled that if we really have Christ in this life, we as certainly have everlasting life in this world. So says the Scripture, Mr. Warlick to the contrary, I am sorry to say. If then we have everlasting life, it is certain that eternity can not end, hence our Christian life can not end.

But my friend says that Timothy was told (1 Tim. 6:12) to

"lay hold on eternal life." Yes, but what does that mean? The Greek word for "lay hold" is derived from "lambano" which means to fight. It therefore means: Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold, that is, fight the fight of eternal life—the eternal life fight or conflict. It has no reference to securing eternal life. Try again, friend.

Jesus says the man who forsakes all shall have eternal life in the future. Yes, but in what sense? Paul had forsaken all as a man and he had to wait for the redemption of his body (Rom. 8:23. Paul kept his body under—had to, for it was unredeemed, and in order for the man, Paul, to forsake all he had to keep his unredeemed body under. That makes the proposition clear and utterly routs Mr. Warlick.

Mr. Warlick dies hard on John 10:27-30. "My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." Several things can't be gotten over by my friend. He has been contending that because the giving of eternal life is mentioned after the "following" that therefore it comes after the sheep have followed. If we grant that the order of mention is necessarily the order of occurrence, then it follows that they are sheep before they "follow." But Mr. Warlick has been saying in his baptism argument that the following—that is, obeying—must take place before a man becomes a sheep. Then the statement that "they shall never perish," Mr. Warlick says means that they will be safe when they get to Heaven, yet he turns right around and says that angels stand on the same basis that Christians do and yet angels fell from Heaven. He needs to do some fixing here as sure as you live. Why not acknowledge that you are wrong, my friend, and seek Christ in the forgiveness of your sins and then Christ will dwell in you, the hope of glory and you will know you have eternal life?

My friend says good behavior saves and that when I say it does not, and that it would ruin all of us if it did, because none of us are perfect, he says it is enough to make the devil laugh in hell. Well, it is a fact that our good behavior does not save us. Read Rom. 4:4-8: "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness, even as David describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." But Mr. Warlick flatly denies all such passages as this and declares in the face of them that salvation is by good behavior. Alas! None are so blind as those who will not see—the spiritually blind.

Mr. Warlick quotes Rev. 22:12-14, where it says: "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life and enter in through the gates into the city." This does not mean we are saved by keeping the commandments but it means that those who are saved keep the commandments and by the fact that they do keep the commandments they prove that they are saved and have a right to enter the city. Obedience is the

proof, not the cause of salvation. Obedience is the evidence that one is saved, not the cause of it.

1 John 3:3: "Every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself." But, says Mr. Warlick, if he loses the love of God, he will stop purifying himself and be lost. But hold. If he stops loving God that very fact will prove he did not purify himself. If he purifies himself he can't stop loving God. To stop loving God would be to pollute himself and if he does that, then it follows that the word of God is false, which says "every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself." It does not say that all will purify themselves, but some few may lose their love and not do it, but "every man that hath this hope purifieth himself."

Mr. Warlick quotes where Paul wrote to Timothy that he might "know how to behave himself in the house of God." Exactly, but Paul did not write Timothy that he might know how to be saved. There is a difference between knowing how to be saved, and how to behave after we obtain salvation. Not one line is written to Christians to show them how to be saved. If there is such a passage, why does not my friend dig it up?

John 15 is the strongest passage my friend has, and I frankly confess that as the King James version renders it, it might be twisted into teaching apostasy. But the scholarship of the world says it should be rendered: "Every branch that beareth not fruit in Me shall be cut off," which means that one must be in Christ before he can bear fruit and that no matter how much good he may do out of Christ, he can not be saved. It knocks out the selfrighteous, moral man. No apostasy in it.

Mr. Warlick dies hard on that unprofitable servant. He says it was a parable that pointed forward to what would be in the future and hence does not teach that the Church existed before Pentecost. But hold. "The kingdom of Heaven is like" says the Lord. Like what? Like "a man traveling in a far country who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods and straightway took his journey." Well, when did the Lord do this? Evidently when He left the world. What did he leave? He left his own servants in charge of his affairs. That was before Pentecost (Matt. 25:14-30). If Mr. Warlick, by this construction, does not get the Church before Pentecost, it looks very much like it. But, says Mr. Warlick, we are not discussing the Pentecost question. Exactly, but when one of your doctrines contradict another, they can not both be true. The system of doctrine you and other followers of Alexander Campbell teach is a contradictory system and therefore false. But to answer the quibble about the wicked servant, I refer you to Ezek. 4:18, where it says "all souls are mine" which means all men both good and bad, both saved and unsaved, are counted servants. Hence there is no apostasy here.

