

HARDEMAN-BOGARD DEBATE

Held at

Little Rock, Arkansas, April 19-22, 1938

Between

N. B. HARDEMAN, Henderson, Tenn.

and

BEN M. BOGARD, Little Rock, Ark.

*Speeches taken and manuscripts
transcribed under the direction of
L. O. Sanderson, Nashville, Tenn.*

Subjects Discussed: The Work of the Holy Spirit,
The Necessity of Baptism, The Establishment of
the Church, and The Possibility of Apostasy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Apostasy, The Possibility of	241-317
Baptism, The Necessity of	82-157
Church, The Establishment of	158-240
Holy Spirit, The Work of	7-81

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

Bogard's First Speech	158
Hardeman's Reply	168
Bogard's Second Speech	178
Hardeman's Reply	189
Bogard's Third Speech	199
Hardeman's Reply	209
Bogard's Fourth Speech	219
Hardeman's Reply	230

NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

Hardeman's First Speech	82
Bogard's Reply	89
Hardeman's Second Speech	99
Bogard's Reply	109
Hardeman's Third Speech	119
Bogard's Reply	128
Hardeman's Fourth Speech	139
Bogard's Reply	149

POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

Hardeman's First Speech	241
Bogard's Reply	250
Hardeman's Second Speech	260
Bogard's Reply	270
Hardeman's Third Speech	281
Bogard's Reply	290
Hardeman's Fourth Speech	301
Bogard's Reply	309

WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Bogard's First Speech	7
Hardeman's Reply	16
Bogard's Second Speech	28
Hardeman's Reply	37
Bogard's Third Speech	46
Hardeman's Reply	55
Bogard's Fourth Speech	65
Hardeman's Reply	73

INTRODUCTION

The Hardeman-Bogard Debate, held at Little Rock, Ark., from April 19 to 22, 1938, was an outstanding religious discussion of more modern times. The speakers of this occasion were: N. B. Hardeman, president of Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tenn., and a prominent evangelist of the churches of Christ; and Ben M. Bogard, dean of the Missionary Baptist Institute, Little Rock, and pastor of the Antioch Missionary Baptist Church, of the same city. Both disputants were at their best, and every possible arrangement had been made for the success of the effort. Two sessions each of two hours' duration were held daily, each speaker delivering two thirty-minute addresses at each assembly. At first it was planned to alternate the services between the church of Christ, at Fourth and State Streets, and the Baptist Church, Twenty-Second and Brown Streets. However, after the first day, taking into consideration the extra accommodations of the Fourth and State Streets building—a greater seating capacity, more accessible location, loud-speaker connections, and radio facilities—it was decided by all concerned that it would be best to conduct all meetings at the church of Christ.

E. R. Harper, minister of the Fourth and State Street Church, acted as general spokesman for the discussion, except at the night session on Tuesday at the Antioch Baptist Church. In addition, Brother Harper was moderator for Brother Hardeman, and rendered also an extraordinary service in handling details of the meetings, radio broadcasts, and being host to the many visitors. Brother Harper and his pleasant, untiring companion were faithful servants of those who traveled far and near to hear the discussion. A more orderly debate and on such a high plane could scarcely have been planned and conducted, and to the Harpers must be attributed much of the credit for its success.

On the one night (Tuesday, the nineteenth) the discussion was held at the Antioch Missionary Baptist Church, at Twenty-Second and Brown Streets, where also the Missionary Baptist Institute is conducted, Dr. J. Louis Guthrie, president of the Institute, was "master of ceremonies." He, too, was moderator for Dr. Bogard, and a more pleasant,

capable one could not have been found. The house that night was filled to capacity and hundreds remained outside to catch the words of the speakers in whom they had the utmost confidence. Members of the Baptist Church rendered every possible service and extended every possible courtesy to all those who attended, and a general spirit of good will and respect prevailed. It must be added, also, that members of the Baptist Church at Twenty-Second and Brown Streets cooperated in many ways throughout the four days of "combat" to make the discussion worth while from every point of view and to cause every auditor to feel that it was good to have been there.

An unusual number of preachers were in attendance, which was an indication of the importance of the meeting of these two representative men. Hundreds came from almost every part of the United States—young preachers and men of experience and long years of service mingled together with the keenest interest in truth. Both Baptist and Christian preachers filled the greater part of the available space. Taking into consideration the number of people in attendance, numbering approximately one thousand each service, the vast radio audience (for all save one session were broadcast over Little Rock stations), and the great number of those who will read the book, it has been conservatively estimated that more than a quarter of a million people will have come into contact with the truth taught on this occasion.

The speakers are too well known to command attention or eulogy from this limited writer. That both men were and are outstanding in and with their particular congregations throughout the nation goes without suggestion. Probably no other living man has had as many—and certainly not more—debates than Ben M. Bogard. A representative of Baptist people and Baptist doctrine for almost half a century, the author of many books, and an editor of long standing reputation, he is easily the champion of the Baptist faith. What he says is accepted as authentic. His ability has never been questioned. Therefore, the reader may expect the best possible in this book that can be presented from the Baptist point of view.

N. B. Hardeman, speaking in behalf of the churches of Christ in the series of meetings, is not only an educator of no mean reputation, but an evangelist whose efforts are known and appreciated everywhere. He speaks with a ready mind, a sincere heart, and a conviction which cannot be gainsaid. Those directly concerned were not only willing to trust him with the task of upholding the truth during the four days, but they were unusually well satisfied when the task was finished.

Two stenographers—Misses Kitty Cook and Virginia Lamb, both of Nashville, Tenn.—were employed during the discussion. The first day's work was taken both in shorthand and on the stenotype under the supervision of this writer. When it was found that the treatise would extend to about 140,000 words, instead of 75,000, as we originally had estimated, and when it was seen that each speaker covered his territory in 200-words-a-minute fashion, it was deemed wise to take the last three days by record method. Through the courtesy of the Democrat Printing and Lithographing Company, of Little Rock, distributors for Ediphone, we obtained the necessary equipment and wax records were made, and from them the transcriptions were made. Hence, we may pledge an accurate account of the happenings. The writer of this foreword took notes and examined carefully every manuscript in connection with the discussion, and after transcripts were made from the records relistened to the voice-writing and checked every word in the manuscript, and we thus pledge that this is an accurate account of the addresses delivered.

Vital themes were discussed and live issues were ever made prominent. Each subject is stated by the speakers themselves and a table of contents has been given in the back of the book, thus making reference to any topic an easy matter. Only a few changes have been made, mostly pertaining to English construction, and only irrelevant matter such as announcements and unnecessary courtesies has been omitted. The comment on Acts 22: 16 is new material and one or two other points have been added by the consent of both disputants with each having the opportunity to know what the other had said. Those who

heard and read will recognize the exactness of the manuscripts.

The publishers, in presenting this to an eager public, realize the importance of its content, and bespeak for it a ready reception and a joyful response on the part of every thoughtful reader to the truth found therein. We therefore submit this, the Hardeman-Bogard Debate, as an accurate account and a fair representation of all concerned.

L. O. SANDERSON, *Business Manager*,
Gospel Advocate Company.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

BEN M. BOGARD, *Affirmative*, First Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The proposition which I shall attempt to prove is: "The Bible teaches that in conviction and conversion the Holy Spirit exercises a power or influence in addition to the written or spoken word."

In this discussion we are addressing three great audiences—the immediate congregation before me; the great radio audience, possibly 100,000; and then the great number who will read the book when published. The responsibility is therefore great, for multiplied thousands will hear or read what is said here. The subject we are discussing today is fundamental. If we are wrong on this subject, all our religious thinking will be wrong on everything. It is, therefore, very important that we know what the Bible teaches concerning it, and I am hoping that many may hear or read this debate and be enabled to see the truth and the truth will make them free. If this debate will result in the salvation of many souls it will be all the reward I want. I breathe a prayer that the Holy Spirit may take these words that I speak and carry them to the hearts of multiplied thousands and that those who learn the truth may accept it and be saved.

Who are the judges in this debate? Each one who hears or reads what is said. Each one of you is personally responsible to God and the decision will be made in your own heart, and certainly Professor Hardeman and I will not act like schoolboys and ask for any public expression of opinion. There will be no public expression of opinion permitted while we are here. The Bible says "take heed how ye hear" and you will give an account to God for the way you hear. You cannot evade responsibility by waiting for some judges to decide which one wins in this debate. You must decide for yourself and then later give an account to God. All we ask is that you listen carefully or read carefully the book we publish and search the scriptures in the interest of your own souls and decide what the truth is.

One rule of debate that we are using (Hedges rules of debate) is that the debater should define his terms, so that

there may be no misunderstanding of the meaning of the words used. This I shall now do. By the Bible, I mean the holy writings contained in what is known as the Old and New Testaments, as they were originally written in the Hebrew and the Greek. There are errors in the translations but no errors in the original writing. By the Holy Spirit, I mean the third person in the Godhead. The Holy Spirit is God the same as the Father is God and the same as Jesus Christ is God. These three are one. What may be said of one may be said of the other; and what one is said to do, the other does. *The Holy Spirit is present with us now just exactly as Jesus Christ was present when he was here on earth in his human body.* What I shall affirm is that the Holy Spirit is actually present and *actually uses his personal presence* in influencing sinners to be saved. By power, I mean energy, force, control, strength. By distinct, I mean not identical; something that can be distinguished. By the written word, I mean the Bible just as I have defined it. So my proposition might be made to read: The Bible teaches that in conviction and conversion the Holy Spirit is *actually present and uses his personal energy and personal influence* in bringing about the salvation of the soul. By conviction and conversion, I mean all that we get in present salvation. I mean that we have passed from death into life. By conversion, I mean turned from sin to salvation through Jesus Christ our Lord—the beginning of life to which shall be added the things which belong to the Christian life.

The Holy Spirit uses the written word or spoken word just as the soldier uses the sword, or the woodsman the axe. The soldier would not slay his opponent without the sword, and the sword certainly would not slay the enemy without the soldier to use it. The woodsman *uses* the axe to cut the tree. But the axe would never cut the tree unless the woodsman brought power upon the axe that did not reside in the axe. The power that resides in the sword is used but additional power is brought to bear on the sword else the sword would never do the work. The Holy Spirit may even use other things besides the written word or spoken word in the conviction and conversion of the soul. He may use storms and pestilences and earthquakes and other providen-

tial disturbances and he may use nature, for the Bible says, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork." (Psalm 19: 1.) The Holy Spirit can use the heavens to convince the wicked man that there is a God and that he needs salvation.

The Holy Spirit is not a mere essence or idea; he is not a liquid or current, such as gas or electricity. He is a person as much as the Father or the Son. Was Jesus real? Was he actually present, and did he use his personal power when he dealt with men while he was here on earth? Was God the Father actually present when he created Adam? Was the Father actually present when Adam hid from him because of sin? Was Jesus actually present when he raised Lazarus from the dead? (John 11.) Was Jesus actually present when he forgave the public woman's sins? (Luke 7: 36.) Did you ever stop to think or to consider that Jesus said that the Holy Spirit would come to take his place? Have you not read where Jesus said, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever"? (John 14: 14-17.) Again Jesus said, "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." (John 15: 26.) Was the Holy Spirit actually present on the day of Pentecost when three thousand were gloriously saved and later baptized? Could the church have been *baptized in the Holy Spirit and the Spirit not actually there*? What I am affirming is that the Holy Spirit is personally present, is really present, in the conviction and conversion of the sinner as Jesus was present when he dealt with men and women while he was here in body, during his personal ministry. Yes, we have the Bible but *the Author of the Bible is actually present* in the salvation of the sinner.

The Bible abundantly proves my position. For even in the Old Testament time God was actually present with the people in their work. God told Moses, "My presence shall go with thee," and Moses said, "If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence." (Ex. 33: 14-16.) In Deut. 20: 4, we read: "God . . . goeth with you, to fight for you against your enemies." Did this mean that Moses and the Israelites

had a book with them? Did it not mean that God was actually present with them? Even so the Holy Spirit, the third person in the Godhead, is actually present in all the work of the Lord in this dispensation.

The Holy Spirit opens the door of faith when the gospel preacher preaches. Here is the scripture: "And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." (Acts 14: 27.) What is the door of faith? In Rom. 10: 10 we are told that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." If the Holy Spirit opens the door of faith, he must necessarily open the human heart to receive the truth (Acts 16: 14). The Lord opened Lydia's heart that she attended unto the things spoken by Paul.

Note the fact that it does not say the Lord opened her heart by preaching, but her heart was opened unto the things spoken by Paul. The things spoken by Paul did not open her heart, but her heart was opened so that she could attend to Paul's preaching.

The preacher preaches, and if he is God's preacher, he recognizes the fact that the Holy Spirit must accompany the preaching; or when the Bible is read (the written word) the Holy Spirit accompanies the reading of the word so that souls may be saved. Here is the passage that proves it: "And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus, and the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord." (Acts 11: 20, 21.) The preachers preached and the Lord also had a "hand" in it. The Holy Spirit was actually there and took a "hand" in the work. That was certainly *something in addition* to the written or spoken word. If the Holy Spirit did not supplement the preaching; and if he did not take a "hand" in it, all our preaching would be in vain. The necessity of prayer proves that there is power in addition to the written or spoken word. Paul said, "Brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified, even as it is with you." (2 Thess. 3: 1.) What did Paul want that he did

not already have? He was already inspired. If all the power was already in the spoken word, what did he want them to pray for?