To depart from the faith, as Timothy speaks of, has no reference to a Christian ceasing to be a Christian, but those who learn the truth and deliberately leave it; refuse to embrace it. A young man offered himself to a young lady to be her husband, but she departed from him, refusing to be his wife. So the faith—the sys-

tem of truth—is presented to many who refuse it and depart from it. That is all. Try again.

Paul feared he might be a castaway, but did not fear he would be lost. "Castaway" means to be disapproved. Paul did not want God's disapproval. But to get God's disapproval does not mean damnation for a Christian—it means chastisement.

Mr. Warlick says I claim to be better than angels. I claim no such thing. But I am safer than angels, for the Lord keeps me and the angels keep themselves. But again I call for the passage which says that we shall be angels when we die, as Mr. Warlick taught in his second speech.

Mr. Warlick says that Baptists do not fear God. We do fear Him but as a child fears a father, but we do not fear that He will cast us into hell. His fear in our hearts makes it certain that we shall not depart from Him.

Mr. Warlick quoted the hypothetical cases of Heb. 6 and Heb. 10. I myself believe that if we fall away and lose our salvation, we can never get it back again, but shall be lost forever, as these passages say. But why did he not quote the 9th verse of the 6th chapter and the 39th verse of the 10th chapter, which plainly say that a Christian will not go back and be lost? Jesus says: "Of them which thou gavest Me have I lost none." John 18:8-9.

I will now make the following and last negative arguments, as I can not, under the rule, do so in my next speech, which will be the last in this debate.

Isa. 54:17: "No weapon against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment, thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of Me, saith the Lord." But Mr. Warlick thinks some weapon may prosper against the Lord's people for they may even be destroyed by the devil's weapon, says he.

Ps. 121:5-8: "The Lord is thy keeper; the Lord is thy shade upon thy right hand. The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil. He shall preserve thy soul. The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in, from this time forth, and even forever more." Unfortunately my friend does not believe these strong words. This certainly teaches the preservation of the saints if language has any meaning.

Ps. 97:10: "He preserveth the souls of His saints; He delivereth them out of the hand of the wicked." If our souls are preserved and God delivers us out of the hands of the devil, how can it be that my friend is right in thinking that there is a possibility of final apostasy?

In conclusion, I offer the following objections to the doctrine of apostasy:

1. It is based on the doctrine of salvation by works and that contradicts Titus 3:5: "Not by works of righteousness we have done."

2. It makes our salvation depend on the grace of the devil. For if the devil can get us, and does not, it is he we should thank

for salvation and not God. But that contradicts Eph. 2:8-10: "for by grace are ye saved, etc."

3. It gives Satan more power than God and this contradicts 1 Peter 1:5: "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation."

4. It makes God condemn His own children and that contradicts Rom. 5:1: "being justified by faith we have peace with God."

5. It reflects on the merits of Christ's blood and that contradicts Heb. 10:14: "by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."

6. It nullifies the work of the Spirit. John 3:5: "born of the Spirit."

7. It makes God swear falsely, Heb. 6:17.

8. It makes void the mediatorial work of Christ. 1 Tim. 2:5.

9. It leaves the world without hope. Heb. 6:19.

10. It declares God was not good enough, not wise enough, or not strong enough, to fix a way for his children to be safe.

MR. WARLICK'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE.

I am perfectly willing for the readers to decide, whether my manner of conducting the discussion has seemed to please my friend. He has been fussing at me all the time, and all because I have kept him trying to show some truth from the Bible, that will make his doctrine appear at least respectable. He has been in the road from the beginning, and I have been behind him, prodding him all the time with the truth; this makes him hot.

It is amusing to read what Baptists say about life and salvation. Their only idea is, that life means eternal life, and this is simply eternal existence, and that salvation means the same. It does them no good to recite such passages as Peter's language in which he says: "Now is your salvation nearer than when you first believed." They pass it all up. You may show them, that even the infidel, has eternal existence, if he be an immortal being, which they allow they care nothing for such a predicament. Such is Mr. Bogard's trouble in his last article. It is he, and not I, who makes the infidel equal with the saved man.