I wish Professor Hardeman would be so kind as to tell this audience what God gave to Paul that Paul did not already have, when God answered the prayer that Paul asked his brethren to pray. Paul already had the word. If all the power was in the word, no power or influence was needed except the word. Then what were they praying for? Again Paul said, "Continue in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving; withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds: that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak." (Col. 4: 2, 3.) Will my worthy opponent tell me what God would do if he answers their prayer? What was it that Paul needed and did not have? He already had the word, because he was inspired by God. If God answered their prayers and "opened a door of utterance" so that souls might be saved, then certainly there was something besides the word that was needed. Paul wanted entrance into men's hearts, and hence he asked something in addition to the word, the word that he already had, to be used in the conviction and conversion of hardhearted sinners.

Again let us read what Paul, the inspired writer, said, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved." (Rom. 10: 1.) Why is Paul praying that sinners might be saved? Did he expect God to do anything in answer to that prayer? If so, what? Paul already had the word and he preached that, but he wanted something more, something in addition to the word in order that sinners might be saved. If he did not want something more, why was he praying? *If all the power is in the word and there was absolutely nothing else needed, why pray for something else?* Do you, Professor Hardeman, ever pray that God may bless the word as you preach? Does God answer your prayer when you ask him to bless your preaching? If so, what does God give you in answer to your prayer? He certainly does not give you the word, because you already have the Bible. Do you merely mouth

that prayer without expecting God to do anything? If so, such a prayer would be sin. Did Paul mean it when he prayed that sinners might be saved? Or did he merely mouth a prayer? If he meant it, what did he expect God to do in addition to the word that was spoken? Then listen again to the same inspired Paul: "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty, for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God, . . . who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." (1 Tim. 2: 1-4.) What was the purpose of this praying that Paul called for? First, that we might lead a quiet and peaceable life; because it was pleasing to God; and, last, *that men should be saved*. If God answers such a prayer, what will he do? *Whatever he does will be in addition to the word* because we already have that. Paul already had the word, and he exhorts to prayer that men might be saved. Astonishing, if God does not give anything in answer to prayer. Certainly God will not give the spoken or written word in answer to such a prayer, because we already have that and if he gives anything at all it will be in addition to the word. Let Professor Hardeman tell us if he and his brethren ever pray such prayers; and, if so, does God answer their prayers; and if God answers, what does he give in answer to their prayers since God could not give them the word? I speak reverently—even God could not give them the word because they already have the Bible, the written word. Does not God give power to preach the word? If so, then there is something in addition to the word. If God does not give anything at all in answer to such prayer, then why pray, and why did Paul command such prayers to be offered? I shall insist that these questions be answered and if they are not answered the report of the stenographers will show it in the published book.

The Holy Spirit gives life in the conviction and conversion of the sinner. Col. 2: 13 declares: "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you

all trespasses." To give life required more than words. You could stand over a dead man and command him to come to life until completely exhausted and there would be no response. But when Jesus stood over the grave of Lazarus, he said: "Lazarus, come forth," and the record says he came forth. (John 11.) You try that over a dead man and see how it works. You can speak the same words he used and there will be no power in the word to bring life to the dead. But when Jesus spoke these words he used power in addition to the word and the result was that Lazarus lived, and came out of the grave. We by nature are spiritually dead and mere words will not bring the dead sinner to life, Eph. 2: 1, "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." The dead sinner, one *separated from God*, for that is the correct definition of death, cannot be brought to life, cannot be brought into *holy union with God* unless there is power distinct from and in addition to the word. The condition of the sinner before he is quickened into life is a desperate one. (Jer. 17: 9.) "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." Paul says, speaking of the condition of the unsaved: "Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit: the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes." (Rom. 3: 13-19.) Talk about arguing a man into salvation, the passage says "there is no fear of God before their eyes." It takes *enabling grace* to get the attention of such a man.

Hence, the need of power in addition to the word. That brings us to the passage: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." (John 6: 44.) God *does not irresistably draw* the sinner, but he *draws him enough to enable him* to accept freely Jesus as Saviour. Our Hardshell brethren make the mistake of thinking God irresistably draws. God draws but does not force. God draws all men and says, "All shall be taught of God," but while God *draws all, he forces none*. His drawing is to

enable the sinner to act, and on their own free will. Why then are not all saved? Because while God draws them, he does not irresistably draw them, and they draw back into perdition; and after being enabled to escape damnation, they voluntarily draw back into perdition.

The parable of the sower shows that something is needed in addition to the word. In Luke 8: 4-15 we read that the sower sowed his seed and some seed fell upon a rock and because it had no moisture it withered away. If the power is in the word, why was not the rock pulverized by the seed and converted into good soil? It "*lacked moisture.*" There must be moisture in addition to the seed, and so with the word of God which our Lord explained was the good seed. No crop without the seed, and certainly the seed will not grow and bring fruit without moisture in addition to the seed. Only the prepared ground brought forth fruit. By whom is preparation made? Prov. 16: 1 says, "The preparation of the heart is of the Lord." A special, distinct power in addition to the word. Certainly there is life in the seed but *life in the seed will never produce life in a sinner* until moisture (influence) given by the Holy Spirit enables it to grow.

James says: "Receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." (James 1: 21.) The word here is "graft" and we all know what a "graft" is. You graft a winesap bud into a crab apple tree and the crab apple tree will then bear winesap apples. The gospel, the word of God, is engrafted into the soul and salvation is the result. Whoever heard of the winesap bud putting itself into a crab apple tree? There must be *power in addition to the winesap bud* to put that bud into the crab apple tree. So there must be power in addition to the word before the word can save. The salvation bud, so to speak. There is the direct, immediate touch in grafting, and unless you have had the divine touch of the Holy Spirit, you are lost. I am hoping this discussion may cause some to receive that divine touch. There is creative power in the salvation of the soul; therefore, in conviction and conversion of the sinner, the sinner is made a new creature, and it takes more than words to create a new creature in Christ Jesus. Paul says, "For we

are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." (Eph. 2: 10.) Again we read, "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." (2 Cor. 5: 17.) When God said, "Let there be light," he spoke creative words, and light came. If you think all power is in the word, you can go out at midnight when the clouds hang low and there is pitch-darkness and you are in need of light and say, "Let there be light," the words of the Lord, and see if there is light at your command. You can speak the words but you will lack the power. The Lord spoke words in creation, but he accompanied these words with creative power. So we preach the word of God or that word is read by the sinner. There are the words but if there is no power except bare words there will be no salvation, no new creation, for you cannot argue a dead man into life.

Divine power attends gospel preaching, not *compelling power, but enabling power*. We read the words of Paul, "By pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left." (2 Cor. 6: 6, 7.) Here are *nine distinct things* mentioned that go together in our work of evangelizing the world. I repeat them. 1. Pureness; 2. Knowledge; 3. Long-suffering; 4. Kindness; 5. The Holy Spirit; 6. Love; 7. The word of truth, spoken or written; 8. The power of God; 9. Armour of righteousness. All of these things are used in evangelizing the world. Then the word of truth, whether the written word or spoken word, is *only one of the nine distinct influences* that are used in the conviction and conversion of sinners. Note that the word of God and the Holy Spirit are both at work along with other influences. My proposition is abundantly proved by the word of God that a power or influence distinct from and in addition to the written or spoken word is used in the conviction and conversion of the sinner. The Lord's assurance to Paul when he was in distress proves the personal presence of the Lord in the work of convicting and converting sinners. The Lord said to Paul, "Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but

speak, and hold not thy peace: for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city." Surely Professor Hardeman will not contend that the Lord meant that Paul had a New Testament in his pocket. Surely that means that the Holy Spirit was really present in the work, and hence Paul was instructed to speak, "for I am with thee." There was Paul speaking the word, the spoken word, and the Lord assured him that he was with him in addition to anything Paul might speak.

Jesus made distinction between the word and the power that goes with the word in Mark 12: 24. "Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the scriptures, neither the power of God?" Why should the Lord mention the scriptures and also the power of God if they are one and the same? Certainly the Lord made a distinction between the scriptures and the power of God. The inspired apostle Paul said, "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." (2 Thess. 2: 13.) This plainly teaches that both the spirit and the word are used in salvation.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Negative, First Speech*

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I want to assure you that I count myself happy to be invited to have a part in this discussion, and may I here acknowledge my sincere appreciation of the confidence which you have expressed and are now evidencing by the invitation and the splendid preparations for and co-operation in this forensic effort, which I trust will result in the salvation of souls and a greater appreciation of God's word on the part of all. I have not had a religious discussion of this type since about 1912, and I have no disposition to resort to any method of reasoning or procedure in argument by way of trying to gain a point, or cite any passage of scripture out of its setting, or in any way leave an impression other than that which I believe to be intended by the Holy Spirit. I am conscious of the responsibility resting

upon me, of the influence that may be imparted unto you, and shall feel keenly that burden throughout the discussion. I rejoice to meet Dr. Bogard, the ablest man in the field of controversy that his brethren have; a man who has had more debates than any member of his denomination of this or any other age. He understands, therefore, all of the arguments and all of the methods of turning and defeating what he considers errors, and hence to his address I gladly give attention.

I am somewhat disappointed in his definition of terms and his presentation of the issues involved. I think, if nothing further were to be said, that you would misunderstand the exact point of distinction or difference that exists between us. The first part of the proposition, of course, needs no defining. The Bible, God's word, teaches that in conviction and conversion—of course of the sinner—the Holy Spirit exercises a power or influence. I would not dissent from any word of the statement that far. But that does not make the matter clear, and I would not have any misunderstanding regarding the issue. I just want to add, for emphasis, that, since the New Testament plan of salvation was placed in effect, there has never been a case of conversion, acceptable to God, but said conversion was begun, carried on, and consummated as a result of the Holy Spirit and his influence upon the heart of the sinner. No, there is no difference between Dr. Bogard and me on that point.

But in the next statement, his declaration is "*in addition to,*" and he injects "*distinct from*" the written or preached word. This represents our difference. Keep clearly in mind that it is not a question of whether or not the Holy Spirit is present or influences; but it is the *manner* by which the Spirit reaches the heart and results in conviction and conversion. It is not that the Spirit does or does not operate in conversion, but rather does the Holy Spirit, independently of the word, exercise his influence and bring forth his fruits?

Dr. Bogard failed to say a word regarding what he meant by "*in addition to,*" and I am, therefore, forced to get these matters before you that all things may be kept

more clearly in mind. The expression, "in addition to," means "*besides*; hence, additional, more, something else; a power that does not reside in the word—a thing that is not of the word and, therefore, has no connection with the word." By the word "distinct," Dr. Bogard misses the definition when he says "not identical." That word simply means "not the same." In addition, however, it means "separate" and also "clear" and "distinct." But to get the meaning clearly, you must add the word "from"—hence, "distinct from." Thus you not only define the word "distinct" but also the word "from"—and that means "away" or "out of contact with." Therefore, according to his proposition, the Spirit of God operates upon the heart of the sinner "in addition to and distinct from the word." This must mean that it is separated from the word, out of touch with the word, away from the word, and operating through the word would strictly violate its meaning. I had just as well make the point clear now, as later, that his proposition demands *separate* and *apart!* He uses the word "direct" and "immediate" which mean one and the same thing. Therefore, there is no difference in the position which his proposition requires and that occupied by what he called the Hardshell Baptist theory.

May I suggest that there is no middle ground, no neutral point, and no harmony between the two positions. There are but two sides to the question: In the conviction and conversion of sinners, the Holy Spirit either operates separate and apart from the word—using his terms "direct and immediate," which means without the intervention of any other agency, instrumentality, or intermediary; or, the other side of the question, the Spirit must operate NOT distinct or apart from the word, but rather with, through, or by means of the word. Any man who assumes the obligation to prove the former disproves the latter, or if he tries to put them together so that they will harmonize, he will labor under a difficulty that cannot be sufficiently worked out to any advantage. Just let Dr. Bogard try it. Truth is the object of this discussion, and the word of God is the basis of all truth in matters religious. Therefore, we must insist that the Holy Spirit operates, in conviction

and conversion, either through, with, or by means of the word, or that it operates distinct and separate from the word, and without the use of the word of God. Proof of the latter is the obligation of Dr. Bogard, and we call upon him to show the position sustained by God's word.

Baptist doctrine teaches the theory of pre-regeneration. That word means salvation without response; regeneration before all other graces; redemption without any act of obedience on the sinner's part. A sinner, therefore, is passive and inactive, and unless God, the Almighty, sends his Spirit *before* the sinner performs any act, even repentance and faith, nothing can be brought to bear upon his heart that will lead him to life.