No one denies that the Christian has Christ. But we, like Paul, know the sense in which He dwells in us. Baptists do not know this. Mr. Bogard shows that he does not understand it. Paul in Eph. 3:17, says: "Christ dwells in the heart by Faith." Mr. Bogard says: "Not so, Paul, He is in the heart actually, and this makes us know that we have eternal life actually. It is strange the Baptists cannot get this matter straight. If Christ be the life, and He dwells in us by faith, it is certain that neither He nor the life is there actually. Can my friend Mr. Bogard not understand this?"

The spiritual life the Christian has in this world is not eternal life any more than is the death of the sinner in this world eternal death. Neither one is eternal. If the Christian has eternal life in this world and can't lose it, then the sinner has eternal death and can never be saved. This would be universal damnation since all men were once sinners.

Mr. Bogard's statement, to the effect that somebody is following A. Campbell, is false and silly, and shows he wants to spite someone whom he can't answer.

The statement he quotes from Paul: "Christ formed in us, the hope of glory." will not do for him, for he says Christ is formed in us actually and really, and not as a hope, which Paul says is something we do not see. Does my friend not know the difference between hope and reality?

In his letters to Timothy and Titus, Paul says we hope for eternal life, and Christ says we shall have to wait until we get to Heaven to obtain it. Paul said we seek for immortality, and that eternal life shall be the reward. This can't be the body which Mr. Bogard says has not been saved, for the man who will have the eternal life has forsaken all to follow Christ. This is the soul, according to Mr. Bogard, even. Mr. Bogard says the soul only has been

saved, that the body has not yet been redeemed, and of course has not forsaken all to follow Christ.

Mr. Bogard says I die hard on John 10-28. Not so. He is the one who died on that passage, and he can't come alive either, Christ said: "My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me and I give unto them eternal life." Of course this will not do for Baptists, for they say Christ gives eternal life to a goat to make a sheep out of him. To obey the Gospel for salvation is not the following here alluded to.

On 1 Tim. 6:19, Mr. Bogard has fixed himself. Paul says: "Lay hold on eternal life," which shows that the Christian has not yet done so, and therefore not in actual possession of it, and cannot get it until he reaches the day to come. Mr. Bogard says the words: "Lay hold," are from the word "Lambano" which means to fight. Now, it happens that this is the word used by Christ when He said the world cannot "receive" the Spirit. "Lambano" is the word for receive, and Mr. Bogard held to this word on the baptism proposition, on Cornelius' case with a death grip. Let Penick, who told Mr. Bogard what the word meant in John 14, see what Mr. Bogard now admits about it. But the word in 1 Tim. simply means to lay hold on, or take hold of, all of which is yet future, so the passage is held to the affirmative and lost to Mr. Bogard. I only wish to have the reader note that Mr. Bogard gives up his contention on Cornelius and John 14, by what he now says is the meaning of the word "Lambano."

Mr. Bogard thinks that my saying that the sheep will be safe when they get to Heaven, and at the same time showing that angels fell, is a contradiction. Not so. When we get into the eternal age, the angels will be safe, too. The idea that Mr. Bogard is safer than the angels who are in the presence of God is amusing, as well as ridiculous, but such is just one of the funny things about Baptist doctrine.

It is too late for my friend to go to talking about salvation by grace and not by works. Baptists do not understand the Bible on such things. It has been shown already that even repentance is called the works of men, and if obedience be the proof, not the cause of salvation, then when one obeys God by repenting which is a command (See Acts 17:30-31- he shows or proves, that he has been saved. This is Mr. Bogard's predicament, not mine.

My friend says not one line is written to Christians to show how to live to be saved at last. I refer him to Rom. 2:7; 1 Cor. 10:1-12; 1 Tim. 6:12; also verse 19, Rev. 22:14, and in fact to the great majority of the New Testament as an answer. Is it not strange that I should have to do this? Every body but Baptists know it already. Why should they be so far behind the rest of the people, or may be so contentious on such a plain thing?