I have here a number of statements—first, from the Philadelphia Confession of Faith; second, from the New Hampshire Confession; and, third, from the late Dr. Graves. We may also call attention to the teaching of Dr. J. P. Boyce whose book is the text in Louisville Seminary, a Baptist school. This will present the Baptist doctrine from representative Baptists, and I take it that their teaching will not be questioned by Dr. Bogard. I quote Philadelphia Confession, chapter 10, section 2. "This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, nor from any power or agency in the creature, being wholly passive therein, being dead in sins and trespasses until being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit: he is therefore enabled to answer this call and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it, and that by no less power than which raised Christ from the dead." The New Hampshire Confession is quoted in Bogard's Waybook and in Pendleton's Church Manual and declares that "regeneration comes first and that such shows itself in the holy fruits of repentance and faith."

"Regeneration always first. It may exist without faith and repentance, but these cannot exist without first regeneration. There is not only antecedence, but in some cases an appreciable interval."

Dr. J. R. Graves endorses the same idea and enlarges upon it in "Seven Dispensations," p. 131.

J. H. Grime says, "This is grand old Baptist doctrine which has come to us through the ages, and is held by the great Baptist brotherhood of today."

Now I should like to ask: If a man who has been born again—there yet being an interval of time before repentance and faith—should die and that before the interval elapses, what will be the result? There will be either a regenerated soul in hell, or a soul in heaven who has not yet exercised himself to repent and believe the gospel.

But further: It is declared in the word of God that the seed of the kingdom is the word. Dr. Bogard believes that the seed will never save unless a direct work of the Holy Spirit is brought to bear upon the word, or seed, and likewise upon the soul. His illustration of the seed and the soil is used as proof. Warlick Debate, p. 30. But, ladies and gentlemen, all of the sunshine and season cannot make seed grow, except that seed have power within itself. Everything done to make a plant grow must be exercised in connection with the seed. Hence, this represents operation through, with, and by the seed, and no one denies that. Dr. Bogard would urge that the sunshine and rain and conducive seasons will accomplish results separate and distinct from the seed. Yet the average schoolboy knows that the exact amount of rain, the exact amount of sunshine, and the perfect season will not produce the plant—the life is in the seed! This, indeed, represents our difference.

Dr. Bogard uses the illustrations of the soldier handling the sword and the woodsman cutting wood with the axe. But he ought to be able to see that there is no power in the sword or axe without some agency to handle them. Aside from the sword, no effect is wrought. There is never any deadly work wrought by the soldier separate from his sword. Power is exercised through the wielding of the sword, and it is the sword, *with* that power brought to bear on it, that makes the contact and accomplishes the result. As to the axe illustration, we cannot fail to see that the woodsman, separate and apart from his axe, does no damage to the forest. Power is exercised through the axe to accomplish the work among the trees of the woodland, but that power, we must maintain, is in connection with—not

separate from—the weapon of service. Let Dr. Bogard furnish just one example or illustration where power is exercised in addition to, distinct from, separate and out of touch or away from the sword or the axe. That thing will not be brought to pass, I am sure, even by one so skilled in polemics as he. I repeat that which has formerly been said: It is not a question, ladies and gentlemen, whether the Holy Spirit is present in conviction and conversion, or whether he has an influence, but *how* does the Holy Spirit operate and have that influence? I would just advise that in the next like proposition there be written out in capital letters these terms, namely, that in conviction and conversion the Holy Spirit operates separate and distinct from, out of touch with, the word of God in accomplishing his results. But Dr. Bogard would not sign that, despite the fact that it must be his contention. He knows that the Holy Spirit operates using the word as a medium of contact and that he makes no contact apart from the word.

But *how* does the Spirit operate? That is the question. My answer, first, last and all the time, is that he influences through the gospel, which is God's power. The word is the medium through which the Spirit accomplishes his work. If that book there were the sinner's heart and this hand were the Holy Spirit (placing hand on book) there is direct and immediate contact; if you put something between, the hand will operate on the book, but this time it is through the medium of this tablet. That represents the only two ideas that can be had from this proposition. That represents the difference between Dr. Bogard and me, the difference between error and truth!

May I call attention to Acts 14: 27, where Paul and Barnabas returned from their first missionary journey to make report of that which had been accomplished by them? I read: "And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." You ask: "How did God open the door of faith to the Gentiles?" That is easily seen: By the help of God these gospel preachers proclaimed the word of Christ, God's power unto salvation, and the result of that influence thus

brought to bear upon the Gentiles through the apostle's faithful preaching was their conviction and conversion. If we grant that the Holy Spirit operated, we would have to urge that he operated in connection with these men or the word which they preached, and not on the Gentiles directly. Attention is also called to Rom. 10: 10—"with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." Certainly! But how did that faith come? In verse 17 of the same chapter the answer is unmistakably plain: "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Faith is always the result of evidence presented—yea, it is the "evidence of things not seen."

Now to Acts 16: 13-15. That little group of preachers of the gospel, under the leadership of Paul particularly, went out of the city to the riverside, where were gathered another small band of worshippers—Lydia and her household. No one doubts that these women were worshipping in error, but, being full of a desire to please God, to know more of him always, they received Paul and his companions gladly. The Lord opened her heart, but how? God opened Lydia's heart so "that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul"—the "things" had already been spoken! Her heart was so opened by that teaching that she attended unto the things thus taught. Paul brought to bear on her heart the truths of the gospel. If the Holy Spirit had a part at all, it must have been either in connection with the preacher or the word which he preached. It was not directly and distinctly on the heart of Lydia, separate and apart from the "things which were spoken of Paul." The enlightenment of that part of her which is responsible and accountable to God Almighty resulted in her open heart—her conviction!—and that in turn led her to attend unto the things thus spoken. There is absolutely no mystery connected with this account of conversion.

We pass next to 2 Thess. 3: 1 and other scriptures on the thought presented there. Dr. Bogard asks: "Hardeman, do you ever pray that the word may have free course?" He seems to think that if I pray thus, something extra will have to be done. I certainly do pray for all preachers of the gospel—my prayer goes out to God in their behalf. For

what? That the "word may have free course"—not that something may be done in addition to the word, but that the word through those earthen vessels may have its influence. That is exactly the kind of prayer that Paul expressed in this connection. But from the Doctor's speech to which you have listened, you are led to believe that something special, very special, in addition to, distinct from, the word, must be accomplished by the Spirit. I think Dr. Bogard has written just about as fine a comment on a matter of that kind as could be given, and, if he is right in his contention, these miraculous gifts have passed away. Do you ever pray for the sick, Dr. Bogard? When you do, do you pray that they may get well contrary to the will of God? Certainly this would not be true. Now let him answer his own argument: When you pray for bread, what is the purpose? Do you expect something additional to, something distinct from, the laws of God? Now hear him: "When we pray for bread, we go to work to get it." All right: "When we pray for sinners, do we not go to work that sinners may be saved? When we pray for the word to have free course, do we not go to work to make it so? When we pray for an open door, we press forward with the truth that we may be the instruments by which the door is opened." Dr. Bogard wants to know why we pray for sinners. Why, for the same reason you say you pray for bread. "When we pray for them we go to work with all power and wisdom possible to bring them back to health, spiritually, just as we do the sick physically. Since God made Peruvian bark, from which quinine is made, we pray for the sick of malaria, and then give them quinine, which is the remedy. We preach the gospel, which is God's power. The sinner is unsaved, and we pray and apply the remedy—the gospel of God—and if the sinner will respond to the remedy, he shall be saved."

But note again: He prays for the poor. Well, I wonder why? He says "when we pray for the poor, we should take 'prayers' along in a basket and pour it into the pantry of the poor." Bogard gives an illustration in his debate with Aimee McPherson: "Two boys are on their way to school. One said, 'Let's get down and pray that we may not be late';

but the other said, 'Let us run and pray while we run.' Now that illustration presents the truth. Will God sometimes heal in answer to prayer? Yes, but exactly as he gives bread to the hungry in answer to prayer, the sick get well in answer to prayer. Both are done by use of the means, and not by miraculous power. Dr. Bogard, I think you have answered your question most admirably in your debate with Aimee McPherson, pages 26 and 27, where you advocate just the things I have here been stating.

The presentation of the truth in the McPherson Debate is powerfully against the Doctor when he tries to defend error.

He well said: "A man must be careful about what he says in one debate because when he has a debate with someone else he will contradict himself." See Penick Debate, p. 266.

Now note again: He quotes Col. 2: 13, where it is indicated that we must be "quickenened together with him." But I ask you, how is this done? In Psalm 119: 50, David said: "This is my comfort in my affliction: for thy word hath quickened me." So if a sinner needs to be quickened, God has taught that by which the act is brought about—the word does that. According to Paul, Eph. 2: 5, when "we were dead in sins" God "quickenened us together with Christ." But how? Verse 17 of the same chapter: Christ "came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh." Hence, by "foolishness of preaching" the sinner is saved. "They shall all be taught of God" and that man who is taught "cometh unto Christ." Yes, quickened, convicted, but by the word of God!

Then again he talks about the sinner's being "spiritually dead." I just want to make this observation, Dr. Bogard, for your benefit and that of the audience: The Bible nowhere uses such a term. There is a difference between the expression "being spiritually dead" and the truth as the Bible presents it in Eph. 2, "being dead in trespasses," or "dead in sins." So that part is answered. When it comes to the heart's being "deceitful above all things" (Jer. 17: 9) and "they are all gone out of the way; they are together become unprofitable: there is none that doeth good, no, not

one" (Rom. 3: 12)—how did they come to be in that condition? God says he 'searches "the heart" to "give every man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his doings." The man is responsible! When they went out of the way, they "became unprofitable"—they were responsible! God cannot be charged with such a condition, for he is not willing that any should perish.

Now to John 6: 44: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day." Of course, God draws him. That is not the question. Ladies and gentlemen, how does God draw him? We are not left groping for the answer. Christ answers his own question in verse 45: "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." The gospel is God's power unto salvation—they shall be taught! If from that teaching they learn, they are to that extent drawn. It could not be otherwise.

In the parable of the sower, Dr. Bogard asks why it was that some seed failed to grow. Will you charge God with the failure? Is it because the Spirit refused to do his work separate and apart from the word? Certainly not! It was because the seed were sown in different kinds of hearts, because they did not reach in some the depths of the heart; hence, the seed was not in some cases permitted to demonstrate its own power. Why will some seed in a field fail to materialize, when all seed have the same sunshine and season? Because there is a difference in the ground! Likewise, the word fails because hearts are different.

Next we turn to James 1: 21—"Receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." But grafting is always a result; means "bring about a grafting," and there never was any kind of grafting separate and apart from those means. No additional power can be brought to bear upon the plant that is being grafted in, unless it operate through and with the power that already exists. So it is with the salvation of the soul. The truth is, the word "engrafted" means "implanted"—receive, therefore, the word that has been planted in your heart. But whether it is the "engrafted word" or the "implanted word"—the fact is, it

is able to save your souls! If James by the Spirit says it is able, we must accept it. In 2 Cor. 5: 17, 18 we are told that "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" and "all things are become new." But note, in the same connection: to the apostles had been given "the ministry of reconciliation" and the very next verse states "the word of reconciliation." How then did they become new creatures? Through the ministry of the apostles. What was the means? The *word* of reconciliation! That is God's power unto salvation.

Now you just watch—Dr. Bogard will tell us before this debate is over that in every case of conversion a miracle is performed. In commenting on Jer. 13: 23 he says: "Nothing but a miracle can change the negro's skin." Everybody knows this. This is the Lord's illustration to show the sinner's condition. "If the illustration means anything, it must mean that it will take a direct and distinct miraculous power to change the sinner's heart." Warlick Debate, p. 12.

Dr. Bogard further says: "The Lord always takes the initiative in conviction and conversion." Well, now, suppose the Lord does not take it! Who is to blame for the sinner's damnation? The sinner is so dead that he cannot hear the word of the Lord, and God is obligated to see to it that he does hear. Whether the sinner wills or not, it is God's duty to enliven him or to quicken him so that he can be saved. Now that can but mean universal salvation or universal damnation. If a man is saved, it is because God in addition to his established means influenced him; if he is damned, it is because God did not exercise that influence. Hence, God is chargeable for damnation—the sinner had nothing to do with it! If Dr. Bogard proves his proposition, he must find a passage where it is declared that the Holy Spirit operated separate, distinct, and apart from the already established means of salvation, the word, the seed of the kingdom, and I think that will never be done.

Dr. Bogard has written some very fine things, and he declares that "the Lord never gives the Spirit to anybody except an earnest, honest believer," and he quotes Acts 5: 32 in support of the same. If God, as that verse states, gives the Spirit only "to them that obey him," how can we recon-

cile that truth with the idea that God must give them the Spirit before they can obey? There must be a new creature, a regeneration, before one can become a lover of the Lord. If you pray that one may be quickened and brought into this new life without the word, it just means that some other way must be used. One receives the Spirit through obedience, and yet he has to have the Spirit before he can obey! What a contradiction! It is somewhat after this fashion: A sinner must be born again, but he cannot be born without a special working of the Spirit separate from the word or the means by which the birth is accomplished. Hence, every soul that goes to hell will go there because God didn't quicken it! But, you say, the heart has to be prepared! I would not dissent from that statement. Faith is preparation work, and "faith cometh by hearing" the word of God. Light is preparation, but the "entrance of thy words" produces light. The Spirit, through the word, is first exercised through the ear or the sense of receiving, that faith may be established. The Spirit, through or by means of the word, continues his work until complete obedience is exercised.