The fact that man who has a hope purifieth himself, makes it plain that he must do the purifying, and if he does not do so, he will be lost. It is as much unreasonable to say that God will compel the saint to remain pure as it would be to say that He will compel the sinner to become pure. TLC

Although Peter says to Christians, that they should give dili-

gence to make their calling and election sure, and that they must do it if they will enter Heaven, Mr. Bogard says that there is no passage which teaches us what to do to be finally saved. Pshaw!

When Christ said in John 15, that the branch which does not bear fruit, is to be broken off and burned, He shows Himself opposed to the Baptist idea altogether. He did not hint at that foolish thought of my friend, when he guesses that Christ had in mind the moral man.

The unprofitable servant is much in Mr. Bogard's way. Christ was talking of His Kingdom yet to come, when He gave the parable, and in the parable He said the man who did not improve the talent, would be lost forever. This shows Baptists to be entirely wrong on that question.

To depart from the faith, and be lost, shows that such would be the condition of those who departed. I hardly think that a man could depart from this life unless he had lived, and no man can depart from a wife who has never been married. But Paul says that some shall depart from the faith, which is language calculated to make a Baptist preacher mad, as it seems to do my friend.

Mr. Bogard admits that in Hebrews 6, also 10, Paul does teach that if a man fall, he can never get back, that he will be lost, but he says he can' fall, and that Paul in these same chapters teaches this. I wish he had given the passage and made his argument. Paul said: "I am persuaded better things of you, brethren," showing that he was hopeful that they would not apostatize. And the fact that he said: "we are not of them who draw back to perdition, shows he knew that men could do it, and thus could, and that some did, apostatize. My friend can't say anything to the credit of his case. The Bible simply does not teach his doctrine on this question. The very statement of Christ, when He said "Of them whom Thou hast given Me, I have lost none," shows that He knew He might have lost them, else He would not have been simple enough to say such a thing. The idea of His congratulating Himself upon having not lost that which could not get away from Him, is ridiculous, but it is so much like Baptist doctrine on the subject of apostasy. The boy says: "Papa, I have not lost one cent of the money you gave me," when both the boy and the father knew it was impossible for him to lose it. Pshaw. It is fun to discuss this question.

Now to Mr. Bogard's advanced argument. His first quotation is a promise to the Jews, not to the saved in the Gospel age. If it means anything like what my friend thinks, then it promises salvation to every Jew on earth, whether they believe in Christ or not. Isa. 54 is his proof.

Psa. 97:10 promises to preserve only those who love the Lord. This is my text, not his. Paul tells Timothy that some have left their first love. These, of course, God will not preserve. Try it again, Mr. Bogard.

David begins the 21st Psalm with the expression: "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh peace." In the next Psalm he said he was glad when they said: "Let us go up to

the house of God." All of this shows that David knew he must walk uprightly if he were preserved.

MR. BOGARD'S OBJECTIONS.

My friend says that if we may fall from grace and be lost, like the Bible clearly teaches (as we have abundantly shown in this discussion), then salvation is by works and not by grace. I wonder, Have we not shown him that repentance is works, and man's works do that, and therefore his idea would save the world. Does not Christ say: "He that does the sayings of mine will be saved?" Does not the angel tell John to say: "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may at last be saved?"

But what does Mr. Bogard care for these, with hundreds of other passages, many of which have been given in this debate, and many more yet could be read?

He thinks if the devil could get one of God's saints, he could get all of them, and that therefore those who get to Heaven will be saved upon the grace of the devil and not by God's grace at all. Well—I wonder. Suppose we turn this logic—If God can get one of the devil's servants, He can get all of them, and if he does not get every one of the lost souls of Adam, those who go to hell will go there because God would not have them; while He could have saved them and would not. Shucks! Mr. Bogard, what is it that seems to trouble you, anyway? This answers him and also kills his third objection.

His fourth objection is: "It makes God condemn His own children." But does not God claim all souls to begin with? Christ said of little children, that of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. All men were once children. Will God fall to condemn any one who was once a child? If He does not condemn any, then universal salvation is what my friend should try to defend, and not Baptist doctrine on apostasy. The fifth objection is, that it reflects on the merits of Christ's blood. But did not Christ shed His blood for all men? He did. Then all will be saved, therefore. If not, will the fact that some may be lost, reflect upon the merits of Christ's blood to save all? How foolish my friend does write.