Dr. Bogard, in other discussions on other subjects, has taught this very principle. "We pray, but go to work that the answer thereto may be accomplished." There are no miracles performed today—Dr. Bogard admits that. A miracle, being that which changes the regular or ordinary means and accomplishes its work in an unusual way, is not performed in conviction and conversion. Therefore, God uses the ordinary means—the Spirit through the word of truth in the act of conversion. In the early days, they did not have the written word; hence, the miraculous gifts were necessary. Dr. Bogard believes that. But today we have that written word, and miracles are no longer necessary. Then why take a position that forces one to contend anew for the unusual, the out-of-the-ordinary, in conversion? If this is not the meaning of "distinct, separate, and away from the word," then reason fails, and the Bible teaching regarding its own power in the salvation of souls becomes worthless. But my time is up, and I thank you.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

BEN M. BOGARD, *Affirmative*, Second Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend said there is really no difference between us as to whether the Holy Spirit was really present or not, but as to how the Holy Spirit reached the heart of the sinner. There is quite a difference, as you shall see by the further arguments and scriptures produced. My friend said there is nothing but the gospel or truth used in the salvation of the soul. The Holy Spirit uses the truth, and the truth *only* is what my friend said. If these scriptures mean anything, there are at least eight other things used besides the word of God in the salvation of the soul, and he made no reply whatever. He had only thirty minutes; didn't have time to get to it. Maybe he will in his next speech.

He contends that I contend that something more than the word is used in the conviction and conversion of the sinner. That is correctly stated; something more than the word of God; *something in addition to it*. Now we are agreed on that.

He says Baptist doctrine requires the idea of pre-regeneration; regenerated before you repent and believe, before you do anything. That is Hardshell Baptist doctrine. I certainly do think my friend ought to know the difference between the Hardshell doctrine and that of the Missionary Baptists, who do not teach anything of that sort. If he could get me to take the position of the Hardshell, the pre-regeneration idea, he would have no trouble in the world in defeating me in this debate. I will take the scriptural position, not the Hardshell position.

Then he quoted from the Philadelphia Confession of Faith. Also from J. R. Graves, where Graves says that the evidence of the salvation is the holy fruit of repentance and faith. I believe with all my soul in the fruit produced by repentance and faith, the holy fruit of (produced by) repentance and faith.

When I say that through repentance men obey God, and they congregate into the service of God, there is the holy fruit. They are themselves fruit, but repentance and faith

produce this fruit, and when we see repentance and faith produce fruit it gives us evidence of salvation. J. R. Graves in the book, *Seven Dispensations*, proves that we believe in this holy fruit of repentance and faith. He is quoting from a very good book.

Then to Acts 14: 27. My friend says that here is the idea that the apostle Paul came back "to Antioch and rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." Well, Rom. 10: 10, "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." So then, the Lord opened the hearts of those Gentiles, so they might receive the truth. My friend in his effort to get me in a position that I might fall into his hands has proved the very thing that I am attempting to prove.

In Lydia's case, he says, Lydia's heart was opened by the words which Paul preached. Now he and Paul need to get themselves together. The record says that the Lord opened her heart "that she attended unto the things . . . spoken of Paul." Her heart was first opened, and then she gave attention to the preached word. We pray God while we preach that there may be response to our preaching, but there will be none unless the heart is opened. Professor Hardeman, tell me what God does when he answers your prayer? He doesn't give you the word, you already have that. When God blesses your preaching, what does he do? Anything he does is bound to be in addition to what you already have.

He refers to my debate with Aimee McPherson, where I mention two boys who are going along to school. One said, "Let's get down and pray that we may not be late." The other replied, "No, let's run while we pray." And what of it? We trust the Lord to do what we cannot. What did the Lord do when he answered that boy's prayer? Something in addition to anything the boy might do.

Then he speaks of taking our prayer along in a basket. Be practical. I am glad my friend calls attention that the Hardshells say, "Let God do it all." Professor Hardeman says, "Do it all by the preaching." Missionary Baptists do all we can and leave the results with God, asking God's blessings to rest upon it. Next—the "gospel *the* power of God." My

friend is a skilled debater. It has been twenty-five years since I debated with Professor Hardeman. I taught him how to do the thing pretty well. He didn't make the usual mistake of those who know nothing of the Greek. The definite article is not before the word "power" in the original, but the word "*gar*" is connected with it. So it does not say anywhere in God's Book that the word is the power. The gospel is a power of God unto salvation, and there are other things beside it, and I quoted eight of them in my speech a while ago. He knows that I know that the Greek word "*to*" is not there in the Greek, but the Greek word "*gar*," which means "for." No definite article at all in Greek.

Next, the "engrafted word, which is able to save your soul." Well, why didn't my friend answer what I said? The records show that he did not. The "graft" never did put itself into the tree. The winesap bud could never put itself into a crab apple tree, but power in addition to it, brought to bear on it, always comes in or there will be no grafting. There's power in addition to the graft. The graft is the word, and certainly there must be something in addition to it or the winesap will never get into the crab apple tree. The scripture does not command to "regenerate" with the word. That is not the only thing used. Certainly the word is used in salvation, but there are other things used in addition to it.

Now suppose the Lord does not take the initiative? Didn't I quote to you where all shall be taught of him? (John 6: 45.) All shall be taught of him, and "If I be lifted up . . . will draw all men unto me." So God draws, but does not irresistably draw. No sinner would ever come unless drawn. But he draws them enough to enable them to act if they will.

Now he says that I said in one of my books that the Holy Spirit is never given to a sinner. I say again, no unsaved man ever did receive the Spirit and no unsaved man ever will receive the Spirit. But does not Professor Hardeman, after having taught Greek thirty years, know enough to know, and I believe he does, the difference between the Holy Spirit being *given to one* and the *influence of the Holy Spirit upon one*? The Holy Spirit is *not given to anybody except the child of God*, the sons of God. If you

have the Holy Spirit, you are already the child of God. The *influence of the Spirit* is one thing, and the *baptism of the Holy Spirit* is another. Now here is the way it is, and I will make myself perfectly clear. I am glad to see in the audience my friend, Joe S. Warlick, with whom I have had twenty-three debates. He said, "You may not always agree with Bogard, but you will always know what he means." I appreciate that. The Holy Spirit *works upon a sinner* and influences that sinner, and then *after the sinner accepts Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit comes into his life* and leads him and comforts him. Having answered all my friend asked, I will go on from there with my affirmative.

The apostle Paul said, "God hath chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." (2 Thess. 2: 13.) This plainly teaches that both the Spirit and the word are used in salvation. The word and the Spirit are not separate and apart from each other, yet they are very clearly distinct one from the other, one working with the other, not working apart from the other. Working side by side, jointly; yet the Spirit and the word each maintain their individuality. The Spirit works as if there were no word and the word is used as if there were no Spirit. Not separate and apart from each other but together, side by side on the same thing. The gospel is the sword of the Spirit (Eph. 6: 15) and as the sword is distinct from the soldier and the soldier distinct from the sword, yet both soldier and sword work together to slay the enemy, even so the Spirit and the word work together to save the soul; the Spirit and the word work together in the conviction and conversion of the sinner. My friend was very, very correct. He said that if you put that hand on the book, it is immediate; but if you put something between your hand and the book, that is intermediate. That is exactly what I am coming to now, the Holy Spirit actually *touches* the human heart! Nothing between at all. My friend knows English as well as Greek, and he knows that "*with*" is one thing and "*through*" is another thing. God does not work *through* the word but *with* it. Let me show you about it. A young man may write a letter to a young lady, and that letter will influence the young lady, but if he presents

himself and comes into personal contact with her it will be decidedly more effective. He might call her up over the telephone, and that telephone talk would influence her, but there is a great difference between a telephone talk and sitting in a parlor holding her hand as he talks. Even so the Holy Spirit has written his word to us, and there is power in the word, but when the *Holy Spirit actually presents himself and comes into personal contact* with the sinner there is a much more powerful influence.

Is there such contact of the Holy Spirit in the conviction and conversion of the sinner? The scriptures teach that there is. Paul said, "Forasmuch as 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 in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." (2 Cor. 3: 3.) In this passage, in conviction and conversion, receiving salvation is compared to writing, only instead of using ink the Holy Spirit is the thing that makes the impression. Just as the ink actually touches the paper in order to write, even so the Holy Spirit actually touches the heart, and since the Holy Spirit is as the ink then there must be actual touch by the Holy Spirit on the human heart to produce salvation. Another passage says, "The hand of our God is upon all them that seek him." (Ezra 8: 20.) Your hand cannot be upon a thing without actually touching it. Your hand may be near the table and not touch the table; your hand may be over the table and not touch it; but your hand cannot be upon the table unless there is an actual touching of the table. Since God's hand is upon all who seek him then it follows that the Holy Spirit actually touches the heart in conviction and conversion.

Paul's illustration in 1 Cor. 3: 5-8 proves conclusively that there is power in addition to the word. Here is what he says: "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom he believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase. Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one." This simply means that just as the farmer sows the seed and cultivates

the seed after having sown it, even so we preach and follow up our preaching by religious cultivation. Yet all our sowing and cultivation will avail nothing unless God gives the increase. In natural sowing, which is an illustration of spiritual sowing, the seed is sown, the ground is cultivated, but there will be no produce from that labor unless the heat of the sun and the moisture of the rain come upon the soil and the seed. So when we preach, and do all we can there must be something from God in addition before anyone is saved.

The influence of a wife over a wicked husband may be used by the Holy Spirit in addition to the preaching of the word to convict that husband and bring him to salvation. Peter says, "Likewise ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives." (1 Pet. 3: 1.) Peter plainly says that even when the word as spoken or written has failed, the husband may be won by the good life (conversation) of the wife. Is that not an influence used by the Holy Spirit in addition to the written or spoken word? If so, my proposition is proved—that the Holy Spirit in conviction and conversion of the sinner uses a power of influence in addition to the written or spoken word.

James says the word of God is a mirror. He says, "If any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, . . . this man shall be blessed in his deed." Peter says the word of God, that perfect law of liberty, is a mirror. A mirror is powerless unless something outside itself is used with it. You would never see yourself in a mirror unless light from the outside of the mirror shined on the mirror which enables the mirror to reflect your image. Outside light must shine on the mirror before it will show you anything. Stand before a mirror at midnight in a dark room with the curtain drawn, and see if you get any reflection unless some light is shining on you as also on the mirror. Something outside the mirror is used. The word of God is a mirror and it will only show you what you are, but there must be power outside the mirror in ad-

dition to the mirror or no image will be reflected. Unless there is power in addition to the word no soul will be saved.

In the nineteenth chapter of Acts we read of some trying to cast out devils by using the exact words that Paul used when he cast out devils and they failed. Here is the way the record reads: "Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth, . . . and the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye? And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded." (Acts 19: 13-16.) Here is a clear case why there must be power in addition to the word spoken or there will be nothing accomplished. You *can't argue the devil out of a man*; you can't reason a soul into salvation—there must be a power in addition to the word if the soul is saved.

Numerous passages of scripture show that both the word and the Spirit work in the salvation of the soul. Here they are:

John 15: 3, "Now ye are clean through the word" yet in 1 Cor. 6: 11 we read the "Spirit of understanding."

Psalms 119: 130 says the "word gives understanding" yet in Isa. 11: 3 we read the "Spirit of understanding."

Heb. 11: 3 says the "worlds were framed by the word of God" yet in Psalm 104: 30 the "Spirit created" all things.

1 Pet. 1: 23 we read that we are "born of the word" yet in John 3: 6 we are told that we are "born of the Spirit."

John 17: 17 says we are "sanctified by the word" yet in 1 Pet. 1: 2 we are told that we are "sanctified by the Spirit."

John 8: 32 says "the truth makes us free" yet in 2 Cor. 3: 17 we read that the "Spirit gives liberty."

In Psalm 119: 111 we read that the "word rejoices the heart" yet in Gal. 5: 22 we read that the "fruit of the Spirit is joy."

Note the fact that the Bible abundantly teaches that both the word and the Spirit work in salvation, not the word

alone, not the Spirit alone, but both the word and the Spirit. Not the Spirit *through* the word but the Spirit *with* the word.

That both the word and the Spirit work together in salvation is seen in Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones. In Ezek. 37: 1-10 we read: "The hand of the Lord was upon me, and carried me out in the spirit of the Lord, and set me down in the midst of the valley which was full of bones, and caused me to pass by them round about: and, behold, there were very many in the open valley; and, lo, they were very dry. And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest. Again he said unto me, Prophecy upon these bones, . . . Behold, I will cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live: and I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and ye shall live; and ye shall know that I am the Lord. So I prophesied as I was commanded: and as I prophesied, there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone. And when I beheld, lo, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above: but there was no breath in them. . . . Thus saith the Lord God; Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood up upon their feet."

The explanation is made in a few verses following that these dry bones represented the whole house of Israel. Israel is an alien to God today, and scattered all over the earth. It is clearly set forth how they shall be saved. How? By preaching and along with the preaching by the power of the breath of God that will breathe upon them. That is the prophecy. They will be led back to the Lord in their own land. So that shows clearly how the breath of God goes with the preaching.

The Hardshell would say that since the bones are dead it would be senseless and useless to preach to dry bones, hence the Hardshell refuses to preach to sinners. He would leave the whole thing to the Spirit. My friend, Professor Hardeman, would take it out in talking, thinking all the

power is in the word. But both are wrong. Our Hardshell friends think the Spirit does it all and my opponent and his people think the entire power is in the preaching, and the Holy Spirit has nothing to do with it except as he may influence the sinner by the words. But Missionary Baptists step right in between these two extremes and preach the word of God as the Bible commands, and then we trust in the "breath of God" to come and the work is done.

You cannot *talk the black skin off a negro* neither can you *talk the spots off a leopard*. In Jer. 13: 23 we read, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." How long do you think it would take to talk the black skin off the negro? How long do you think it would take to talk the spots off a leopard? You will say you can never do it. Then you can never preach enough to change the sinful nature of dead sinners. But when we preach to dead sinners, the "breath of God" (the Spirit) comes and enabling grace is given. God does not compel, but he enables men.

I have time to ask some questions, and I have them in black and white. He can answer them in his next speech.

1. Do you believe the Holy Spirit is in the world today?
2. If the Holy Spirit is in the world today, what does he do?
3. If he does nothing, then is he just an interesting spectator of what the people are doing?
4. If he does anything at all, is that not something in addition to the word?
5. Do you ever pray that the Holy Spirit may save sinners?
6. If you pray that the Holy Spirit may save sinners, what do you expect him to do in answer to your prayer?
7. If he does anything at all, is that not something in addition to the written word?
8. Do you ever pray that the Holy Spirit may bless your preaching?
9. If you do pray that he may bless your preaching, what will he do when he answers your prayer?
10. If you do not pray that the Holy Spirit may bless your preaching and the Holy Spirit does nothing to help your preaching, is not your preaching spiritless preaching?

11. Do you pray like Paul that the Holy Spirit may open the door for your utterance?
 12. If Paul needed such help, do you not need it?
 13. Did not Paul have the word given him by inspiration?
 14. What was he praying for when he prayed that his fellow Israelites might be saved?
 15. If God did anything in answering that prayer, what was it and whatever it was, was it not in addition to the word?
 16. The Bible says the word of God is a hammer that breaks the rock in pieces. Please tell me if the hammer could do anything at all unless some power in addition to the hammer be brought to bear on it.
 17. Did you ever hear of a sword killing an enemy unless the soldier brought power to bear on the sword?
 18. Since the preacher, preaching the word, furnishes the sword, or the Bible being read is the sword, is it not necessary that the Spirit use the word (the sword) to bring the power to bear on it if the sinner is convicted and converted?
 19. If the word has failed, and men are saved by the "conversation" or the lives of their wives, is that something not in addition to the word?
 20. Do you really believe the Holy Spirit actually touches the sinner's heart?
- Time called.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Negative*, Second Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I rejoice to be able to respond and again state the issue introduced thus far in the discussion. I am calling attention first to the argument made at the beginning as regards the doctrine of pre-regeneration. Dr. Bogard says, "Oh, that is Hardshell doctrine." The article, to which I called attention, was written either by Dr. Bogard or J. H. Grime. I am not certain but I think he is a regular contributor to Dr. Bogard's paper, and I am sure that the doctor would endorse him. J. R. Graves and the others quoted or referred

to are representative Baptists—yes, they are Missionary Baptists. The question is: Is pre-regeneration a Baptist doctrine? Now listen to an accepted Missionary Baptist: “The contrary is held by Free-Will Baptists . . . but pre-regeneration is emphatically a Baptist doctrine.” Mr. Pendleton’s manual states precisely the same point. At this point we read: “We believe that in order to be saved sinners must be regenerated or born again and that this regeneration expresses or evidences itself in the holy fruits of repentance and faith.” I am assuming that Dr. Bogard endorses statements of that type, for he has them in his own books to the same effect.

The point I made regarding pre-regeneration was that, if this Baptist doctrine truly represents him, then he would have the sinner born again, and that before repentance and faith, for these are fruits of the new birth. If repentance and faith result in the new birth, then it necessarily follows that by those acts the new birth is brought about. Which will he take? If he stays with representative Baptist and with his own past writings and statements, he will cling to the idea of pre-regeneration—that you must be born again before repentance and faith. And if that is true, we just wonder: Should that man die following his regeneration but before his repentance and faith, what would be the result? You would either have a regenerated soul in hell or an unbeliever in heaven. Now which?

He refers to the matter of opening the door of faith and asks: “How does God open the door of faith? And if he opens it, is that not something in addition to the word?” Certainly it is not separate from the word! Those men of God, with a burning love for lost souls, went about seeking whom they might save. They prayed to God, no doubt. God opened the door of faith! I wonder if God performed a miracle when he opened the door of faith to the Gentiles? Let him answer by a “yes” or “no” or bat his eye. God saw to it that those people had an opportunity to hear the gospel that they might be saved. Through the goodness of God and the willingness and loyalty of gospel preachers the Gentiles also were given an opportunity to be the children of the Lord, and there were opportunities given to pre-

sent to them the truth just as through the providence of God we are at liberty to speak to you this afternoon—we trust that the door of faith to many a heart may be opened during these four days of discussion. Gladly do I, therefore, through that chain of providential affairs, take advantage of the open door and proclaim the gospel of Christ, God's power unto salvation to every one that believes it.

In regard to the case of Lydia, I desire to read a statement from a representative Baptist. From page 524, of the paper called "The Baptist," Dr. J. R. Graves' own statement on this point is taken: "The Lord opened the heart of Lydia by bringing facts, truths, before the mind and the heart." "He opens the heart by the instrumentality of his word. The opening of Lydia's heart resulted in her giving heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul." Giving heed was that which followed, and that which preceded this result was the teaching of Paul—and he was determined to know nothing save the Christ and him crucified, which involves the facts of the gospel. The record says "a certain woman named Lydia . . . heard us." Had she not heard, she would not have believed, for "faith cometh by hearing," and without faith she would not have given heed to the things spoken. Hence, through teaching, her heart was opened and, being fully persuaded, she obeyed from the heart "that form of doctrine" delivered unto her. Though the record is silent on that point, the Spirit had a part—but the Spirit operated through the spoken word! How could the Spirit open the heart without means, and what could the means have been except the word?

But Dr. Bogard thinks the Spirit operates without means. Why God himself has never done that! He says, "It is immediate"—and that means without medium. This position is a misrepresentation of Baptist scholars, and much more an untrue presentation of the truth of God. Dr. Bogard is a great man, but I think he will agree that he does not range in the class with Dr. Graves, and I say this with all due respect—I doubt that there is a Baptist in all the land who is superior to Dr. Graves, and he teaches just as I do at this point.

Now he asks me—and insists upon an answer—if I pray, if God answers prayer, how does God answer prayer? I come back to Dr. Bogard's own statement in answer to his argument today. Here it is: "When we pray for bread we go to work to get bread. That is right. When we pray for sinners, do we not go to work and do all we can to get sinners saved? Certainly we do." Now, Dr. Bogard, that's the truth, if you ever told it! And again, he says, in that same "dear Aimee" book: "Since God made Peruvian bark from which quinine comes and quinine kills the malaria germs, we should pray for the one sick with malaria and then give the quinine, God's remedy for malaria." And then a little further on: "The sick get well and the hungry are fed in answer to prayer, but both are done by the use of the means and not by miraculous power." But what does Dr. Bogard's proposition demand today? Why, it is separate and apart from the means! The Spirit does its work without means! It is not with, by, or through the word, according to the question under discussion.

I want to suggest to you, my dear sir, that in all the hour that you have spent on this subject, not one passage has been presented—nor will there be in the next hour's discussion—where the influence of the Spirit is brought to bear on the heart of the sinner distinct or away from the gospel, God's power—the power of God!—unto salvation. It matters not if the definite article is not there. I have not put it there—you have tried to eliminate it—but I did say the gospel was "God's power," for that is another way of saying "the power of God." Put "*gar*" before the word power and it is God's power. The Spirit operates on the sinner's heart, but he uses God's power to do it. Now let him find just one passage, or even a necessary inference in one, where the Spirit operates independently of means and I am ready to yield to the position advocated by him. "No unsaved man ever received the Spirit," he says, "but that the Spirit worked upon the heart of the sinner." Why, Dr. Bogard, I believe that as strongly as you do, and I said in my first speech that in every case of conversion, that conversion was begun, carried on, and consummated as a result of the Spirit, but

that the Spirit never operates independently, separate or apart from, the means—the word.

He talks about 2 Thess. 3: 1—“pray for us, that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified” and the next line says “even as also it is with you.” You received it! You believed it! May others also! Pray that such may be! John, in chapter 17, records the prayer of the Savior—Christ prayed for the sinner, and he said: “Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth.” Pray, then, that the word may run and be glorified so that this sanctification may be the consequence. You couldn’t afford to pray and then not furnish the truth that they may be sanctified. You will never find where any man has ever been set apart aside from the preaching of the word of God or from the written word read. When such a passage is found, there will be time for further discussion.

Next we note the argument on Eph. 6: 17: “And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.” That definitely shows that the Spirit has a sword and that sword is God’s word. They are not used apart or distinct. You will notice that Dr. Bogard is rather slow about furnishing definitions of words. I pointed out that the word “distinct” means *away*, and *distinct from* means away from—hence, separated! If “distinct from,” the Spirit would be out of touch with the word. Hence, how can they be not apart and yet apart at the same time? Those two statements are exactly the opposite, and I beg him to make at least some effort to harmonize them.

But he wants to know: Doesn’t the Spirit come in actual touch? Well now, let’s take your own passage, 2 Cor. 3: 2, and get it before us. “Ye are our epistle written in our hearts.” Now Dr. Bogard, what you really needed is a passage which shows that the writing was done on the sinner’s heart. It was in Paul’s and Timothy’s hearts that this thing was written, “known and read of all men.” Now watch: “Ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in tables that are hearts of flesh.” Christ is the writer. The Corinthians themselves are the epistles. The apostle’s heart is the paper—not the sinner’s heart. The Spirit is the ink,

and the apostle represents the pen. Now when Dr. Bogard comes tonight, I want him to bring a fountain pen and show how the ink writes separate and apart from the pen; whenever he does, I am ready to yield this point. He must find where the ink goes beyond the pen—the preachers of the gospel and their message. Let him show how writing upon the heart out of touch with the pen can be done. That thing is a dangerous illustration for you, Dr. Bogard, and I would advise that you find another passage.

We call attention next to another illustration used by Dr. Bogard. He says that the young man writes the young woman a letter or calls her over the telephone, but that is never as effective as when he is holding her hand. Why bless your heart, holding the hand is the medium of contact, and you, Dr. Bogard, are obligated to prove that the Spirit operates out of contact! If you write a letter, that is the medium. If you talk over the phone, that is the medium. And if you hold her hand, that is the medium. You just can't get away from the means of contact! And I thought you said the Spirit operated distinct from the sinner, and here you have the young man actually holding the girl's hand! Is that distinct from?

Now to 1 Cor. 3: 6: "I have planted, Apollos watered: but God gave the increase." Now he asks, "How is that done?" God Almighty furnishes the soil, likewise the sunshine and the showers, but not in a miraculous way. Whenever man works together with God, whether in planting or in growing, he is using the means that God has ordained, and the harvest—the increase!—is sure to come, for God sees to that.

But I wonder about 1 Pet. 3: 1-4. "In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives." How does she accomplish that? Verse 2 shows that the husband beholds her behavior and yields through that influence. It is not the outward appearance but it is "the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit." By her life, which is fashioned after the word of God, she influences! She may pray for him, but she does not depend on prayer alone. And even if Dr. Bogard were to prove that the wife

influences the husband even unto conversion, he is still far from showing that the Spirit operates without the word!

But he calls our attention to the things that the Bible says the Spirit does. No one is disputing that. But how does it do it? I want to make this proposition: There is not one thing ever said to be done by God's Spirit but the same thing is said to be done by the word of God. That being true, what is the answer? Just this: God uses the word as the means by which the Spirit operates. And what one does, the other is said to do—for they operate together.

In the next passage, Jer. 13: 23, where he brings in the change of the leopard's spots and the Ethiopian's skin, Dr. Bogard says: "If that has any meaning, it must be that it would take a miracle to make the change." But you say in your own book with "dear Aimee" that "those who use miracles or expect miracles to be used now show that they do not believe what God has said in his word." That's on page 21. But again: What was it that made the color of the Ethiopian's skin in the first place? Was that a miracle? Was Adam created black or white? What is it that causes the color of the races today, anyway? Let him answer that, and tell how he would account for that if someone were to find fault with the Bible because of that. How would you answer the critic on a matter of that kind?

Now he gets up and asks a lot of questions. That is an old, old way of debating, fairly legitimate, possibly, but more often done just to get the opponent to waste his time so that he cannot get to the real issues of the case. Those questions were, no doubt, carefully prepared and that outside of this discussion. I will take the same liberty and prepare the answers outside of my speaking time and read them just as fast as he read the questions. I do not intend to waste my time by being forced to read and reply to a long list of questions prepared outside of the time of debate. Most of them already have been discussed if they have any bearing on the proposition. I'll answer them tonight, and that is enough on that point.