His 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th objections are answered when we notice the 10th one. He says that if any of the saints may be lost, it shows that God was not good enough nor wise enough, nor strong enough to fix a plan whereby He could save them? Now look at this one as we have the others. I have frequently said that a Baptist preacher could not make one argument on his doctrine of apostasy, which I could not show was either universal salvation, or universal damnation. Take this objection. Christ died for all men. God so loved the world that He gave Christ to save the whole world. God will have all men to be saved, Paul says. Peter says He willeth not the death of any, but rather that all would come to repentance. Will all come? If they do not, then Mr. Bogard says it is because God was not wise enough or good enough or strong enough to fix a plan to save the whole human race. Thus do we turn the last thing he says against his false doctrine.

OUR SUMMARY.

We have learned from such passages as Mark 10:28-30. that we do not get eternal life in any actual sense until we reach Heaven. This was also proved by John 10:28; by Rom. 2:7; 1 Tim. 6:19; Rom. 6:22; Rev. 2:10, and other Scriptures, all of which teach that eternal life is to be obtained after we leave this world, and that all such passages as those generally used by Baptists on this question, only refer to the promise of the eternal life and that Paul says we hope for it. We also showed, that if the believer was secure against **falling**, like Baptists seem to think, because Christ said he shall not come into condemnation, then the unbeliever could not be saved, for the reason that Christ said in John 3:36, that he should not see life. We found that if the unbeliever could become a believer and be saved, then the believer could become an unbeliever and be lost. We showed that the sheep must follow Christ to get eternal life, and that they did not follow Him because they already had it. That Christ gives eternal life to His sheep who follow Him, and not to goats to make sheep of them, like the Baptists think.

We showed by Ezek. 18, that if the righteous man, God's man, the saved man, turned from His righteousness (meaning the Lord, Jer. 23), he would be lost forever. We showed by John 15, that the branches which did not bear fruit would be cut off and burned.

To all of this, Baptists offer objections, saying: "We have eternal life now and cannot lose it. God gives eternal life to the sinner to save him; to the goat, to make of him a sheep, and not to a sheep after he has followed Christ. They deny what Ezekiel says, and declare the righteous man will be saved anyhow whether he turn from his righteousness or not. If we believe the Bible, we cannot believe Baptist doctrine on apostasy.

We have shown that Ananias and his wife, two of the first Christians, sinned and fell and were lost. That the rich man in hades, who was in covenant with God, died and went to hell. That Paul says in the later times, some shall depart from the faith, and that Christ will not come unless there come a falling away first. All of which, Baptists stoutly deny and refuse to accept.

We showed that Paul himself said he kept his body under lest he be **lost** at last, after preaching the Gospel to others. That Peter says we must give diligence to make our calling and election sure, and that unless we do, we shall not enter the gates at last. Baptists deny all this, and declare otherwise. We have shown that Paul, in Hebrews, declares that a man may fall away, and that some had done so, and that the apostate child of God shall be punished with a punishment sorer than death without mercy. Heb. 10. But Mr. Bogard disputes all these passages, and quibbles over what he calls objections. We have shown that angels sinned and fell and were cast down to hell to be punished, and this is our example; still my friend denies it all, and says he will have none of these Scriptures.

We found that Christ taught in His sermon on the Mount, that only those who do the will of the Father will be saved at last, and that He taught in John 5:29 that those only who have done good will

at last enter Heaven, yet my friend refuses to believe. We showed that at the death of the saint, and at his funeral, we are to say that he dies in the Lord, and that his works do follow him, and that when we come to enter the gates into the everlasting city, John said: "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city," and now we may say: "Hear the conclusion of the whole matter. Fear God and keep His commandments for it is the whole duty of man, and don't forget that Christ said, the branch which does not bear fruit will be broken off and burned."

MR. BOGARD'S FOURTH NEGATIVE.