Now quickly to the negative argument. I base my first upon the power or perfection of the word of God and suggest 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17 as the proof text. "All scripture given

by inspiration is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly (or completely) furnished unto all good works." Now I am adopting Dr. Bogard's own argument again, and making it mine this afternoon. Here it is, page 21, Bogard-McPherson debate: "If we are COMPLETELY, THOROUGHLY FURNISHED FOR ALL GOOD WORK"—and the capital letters show that he wants to emphasize it—"in the Bible there is no need for miracles. If something in addition to the Bible is needed to bolster up the Lord's work, then the Bible is not a perfect rule, it is short somewhere or somehow." Now that is Dr. Bogard in 1934. If you will just bring his own statement, thus read, and place it beside what he is arguing this afternoon, you will have Dr. Bogard vs. Dr. Bogard. Yes, he urges that if it is in addition to, the Bible is short somewhere, somehow. Yet he himself says this afternoon that the Spirit does work in addition to! Consistency, thou art a jewel! Right here in this little debate he shows positively that if one expects a miracle he does not believe the Bible. And I believe I am about to show that thing to be true right here this afternoon. He said there is one thing about debates that "when a man has a debate with one man, he must be very careful lest he contradict himself." You will find that statement on page 266 in his debate with Penick. So after having a debate with one fellow, Bogard says, one must be mighty careful when debating with someone else or he will contradict himself. Well you have already "gone and went and done" that thing in spite of your own warning to yourself. Let's see, wasn't he affirming this afternoon that the Holy Spirit operates distinct from, *in addition to*, the word? Well that proves, friend Bogard, that the Bible is short somewhere, somehow, and I have you as expert authority!

But we hasten to the next, John 14: 26, where Jesus says: "But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you." Here, in simple terms, the work of the Spirit is given—he will teach! He would influence the minds of the apostles—not go direct to the heart of the sinner without a medium of

contact—and bring things to their remembrance. I quote again from Dr. Bogard, for he is straight along this line in his debate with Mrs. McPherson. Here it is: "Thus Jesus leaves no uncertainty for us to guess at, about the baptism in the Holy Spirit, but tells us in plain words the exact purpose of this baptism. It was 'to teach' his apostles, 'to show' them, 'to guide' them, to 'bring to their remembrance' and 'to testify' to the world, of Jesus through them." And more: "At that time there was no New Testament to tell people how to be saved, and how to live, hence Jesus sent the Holy Spirit to guide his apostles into what to teach men and women." That's what you said in 1934, Dr. Bogard. But that is not all: "What they taught and did, and how sinners heard and believed and became Christians, and how Christians should live, is written in the New Testament for our guidance, because we are to observe the same teaching. Therefore, when we hear the teaching of the New Testament, we hear the Spirit speaking to us; and when we OBEY what it teaches, we walk after the Spirit and are children of God, saved and sanctified." Dr. Bogard, you couldn't put it any stronger. In view of this your own teaching, where is there any room for the Spirit's operation "in addition to" and separated from the word? And furthermore, he states on page 28 of the McPherson Debate: "The Lord's people are willing to accept the Bible as a PERFECT RULE (and he puts that in capitals again) OF FAITH and practice, but the devil's people positively refuse to believe the Bible unless a miracle proves it to them. You should use your brains," he said to dear Aimee, "and not be carried away by pomp and beauty and spectacular performances and miracle working." He'd better be mighty careful what he says in one debate for in another he may contradict himself!

To your attention I now bring another statement made by him. He quotes, following his statements, 1 Cor. 2: 12: "But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is from God; that we might know the things that were freely given to us of God." But now note the next verse: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth." Certainly we receive the Spirit, and, as Bogard himself says, "When we

hear the teaching of the New Testament, we hear the Spirit speaking to us, and when we obey what it teaches, we walk after the Spirit." It is not in man's wisdom—that would be the word only, but in the words which the Holy Spirit teaches. "By those words given to and through the apostles, we are taught and guided today." Brethren, that is the truth—but it is not Baptist doctrine, unless Bogard happens to be in a debate with someone else, and then it comes in wonderfully well.

He read from Ezek. 37. The only reply needed is to state that God's power exercised was always "*As I prophesied*" and never separate and apart.

Thank you again.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

BEN M. BOGARD, *Affirmative*, Third Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad to reply to the speech which my good friend made this afternoon. The questions which I asked my good friend he said he would answer tonight. I am afraid the stenographers did not get those questions for I read them exceedingly fast, talking at the rate of 175 words a minute, so I am repeating them. He said he would answer then and they will be fresh in your minds, perhaps appear better in the book when printed, and his answers will be more intelligent.

1. Do you believe that the Holy Spirit is in the world today?
2. If the Holy Spirit is in the world today, what does he do?
3. If he does nothing, then is he just an interested spectator of what the people are doing?
4. If he does anything at all, is that not something in addition to the word?
5. Do you ever pray that the Holy Spirit may save sinners?
6. If you pray that the Holy Spirit may save sinners, what do you expect him to do in answer to your prayer?
7. If he does anything at all, is that not something in addition to the written word?
8. Do you ever pray that the Holy Spirit may bless your preaching?

9. If you do pray that he bless your preaching, what will he do when he answers your prayer?
10. If you do not pray that the Holy Spirit bless your preaching, and the Holy Spirit does nothing to help your preaching, is not your preaching Spiritless preaching?
11. Do you pray like Paul that the Holy Spirit may open the door for your utterance?
12. If Paul needed such help, do you not need it?
13. Did not Paul have the word given him by inspiration?
14. What was he praying for when he prayed that his fellow Israelites might be saved?
15. If God did anything in answering that prayer, what was it, and whatever it was, was it not in addition to the word?
16. The Bible says the word of God is a hammer that breaks the rocks in pieces. Please tell me if the hammer could do anything at all unless some power in addition to the hammer be brought to bear on it?
17. Did you ever hear of a sword killing an enemy unless the soldier brought power to bear on the sword?
18. Since the preacher, preaching the word, furnishes the sword, or the Bible being read is the sword, is it not necessary that the Spirit use the word (the sword) to bring power to bear on it if the sinner is convicted and converted?
19. If the word has failed, and men are saved by "conversation" or the lives of their wives, is that something not in addition to the word?
20. Do you really believe that the Holy Spirit actually touches the sinner's heart?

Now he has those questions in his possession and said he would answer them and I am not questioning his good intentions.

Now I come to reply to some of the things he said this afternoon. My friend quoted from my good friend and brother, that great man of Lebanon, Tennessee, J. H. Grime, a statement on pre-regeneration, stating that Baptists believe in pre-regeneration. Brother Grime, while a great and good man, and personal friend of mine, is not a representative Baptist, and not so taken and accepted among his

fellow Baptists. A good man he is, but you can find a great many individuals like him who will express doctrines contrary to the general body of faith held by their brethren. Brother Grime, with the best intention, misrepresented Baptists when he said what he did. Baptists do not believe in pre-regeneration, and I wish to drop this thought to Professor Hardeman. Would it not really be better to debate with Ben M. Bogard rather than bring in J. R. Graves and J. H. Grime and others? Suppose I disagree with those great men! I have as much right to my private opinion as they have to theirs.

The question is: Which of us is in harmony with the body of Baptists? And since I have been put up by Baptist churches for more debates than any Baptist preacher who lives or who has ever lived, I think I know how to represent Baptist doctrine, and I told Professor Hardeman what Missionary Baptists believe. If he doesn't want to take my word for it then he can debate with J. R. Graves and J. H. Grime. They will have no reply, but he is debating with Ben M. Bogard at present.

He comes to the question of prayer. How does God answer prayer? I asked him that question. Well, he said, I will answer that by reading Mr. Bogard in the McPherson-Bogard Debate. Hardeman said when we pray for the sick we should use means to make the sick well. God made Peruvian bark. It is made into quinine for malaria, and we must use the means that God has ordained to cure the malaria. We pray for the sick and do all we can for the sick. You may wonder what in creation that has to do with the argument I have been making. I have contended that we should work as well as pray, but when we have done all we can, *God adds something to it*. If not, there is no sense in prayer; none whatever. Certainly, if I pray I should take enough interest to try to bring about the answer to my own prayer. I pray for bread and then hitch up Old Beck and go to plowing. Man's extremity is God's opportunity, and God does answer prayer, and God does give something in answer to prayer. My friend had one more question. Does God answer prayer, or do you have to answer your own

prayers all by yourself? Now that will go into the record. If you have to answer them all by yourself you rule God out and there is no sense in praying at all.

My friend said, "I wish Mr. Bogard would show me just one single place in the Bible where anyone was ever saved except through the word." I read the scripture and he paid no attention to it, possibly for lack of time; no doubt he will get to it tonight, and I will cite it again in this speech and perhaps in my next one. The apostle told the wives that by their lives and their conversation (life) they might save their husbands *without the word*. So after the word had failed there came in the lives of the godly wives for the salvation of their husbands. No response to it yet and I will put it into the records again. Wives were to save their husbands by their lives. The word "conversation" means conduct or living and I added that. But note that they "without the word" may save them by their godly life or conversation. God uses other things besides the word.

I want this to go down into the record for the second time too, and I want to refresh your mind with it a second time. His brethren—I don't believe there is one exception in a thousand—go around here telling you that Rom. 1: 16 says the gospel is *the* power of God unto salvation. Today when he quoted that he was very careful, for he knew that I would take him up; and I am careful too, for I know he will pick me up if I make a mistake. He is very careful not to say the gospel is *the* power, for the Greek doesn't say it. But it says "*gar*" with "*dunamis*," not "*to*"; "*to*" is a definite article, "*gar*" means the gospel "*for*" power. That is what the word "*gar*" means. Now you have been making that *the* power and using *the* as when speaking of John *the* Baptist. He was *the only* Baptist at that time, hence we call him **THE** Baptist. Very well, The Gospel, **THE POWER**, trying to make it out **THE only** power; but that scripture is taken from him completely, Professor Hardeman being the judge. The gospel God's power for salvation, not **THE** power.

Now to the valley of dry bones, Ezek. 37. God told the prophet to prophesy to that valley of dry bones. There is a movement and a stir and then he was told to prophesy to the wind (pray) and the breath of God came upon the bones

and they stood up as a mighty army. There was the interpretation—it's the whole house of Israel, scattered all over the land, lost, ruined in sin, on the road to hell. The Bible teaches that the Jews will one day have a home, be saved as a nation, some day they will be saved. How? Ezekiel saw a vision how it was to be. He was inspired by God. How? By preaching and by the *breath* (Spirit) of God breathing on them; and so if all Israel is to be saved, and they will be in the future, whatever your views may be about it, I am not going into that detail tonight, but when they do, it is to be by preaching and by the *breath* (Spirit) of God. No doubt there is something in addition to preaching!

Very well, I come to my friend's negative. First, 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." My friend tries to make it appear that the perfect rule there is all that is needed for salvation. Did his best, and about all the comfort that his brethren got out of the debate today was that he showed the Bible is the all sufficient and perfect rule of faith and practice. And then he says I turned right around and said, "No, we must have the Holy Spirit in conversion and conviction." There is absolutely no contradiction between the two statements. Why? Because the Bible is the all sufficient rule of faith and practice. The faith is what the Bible teaches. The Bible is the all sufficient rule of faith and practice, but that perfect rule of faith says the Spirit does something in addition to the word for us. Very well. That *Perfect Rule of Faith*, the Bible, says there are at least *eight other things used in the conversion of the sinner* besides the word of God and if *the* all sufficient rule is believed, I have to believe that these things are in addition to the word. There are eight other things and he may add more. No statement or reference was made by Professor Hardeman to these *nine things*. But the Bible is the all sufficient rule of faith and practice and it teaches me there are other things beside the word. The gospel together with

other things brings salvation, the other things in addition to the word have their part, so teaches the All-Sufficient and PERFECT rule of faith and practice.

In my debate with Aimee McPherson, I said that we did not need miracles anymore. Since we have the word we do not need the direct inspiration from God for God to speak to us or to inspire people now. We do not need that. We don't need to go around opening the eyes of the blind and raising the dead. Our all sufficient rule of faith and practice is thoroughly established now and the power for men to work miracles has passed away so says that PERFECT rule. The gift of miracles is a thing of the past, and we don't need it. I am maintaining that very same thing tonight. The gift of miracles was what I was debating with Aimee McPherson, or when men had the power to work miracles; and there is not one bit of difference between what I said then and the position I am taking tonight, none whatsoever.

So he says we ought to be very careful what we say lest we contradict it in another debate. I have not contradicted myself in debate; but suppose I had? What of it? I did not, but what if I did? I debated with Professor Hardeman about twenty-five years ago, and I have learned something since then, Professor Hardeman. Have you? I hope you learned something so that you may change your mind, my good friend, and if I had changed because of more thorough enlightenment, what would be wrong with that? The thing is, you should meet what I say *now*—that is the point. There is no contradiction between what I said then and what I say now. But even if there be a contradiction why not answer what I say now?

My friend gets all mixed up on the leadership of the Holy Spirit. After having taught the Bible for over thirty years, he doesn't seem to know the difference between the gift of the Holy Spirit and the operation or the work of the Spirit upon a sinner. My friend seemingly would not know the difference when a young man is influencing a young lady to accept him as her husband and that lady giving herself to him as his wife. Most men know the difference if they have tried it, and so the Holy Spirit works upon a

sinner but there is a big difference between that and the Holy Spirit coming into the life. No sinner is baptized by the Holy Spirit now; but sinners are *worked upon by the Holy Spirit*. My friend quoted some things about what the word does. The word brings enlightenment and the word begets and quickens; and the word cleanses the soul, and faith comes by hearing the word. I most heartily believe all this and there is no controversy between us there, but he says *word only*, and I say the word *plus about eight other things* laid down in the word of God. God gave the all sufficient rule of faith and practice and that all sufficient and perfect rule of faith teaches us that at least eight things in addition to the gospel are used in conversion of the sinner.

My friend criticized by saying that I said men and women were spiritually dead. The Bible says, 1 Tim. 5 and 6, "But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." She was not physically dead. Spiritually dead or else she was not dead at all. "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth!" That's everything my friend said.

I read from Acts 14: 27 where it says, "And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." What was it the Holy Spirit did? What was the door of faith? Rom. 10: 10: "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." The thing that believes is the heart and the door of faith was opened by the Holy Spirit to receive the truth. And then again I quoted from Acts 11: 21, "And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord." They preached to the Grecians and the "hand" of the Lord was with them. If the power or hand was with them, yet not needed, that is redundancy, that is surplus. My friend is an excellent teacher of English and a competent teacher of Greek. Would you be guilty of such surplusage and redundancy as that in speaking? If all the power is in the word that we preach, then why say "the hand of the Lord was with them"? If all the power is in the word then where does the "hand" come in? Something in addition! Well, my friend hasn't noticed that yet.

I call your attention to John 6: 44-46, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father." There is enabling power of the Lord. My friend asked the question: What if the Lord did not draw? In the very next verse, it says "all shall be taught of him." He draws by teaching, of course—he draws giving them enabling power thereafter. He is no respecter of persons and if "I be lifted up . . . will draw all men" unto me. If sinners are not drawn then undoubtedly they will die and go to hell. But God takes the initiative. He draws. God wants you saved, but you will find when too late that God did want you saved, but you cannot be drawn by any power then. Now here in 2 Tim. 2: 13, "If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself." The Holy Spirit comes and works upon the heart and results in belief of the truth. There is both the work of the Spirit and the belief of the truth in the salvation of the soul.

Here is one that I didn't give this afternoon, 1 Thess. 1: 5: "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost." If all power is in the word then why say "also in power, and in the Holy Ghost"? You cannot use the conjunction "and" with a thing if that was the only thing. Very well, I call your attention one more time to those *nine things* my friend did not have time to reach. Perhaps he will reach them in his next speech. He will have no right to bring them in his last speech, for no new matter can be brought into his last speech. 2 Cor. 6: 3-7. "By pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left." These *nine things* that are used in the salvation of the soul, but my friend says there is only one thing, and that is the word. He didn't get to it.

If all the power is in the word why this verse? Mark 12: 24: "And Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not

therefore err, because ye know not the scriptures, neither the power of God?" The record will show that he in no way tried to answer that. If all the power is in the word, why such redundancy? He says do you not know the scripture is the written power of God? Suppose I say you don't know my friend Harper *nor* my friend Kesner; you don't know my friend Tant, *neither* Harper. There you see two things. Know not the scripture, *neither* the power of God. There is bound to be something there besides the word.

I want to call attention to some particular things. I want my friend to be sure to notice them in his next speech. In the final reply you will hear all that is to be said. Acts 19: 13-16, I read where certain ones undertook to cast out devils by calling over them the name of the Lord Jesus, exactly the same words that Paul used, and here is how it reads, "Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth. And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, which did so. And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know: but who are ye? And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded." Now Paul commanded the evil spirit to come out and he came out. They did not come out for these other men for the power was not in the word Paul used. Why could not these men, using the *very same words*, cast out the devils? You *cannot argue the devil out of a man*, nor can you talk it out of him; the power is not in mere words. You may use the very words of God and there won't be the power of God that goes with it. That is an illustration that something besides the word is used in the salvation of the soul.

2 Cor. 3: 3, "Forasmuch as 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 in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." These Corinthians were epistles. How were those epistles written by Paul; who administered? He was the pen. What was the ink? The Spirit. And just as the ink touches the paper in order

to write, and that is why the Spirit, in order for these Corinthians to become the epistles of Christ, touched them. He said, "Bring your fountain pen tonight and show us." The fountain pen is a recent invention. The pen in Paul's day was a goose quill. The ink did not go through the pen, but the pen and the ink went together, not one *through* the other but one *with* the other. The fountain pen is a modern invention. It is the ink of the Holy Spirit that touched the heart of the Corinthians and they became the epistles of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Time called.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Negative*, Third Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is certainly fine to see such a splendid audience assembled and to note the interest which characterizes your hearing of all that has been said. I want, first of all, to reply to the long list of questions presented by Dr. Bogard, and in the exact order of their presentation. The questions were written out and read, and, though such questions are often asked simply to waste the time of one's opponent, I shall answer every one. I think it in order that I read the answers to those questions so that the matter may be handled in the most orderly manner possible. I refer to the questions by number and the answer to that question follows in like order. Now for the questions:

1. The Holy Spirit is in the body, the church.
2. He operates through the word in comforting and convicting.
3. No, he does something—he influences by means of the word.
4. No, it is not in addition to the word. It is by it.
5. Yes, in the manner ordained by the Lord.
6. To save them through the word.
7. No, it is through it.
8. Yes.
9. Through his providence he will help.
10. No, it is in harmony with the Spirit.

11. Yes.
12. Yes.
13. Yes.
14. That the gospel might be preached to them.
15. No, nothing except as the Spirit directed.
16. 17. The Spirit always uses the person or soldier to use the weapon—the weapon is never distinct from the one handling it.
18. Always using the word, the sword of the Spirit.
19. No. The conversation or lives have been influenced by the word.
20. Only by means of the word.

Thus you have the answers to all the questions submitted today.

I am a little bit surprised at Dr. Bogard's suggestion regarding Dr. Grime of Lebanon, who used to be in Texas, and who has ever been regarded as an outstanding Baptist. However, he possibly stated about all that could be done under such circumstances—he must needs reduce the weight of his testimony some way. I wonder how Dr. Grime will feel about the statements made.

Now I have quoted the teaching in question from the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, from the New Hampshire Confession, from the leading teacher in the Louisville Seminary, from Dr. Boyce, from Dr. Grime, and lastly, from Dr. Graves, Elder Bogard has a perfect right to deny all that these records present and to say that these men are all wrong and not representative Baptists! But just in anticipation of his refusal to accept what these books and Baptists say, I brought here a volume called "The Baptist Waybook." Dr. Bogard is the writer of it, and it teaches exactly the same thing—but probably he will also discard himself as a representative Baptist, along with the others. On page 83, article 7, Dr. Bogard has this to say: "We believe that in order to be saved, sinners must be regenerated or born again, that regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind: that it is effected in a manner above our comprehension by the power of the Holy Spirit, in connection with divine truth, so as to secure our voluntary obedience to the

gospel: and that its proper evidence appears in the holy fruits of repentance and faith and newness of life.”

Now the first point in that is that regeneration gives a holy disposition to the mind—it takes the regeneration for one to get ready to repent and believe. Secondly, the holy fruits are repentance and faith, the same following the regeneration. If this is not pre-regeneration, it means nothing. Now look at it: First, there is the regeneration—a good tree made out of corrupt sinners; and then there must be the new birth, and after the tree is formed quite independently of the word of God, you may look for the fruit. There is an interval of time between the tree’s becoming good and the bearing of fruit, and hence the fruit is an after affair. Now then I raise a point: What are the fruits? Answer—Repentance and Faith. Suppose that man passes out of existence after being born again and before he bears the fruit of repentance and faith, what have you? Now watch—born again, saved; without repentance and faith, condemned! Hence, you will either have a regenerated soul in hell or a man in heaven who has neither repented nor believed. Now Dr. Bogard, I wonder if you will accept yourself as a representative Baptist—that is what you teach along with those others with whom you find fault. If that isn’t pre-regeneration, what is it?

Now I come again to the matter of prayers being answered, which question has been raised several times by him. I am calling attention again to his own discussion of the matter in the Bogard-McPherson Debate, which was a very unfortunate discussion for Dr. Bogard, because “when a man has a debate with one man, he should be very careful or else he might contradict himself.” It is a pretty state of affairs, because you amuse me in calling her “dear Aimee.” Now, Dr. Bogard, you answer your own question in respect to prayer. You reason that we should pray for bread but that we should work with our hands to bring answer to that prayer—that we visit those in need to answer our prayers for them. Why, certainly, pray for bread—then you go to work, you furnish the hoe and put the elbow grease to it (put the power back of it) and I just want to know if Dr. Bogard insists or means to imply that God by miraculous

means gives us the bread as a result of such effort? You pray for the sick of malaria, and then you give them quinine, the Peruvian bark from which it is made having been supplied of God—and do you mean to teach that God steps in and cures the sick apart from and without the influence of the medicine? If so, what is the use of giving the medicine at all? Does God visit the fatherless and widows with physical needs separate and apart from the kindness of those who render them service? Well, when we pray for a sinner, we do the same thing—we pray for him, and then we go to work with all the wisdom and strength we possess, and, guided by the word of God, we point him to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Now that's not something pretty near like it—that's it! Just as God gives us bread! Just as he heals the sick! Just as he blesses the poor! Now I want him to tell us if that is miraculous. Every time we get a biscuit, is that a miracle? The hungry are fed, the sick get well, the sinner is saved—but by the ordained means of God. Talk about contradictions! This is one in the "nth" degree. Dear Doctor, you are meeting yourself coming back. In 1934 you were headed one way, and in 1938 you are headed in exactly the opposite direction. And whether you are meeting yourself coming back or not, you ought to try to meet that argument in a more acceptable manner. Friends, there is no escape when a man puts down a thing after that fashion and then later tries to evade it. It is not weakness on his part—he is struggling with all the power of his might. It is the weakness of his doctrine—it cannot be sustained.

When you pray for bread, is a miracle performed in answer to it? Does God step outside the bounds of established laws to bring it to pass? Certainly not! When we pray for a sinner, does God step outside the bounds of his divine will to answer it—or does he, as his will teaches, use the medium, his word, to bring about the answer to the prayer. You cannot evade the force of that. Dr. Bogard says God accomplishes these things through established means. What does his proposition say? In conversion, it is accomplished "direct." What does direct mean? The immediate. What does

immediate mean? *Without* means! If that is not a plain open-and-shut case of direct contradiction and thoroughly faulty, then reason has lost its balance.

Now to the reference from Peter's writing relative to the wives "without the word" converting their husbands. I do not wish to burden the book with too much repetition, and I have already answered this, but will give it attention again briefly. The Bible distinctly teaches that the woman, in case her husband has failed to hear the word, may by her manner of life and by her chaste life so influence him that he will become a Christian. But how was she converted? How did she come to develop godly conversation? How did she build a chaste life? By the guidance of the word! It was and is the word operating through her that influences him! He is but seeing a sermon instead of hearing one! God is but using the word in an earthen vessel—it is the same means, the word, and there is nothing unusual or miraculous about it. The husband was not attracted by the word until he saw her really live it. This cannot be misunderstood.

I am still amused at my friend, on Rom. 1: 16, where it is stated that the gospel is "*the* power" or God's power "unto salvation." He thinks he has something great in that *the*, the definite article, is not in the original. I just wonder if Dr. Bogard knows anything about the possessive case. Suppose I say, "That is Dr. Bogard's head." Then, I say, "That is *the* head of Dr. Bogard." Have you another head? That is Bogard's nose, or that is *the* nose of Bogard. Why, it is purely a matter of grammar. The gospel is God's power. Or it is the power of God. All right, that is your direct possessive—and the prepositional phrase meaning the very same thing. I would recommend that he devote a little study to simple English.

But let me cite Dr. Bogard again. I am glad that he had his debates put in book form. In his discussion with "dear Aimee," on page 21 and again on page 29, he has much to say on 2 Tim. 3: 15-17. The scripture is plain and Dr. Bogard well interprets it. Hear him: "And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

All scripture is given by inspiration, . . . is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Now then, if, as Dr. Bogard urges in this debate, the word of God completely or thoroughly furnishes us unto every good work—and EVERY GOOD WORK is spelled out in boxcar letters—how then is something in addition to this scripture needed? You say Paul had the word; yes, and he had the Spirit also, and yet he says the scripture will furnish completely unto every good work. Dr. Bogard, what about a man that will one time contend that the word is all sufficient, and will then turn around and say that it isn't? Thou art the man! To you, now, the Bible is not a perfect rule! Back yonder in that debate, 1934, it was. There is something wrong somewhere.