Gentlemen, Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Mr. Warlick says that eternal existence is all that eternal life means and is what Baptists teach. We teach no such thing. Eternal life, which we get when we are saved, means eternal union with the Lord. "He that hath the Son hath life and he that hath not the Son hath not life." (1 John 5:12). That definition of life suits Baptists very well. It is a settled fact that the child of God has something more than eternal existence, because he really has Christ—not merely a hope of some day obtaining Christ, as Mr. Warlick contends. "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life." 1 John 5:13). Not so, says friend Warlick; we do not have eternal life and the Lord ought to have known better than to put such stuff as that in the Bible. God ought to have called Mr. Warlick into counsel with Him when He made the Bible, then there would not have been so many mistakes in it as Mr. Warlick has found. All those promises of eternal life after the resurrection which he quotes, are explained by the fact that man is a dual being and has eternal life in his spirit now (if a Christian) and will get it for his body in the world to come. See Rom. 8:23. That passage Mr. Warlick has steered clear of all through the debate. Mr. Warlick keeps repeating that the man who forsakes all, is the one to get eternal life in the future and the body does not forsake all, hence the body can not be the man to get eternal life in the future. But the body is only a part of the man. The man is both body and spirit and the body of the man does not get it in this world. At least, that is what Paul says about it. The body is kept under and in that way it does forsake all, and therefore the promise is that the body shall get eternal life after the resurrection.

Mr. Warlick says in the third paragraph of his speech that "It is certain that neither he nor the life is in us actually." Then it follows that there is nothing actual about the present Christian life we live! It is all only a possibility, not a reality! But thank the Lord, the book says: "Christ in us the hope of glory," but Mr. Warlick says that means that we have a hope of Christ being in us sometime in the future. Tut! Tut! it says: "Christ in us" and that gives hope of glory. We shall be glorified because Christ is in us. The language means that or it means nothing. Mark you, if it be established that we now in this world actually have eternal life, then the doctrine of apostasy can not be true, for that which is eternal can not end. The Bible says we have eternal life here.

In John 10:27-30, where it says Jesus gives eternal life to his sheep, Mr. Warlick says that they must follow first. Then when I asked him if the order of mention was the order of occurrence and he was bound to say it was or give up his silly argument, then I closed in on him by showing that if that be true, then they were sheep before they heard and before they followed, and lo! and be-

hold, that the hearing and the following in the passage does not mean the obedience of the Gospel as Mr. Warlick calls baptism. Then it follows that a man is not following the Lord when he is baptized! What next?

In 1 Tim. 6:19, where Paul tells Timothy to "lay hold on eternal life," I called Mr. Warlick's attention to the fact that the Greek word is "lambano" and means to fight. He does not dispute it, but says that this word is the word which Penick called my attention to in John 14:17, where it says: "Him the world can not receive," and the word in Acts 10:47, where it says Cornelius "received the Holy Ghost." Exactly. Thank you for reminding me of it. You have been saying all the time that Cornelius did not receive the Holy Ghost in the sense the Lord used the word in John 14:17. Now you confess that the same Greek word is used, hence the same idea is expressed. So Cornelius did receive the Holy Ghost in the sense the Lord used the word in John 14:17 but the world can not receive the Holy Ghost in that sense. Hence Cornelius was a Christian before he was baptized. It was a hard matter to pull this confession out of Mr. Warlick, but by patience I got it. Thank you for thus surrendering on the baptism proposition, in order to hold up on apostasy. The trouble with the doctrine of Alexander Campbell's followers is that to sustain one part, you are compelled to destroy another part. But what does "lambano" mean? It means "to take to receive, to force, to fight," etc. So when Timothy was told to lay hold on eternal life, we are compelled to get the meaning of the word from the context. Since the Bible abundantly teaches that a Christian already has eternal life, then it follows that, since Timothy was a Christian, he was to fight ("lambano") the eternal fight. In order to understand the Bible we must let one passage interpret another, a thing Mr. Warlick has never learned. But an unsaved man can not receive ("lambano") the Spirit in any sense, either to take by force, or accept Him in their life in any other way. Hence Cornelius was not an unsaved man when he received the Spirit, and since he received the Spirit before baptism, he was saved before he was baptized. It is a picnic to show up the contradictions of Campbell's doctrine, which Mr. Warlick and his brethren try to palm off as Christian doctrine.

Mr. Warlick says Rom. 2:7 teaches a Christian how to be saved and when we turn and read it, we find it only says a Christian "by patience in well doing seek for glory, honor and immortality," etc. Does he think that "glory and honor" are salvation? We get our salvation here and then seek for glory and the honor. It looks like any body would know that much about the Bible. Then he refers to 1 Tim. 6:12, where it says "fight the good fight of faith." But what has that to do with obtaining salvation? That is what a saved man is to do after he is saved and not in order to be saved. Then he refers to Rev. 22:14, where it says that they who "do his commandments have a right to the tree of life." Certainly. But they did not get the right to the tree of life by doing the commandments. But such as did the commandments were the ones who had

the right to the tree of life—those who did the commandments also had the right to the tree of life. The thing that gave them the right to the tree of life (the grace of God) also caused them to keep the commandments. You will have to try again to find a passage that teaches a saved man how to be saved.

1 John 3:3 says: "Every man that has this hope in him purifieth himself." Yes, says Mr. Warlick, but he does his own purifying. Who cares if he does? It is not a question of whether God keeps him pure or he keeps himself pure, so far as this passage is concerned. **The fact is he remains pure. Not almost all, but all.** If one single child of God pollutes himself and loses his soul, then the book has told an untruth, for it says "every man that has this hope in him purifieth himself."

Mr. Warlick thinks a man can not depart from any thing which he is not in or in possession of. Well, he does not understand how a young lady can depart from a young man and refuse to be his wife unless she first marries him. Shucks! Why is it a hard thing to see how some can depart from the faith without having embraced it?

Mr. Warlick gives up the case of Judas falling from grace for the Lord plainly said: "Of them which Thou hast given me have I lost none." I am thankful for this good confession. So, goodby Judas.

In Ps. 121, where David said the Lord preserveth thee from all evil," he thinks that means only those who love him. Well, if he actually preserves those who love Him, where is the chance for them to stop loving Him and fail of being preserved?

In his efforts to answer my objections to apostasy, he says that a man is saved by works, that even repentance is works. But the Book says "repentance is from dead works" (Heb. 6:1-4).

If the devil can get one, he can get all of the saved; but, says Mr. Warlick, that applies as well to God. If God can get one of the devil's children, he can get all. Yes, if he choose to save them against their will, but He does not choose to save any man against his will. But the devil does not care how he gets a man, so he gets him. So that objection stands.

Apostasy makes God condemn His own children. But says Mr. Warlick, everybody was once God's child, and he condemned them when they sinned. But the Book contradicts him here. "We were all by nature the children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3). Yes, Christ died for all, but His blood was not applied to all, hence your quibble about some of Christ's blood being nullified, goes down.

Having answered fully all of Mr. Warlick's so-called arguments, I now give a review of the discussion and thus bring to a conclusion all that we have seen in the discussion.

(1) "The Lord has mercy on our unrighteousness." Heb. 8:12. "Our" refers to Christians only, for the letter was written to Christians.

(2) "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." John 6:37. The members of Alexander Campbell's Church believe that

this is all a mistake, for they think God will cast out any who may do wrong.

(3) "Depart from Me, for I never knew you." Matt. 7:23. Then it follows that those who are cast off at last are not those who were once of the Lord, for He never knew them.

(4) "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins." Matt. 1:21. Mark you, He was not to save the lost from their sins, but "his people." If there are passages which say He offers salvation to the lost, that has nothing to do with this one. This says, he will save "His people."

(5) "I give to them eternal life and they shall never perish." John 10:27-30. Eternity can't end, hence our Christian life can't end.

(6) "A stranger they will not follow, but will flee from him." John 10:5. If a child of God ever does follow the devil to ruin, then the Lord told an untruth in this passage.

(7) "They shall never perish." John 10:28. The words, "shall not perish," are in the middle voice (a voice used in the Greek, but not in English). The middle voice is used to show one's action upon himself. Hence it means the Lord's people shall not cause themselves to perish. This is an argument no man has ever made a decent effort to answer.

(8) "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." John 3:36. This says the believer is in possession of everlasting life, then it can not end, for if it end, it would not be everlasting.

(9) The believer "shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death into life." John 5:24. There has been a real change in the nature and life of the saved man and he has the guarantee that he is safe.

(10) "The steps of the good man are ordered of the Lord and he delighteth in his way and though he fall he shall not be utterly cast down for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand." Ps. 37:23-24. It is nonsense to say that the Lord's upholding him depends on his good behavior, because if he behaves as he ought he would not need to be held up. This guarantees that even if one falls, he will be taken up again by the Lord. None will be left to perish in sin.

(11) "Nothing shall separate us from the love of God." Rom. 8:38. In hell a man is separated from God's love for the second death means an utter separation from God, and God is love. Hence it follows that once in hell a man is separated from God's love. This shall not be to any Christian, for nothing shall separate them from God's love.

(12) "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Rom. 4:8. Why don't the Lord count sin against a child of God? Because a Christian's sins are all counted against Christ, who is our substitute. See II Cor. 5:21.

(13) "Sin shall not have dominion over you. Rom. 6:14. If so, it follows that sin can not ever ruin a child of God.

(14) "All things work together for good to them that love God." Rom. 8:28. If so, then the devil himself can not do a thing

to us that God will not overrule for our good. How, then, can a Christian be lost in hell?

(15) "Kept by the power of God through faith ready to be revealed at the last day." 1 Peter 1:5. Then if the devil gets us, he must have more power than God.

(16) "Whosoever is born of God overcomes the world." 1 John 5:4. It is not a question of how a child of God overcomes. I emphasize the fact that the Bible says they all do it.

(17) "Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself." 1 John 3:3. No matter whether he is active or passive in purifying himself. The point is, they all do it, and hence none are lost.

(18) "If they had been of us they would have no doubt continued with us." 1 John 2:19. If there is "no doubt" about all who are of the Lord staying with Him then where is the danger of final apostasy?

(19) "His seed shall endure forever. * * If his children forsake My law and walk not in My judgments; if they break My statutes and keep not My commandments, then will I visit their transgressions with the rod and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless, My loving kindness will I not utterly take from him." Ps. 89:29-35. Instead of sending His disobedient children to hell, He will chastize them as children. See also Heb. 8:12. Why has not Mr. Warlick met this argument?

(20) "I will put My fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from Me." Jer. 32:40. Forever one with the Lord. Security.

(21) The Lord swore that He would no more destroy the world with a flood and offered that as proof, that He would not allow His covenant of peace to depart from His people. Isa. 54:6-10.

(22) Christ constantly intercedes for His people. Heb. 7:22-25. Will His intercession fail in our behalf?

(23) "Of them which Thou hast given Me, have I lost none." John 18:8-9. This was said after Judas had betrayed Him and after many of His so-called disciples had gone back and walked with Him no more. It is proof positive that none of the Lord's real saved ones were ever afterwards lost.

(24) "No weapon against thee shall prosper." Isa. 54:17. If so, then the weapons the devil uses to destroy the Lord's people shall not succeed.

(25) "The Lord shall preserve thee from all evil." Ps. 121:5-8. A thing that is preserved is beyond danger. An effort to preserve is one thing and to really preserve is another. The Lord does not say He will make an effort to preserve, but He preserves.

(26) "He preserveth the souls of His saints; He delivereth them out of the hands of the wicked." Ps. 97:10. If we are delivered from the wicked one, then how shall the devil ever get us?

Thus Mr. Warlick goes down on each of the propositions. He can not sustain one of the un-scriptural doctrines handed down from the founder of his church (Alexander Campbell) without contradicting some other doctrine. The effort to prove that the wicked

servant was a true Church member got the Church before Pentecost. Hence, he can not hold to his Pentecost theory and to the apostasy of the wicked servant, too. His effort to prove that Cornelius was not saved before he was baptized, forced him to say that the Holy Ghost was received by a donkey before Pentecost, hence down goes his argument that nobody could receive the Holy Ghost before Pentecost, and hence the Baptists may be right after all when they contend that the Church had the Holy Ghost before Christ left the world. For if a donkey received the Holy Ghost before Pentecost, it is not a thing incredible that the Lord's people should. Mr. Warlick tells us in one breath that angels fell from Heaven and hence we are in danger of falling, and then he turned right around and said that if we ever get to Heaven, we are perfectly safe, and all that to get out of the truth, as found in John 10:27 where it says, the sheep shall never perish. He tells us in one proposition that there is no influence used to save a sinner except the word and then in Cornelius' case, he says that there were other influences to bring together the means of his salvation. Then to bolster up a defeat that was humiliating, he ran in a lot of new matter in his last speech on the Plan of Salvation, in which he discussed the mourner's bench and other practices, when he knew it was not on the subject and that, too, when I had no come back at him. I thank God I am not put to such necessity. With the impregnable word of God in favor of all I teach. I gladly use that word and leave the people to judge.