Now note, ladies and gentlemen, there (indicating Bogard) is a man who teaches that a man can't be converted without a miracle. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." (Jer. 13: 23.) He thinks something has to be done for the sinner before repentance and faith. But does he believe in miracles? Well, I hardly think so—just let him get in a debate with Aimee McPherson again, and he will not. In that connection he argues that those who use miracles or expect miracles to be used show that they do not believe the Bible. The Ethiopian and the leopard are types of the sinner, he insists here in this discussion, and I just wonder: Do you believe that miracles are performed in conversion and thus show that you do not believe the Bible? Then he further says that to demand miracles represents the "difference between the people of the devil and God's people." He demands miracles, and, by his own argument, you can see what class that puts him in. I didn't put him there—he put himself there. He is the one who would demand miracles in conversion. See Warlick Debate, p. 12.

Well let's pass to where he says "meet me *now* on that issue." I think I have been reading some good things on that matter, and I am hoping and praying earnestly that I

may note even more changes toward the truth and that I may learn some things as we both go along life's way. He urges the "leadership" of the Holy Spirit. I simply read from his book along that line. "This stated what the apostles did and taught. (McPherson, p. 76.) How sinners believed and became Christians. How to live a Christian." "All this is written in the New Testament for our guidance. Therefore, when we hear the teaching of the New Testament, we hear the Spirit speaking to us." What is that? It is God's Spirit operating. How? Through the New Testament. "And when we obey what it teaches then we are walking after the Spirit, saved and sanctified." That is leadership, operation, and there is the result. Saved and sanctified by the Spirit. What is the medium? The New Testament.

But have you noticed one thing—not a single, solitary passage has the man quoted, or will he quote, that is even a relative to an imitation of the Spirit of God operating separate and distinct from the word—upon the heart of the sinner. That thing cannot be found—if it could, he would find it; but that thing is sadly lacking in all of God's book.

Such an expression as "spiritually dead" is not in the Bible. The passage he had in mind refers only to widows—that is, she is "dead while she liveth." The Bible does not say "spiritually dead." We are dead in trespasses or sins—that is the way the book talks, and why on earth can he not learn it?

But again: He says, "The hand of the Lord was with them." That is true, but can you not see that the hand of the Lord was with the *preacher* and not the *sinner*? We are talking about the conversion of sinners, not the guidance of preachers. Dr. Bogard will have to find a scripture that shows the Lord's hand to be on the sinner. "And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." (Acts 14: 27.) "And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord." (Acts 11: 21.) All that misses the mark far, and does not in the least substantiate his proposition.

“The gospel came not in word only.” That verse was given to correct a false impression the Thessalonians had. Paul wanted them to know the Spirit operated with the word. It was not word only—there was power back of that word.

In reference to the “nine point program,” I may say: My reason for paying no attention to it is that it misses the mark. Our proposition is that the Holy Spirit operates directly— independently of the word—on the sinner in conversion. To show that something co-operates in influencing is beside the point. Just let him name even one passage where the Holy Spirit operates on the heart of a sinner independent of, separate from, distinct and apart from, and in addition to the word, and then we will feel obligated to give an abundance of time to it. He said this afternoon that the word and the Spirit were never apart. Well, then, that means they are always together. But listen to his next statement: “They are conjoined, yet distinct.” They are together yet separated. Dr. Bogard, you ought to know that you can have no such arrangement—together and apart all at the same time. Conjoined and distinct are opposite terms, and when you add “from” to distinct, as you do, then you have them a long way from each other. Now that thing needs your attention immediately, if you can see the point.

He makes ado about “you do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.” (Matt. 22: 29.) He says “nor” indicates something additional. Certainly God has power—in and through the word. Anyone who knows the Bible at all knows that Jesus was talking of God’s power as respects the resurrection—they didn’t know the teaching of God, and they did not comprehend the power back of his word. Now that’s all there is to that.

It is amusing to me, the turn that Dr. Bogard takes on 2 Cor. 3: 2, 3, regarding the disciples’ being “epistle written in our hearts.” Why, he says, they didn’t have fountain pens back then. That is true, but what has that to do with it? I want to read the statement and make a request: “Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men: forasmuch as 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." Now note: The Corinthians were the epistle; the heart of the apostles was the paper; the Spirit is compared to ink. What happened? The Holy Spirit, Christ being the writer, operated by or through the apostles to make Christians. And those Christians were "read of all men." It was the work of the apostles. Now I know they used goose quills or something like them. Whatever it was, I want Dr. Bogard to illustrate how the pen could operate without the ink, or the ink without the pen. Did they not operate together? You miss the entire point on that scripture. Paul means to say: "You Corinthians, by your life and conduct, become as epistles stamped on our hearts." But Dr. Bogard would lead you to think that the sinner's heart was the paper, and the Holy Spirit a peculiar sort of ink that would write by itself—independently of means! I want to say that you can examine every verse in the Bible, under the reign of the Holy Spirit, and there is not a single, solitary, case where the Spirit operated distinct or away from the word. On that memorable day of Pentecost, when the apostles were baptized in the Spirit, Peter spake—it was the Spirit speaking through him!—and the Spirit operated on the hearts of thousands of hearers by means of words! He told the story of Jesus and convinced those Jews that they had by wicked hands crucified the Lord Jesus. When they heard such preaching, they desired to know what should be done. Again the Spirit operates, but through the spokesman; and again by means of words! You can't get away from those means.

In Acts 3: 12-26 we have another sermon. The Spirit is again operating; and again through a preacher, using words as a medium. The case, next in order, is that of the eunuch. The Spirit had a part, but his operation was confined to the evangelist Philip. Philip preached "Jesus" unto that Ethiopian, and it changed him, and yet there was no miracle so far as he was concerned—just an ordinary conversion. It was the word preached and believed and obeyed. That's all. In Samaria, when they believed the things concerning the kingdom of God which Philip preached, they were baptized, both men and women. The Spirit did operate, but through whom? By what means? You cannot fail to see that. Dr.

Bogard cannot find, nor can any other Baptist preacher, where the Spirit ever operated on the sinner's heart distinct from the word. O, he might say, "Saul of Tarsus had direct contact with the Spirit." Though it was Christ who appeared to him, suppose we grant that it was a direct contact—it was not for the purpose of bringing immediate salvation, else he was saved that very moment. Yet he was told to go to a certain place where he would be told "what thou must do." Hence, the Spirit used the medium of words, as is always true.

Now we might pass through every case of conversion, and the result would be always the same. And if he endorses the statement that he made back in 1934, on page 86 of the Bogard-McPherson Debate, as to what the apostles taught, how sinners heard and believed and became Christians, how Christian living was taught by the same method, then he must agree with what we have here presented. Now, Dr. Bogard, do you endorse the next statement in this connection—you made it, and you should endorse it. "When we hear the teaching of the New Testament, we hear the Spirit speaking to us" and "when we obey what it teaches, we walk after the Spirit." That's your teaching, and I beg you give answer to my arguments and to your own teaching in 1934.

Only a few minutes remain for review of things already stated. There is not a single step taken by any man from the time he decides to leave the cold, bleak world of sin until he enters the door that stands ajar, but said step is effected either directly or indirectly by the word of God. These steps to heaven are not blank or dark steps—each one is effected by the word of God. The Spirit does his part, and he, as always, uses as a medium of contact the word of God which is "able to make one wise unto salvation" and to thoroughly furnish everyone unto every good work. Our difference is not that of whether the Spirit does or does not operate—it is whether he operates outside the realm of God's will or in harmony with it. I know the man doesn't live who can find a single passage where the Spirit operates distinct—away—from the blessed word, or where there is the slightest intimation of an isolated span or distance inter-

vening between the Holy Spirit's work and that of the word. It simply is not in God's book, and it is futile to fight against God. "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul!" If one needs sanctification, "sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." If we would be free from sin, the law of Christ makes us so. (Rom. 8: 2.) If you want a man saved, let him receive the engrafted word. It is God's power. This is my watch (indicating a watch in his hand). It is the watch of mine! It is God's power—the power of God. Thus you have the truth before you. And I thank you.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

BEN M. BOGARD, *Affirmative*, Fourth Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

While it is fresh on your minds, I just as well have that matter of Rom. 1: 16 settled in our minds. My friend says it is merely a matter of grammar. Now let me read it exactly as it is given in the King James Version, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Certainly it is possessive case for it is God's power unto salvation, possessive case. What has that to do with the *definite* article? Now listen, let me read it exactly as it is in the Greek: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ it is ('gar') for power of God" to salvation, not *The* power. *The definite article is not there.* Now he says it is the possessive case. Yes, it is possessive case, but it is not the definite article. Let me read it now: "For it is for (gar) power of God." He said that is "Bogard's head." Have you got another? I have not another. One head is enough to handle him with. But if you say that is Bogard's hand, I certainly would have another. I have one head, enough to know that "gar" is not "to" in Greek. If you do not know it, the dictionary will tell you so, and the Greek lexicon is right downstairs in our schoolroom. It is "gar." All of you can't see this but I will write it on the board in English here. Now that word "gar" means *for*. The Greek word "to" means *THE*. My friend will not deny

it. So it reads: I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, in the possessive case, it is for power of God. The gospel is used for power. If it had said *The* power it would have been *the only* power, and if that had been said, it would have contradicted dozens of other scriptures, and you can't make scripture contradict scripture. No scripture is of "private" interpretation, and you must interpret scripture by scripture. If this word "*gar*" does not mean *the*, then read it like the Bible says it. I read where there were *nine things* that were used in the salvation of the soul. But friend Hardeman says there is only one. Who said it? My friend Hardeman. If we are going to take his word for it, he has won this debate. If we take God's word for it, I have won. He gets up and says, "Well now, I didn't answer Bogard on certain things because it didn't have anything to do with the subject." Bogard says it does have something to do with it. It is my word against his. Now let these people decide. I read plainly that there are *nine things*, named them by number, and they will go down in the book, that he has said nothing in reply to it. We will let the people decide whether it did or not and I am perfectly willing to leave it to them.

My friend asks, "Do you endorse the statement on page 86 of the Bogard-McPherson Debate?" I do most heartily. I am like the fellow that got a check and went to the bank to cash it. The cashier told him he must endorse it. He wrote on the back of it, "I most heartily endorse this check." That is why I most heartily endorse this statement. Let me read it again, so that you will be sure to get it.

"What the apostles taught and did, how sinners heard and believed and became Christians, how Christians should live is written in the New Testament for our guidance for we are to observe the same teaching. Therefore, when we hear the teaching of the New Testament we hear the Spirit speaking to us. We walk after the Spirit and are led by the Spirit and are the children of God, saved and sanctified."

Do you endorse it most heartily? We do not now receive *one particle of teaching direct from the Holy Spirit*, for the age of miracles is passed. There is nobody inspired today. *All the instruction that we ever get is written in the New Testament*, but when I read the instructions written in the

New Testament I find that by those instructions there are *nine different things* that go into the work that leads the soul to Christ. My friend says there is *only one!* Certainly we don't need any further instructions. We have all that we need in the New Testament. The age of miracles is passed; no man has the power to work miracles today. Must God speak to Professor Hardeman to convince him the Bible is true when it mentions eight things in addition to the word?

May I make you a little speech on miracles? Miracles began when Jesus turned water into wine. Miracles ended when forty years were passed as foretold by Micah, the prophet. In the same length of time the Israelites were coming out of Egypt, he shall "show unto us wonderful things." (Mic. 7: 15.) How long? Forty years! The only time when anybody ever worked miracles in New Testament times. There were Old Testament miracles. The power for man to work miracles has nothing to do with the ordinary work of God. If you say that all extraordinary power is a miracle then man himself is a miracle. The sun as it goes through heaven is a miracle. The lifting up of my hand would be a miracle, for divine power holds it up. No human being can explain it. No doctor on earth can explain it. The very fact that I can see you is a miracle in that sense. God's ordinary work has gone on all through the ages. Regeneration of the soul is the ordinary work of God, just as the sun shines in the heavens is the ordinary work of God. He was talking about my debate with Aimee McPherson where Mrs. McPherson said if God answered prayers, would my praying be heard? *God does answer prayer and it is not a miracle* when he does. There is quite a difference between answered prayer and a miracle. Peter said, "Rise up and walk. And he leaping up stood, and walked." That is the kind of miracle I was discussing with Mrs. McPherson. Hence no contradiction between what I said then and what I say now. My friend denies that God will hear you when you pray. My friend doesn't think prayer changes things. My friend thinks that there is nothing in the world that God will do about it. He thinks you should work out the thing for yourself. I take quinine for malaria, but I want the doctor to be a prayerful doctor as

well as use the right medicine. God hears prayer and blesses the means, and when he does he *does something besides the means*, and in addition to the means used. My friend denies it all. He tries to make a kind of trade with God. If God will do something, if God will do so much, and he'll get all right provided —. His is "*maybe*," mine is *real*.

Now to the next; it is my last speech on this proposition. I read where the "hand" of the Lord was with them when they preached. They preached and the hand of the Lord was with them. If I say I preach and stamp my feet, would I not be doing something besides preaching? Today we *speak* and *pray* and is that not something else? Well the apostles preached and the "hand of God was with them." Was that not something else? What is the matter with a man who cannot see that they preached and the "hand of the Lord," something in addition, was with them? "There is nothing but the word" and "the word only," says my friend. God said there was something else. Now he comes to my Baptist Waybook, since I said I wouldn't take Brother Grime as an authority. I love the dear old soul; he is a great and good man, and nothing I say is through disrespect of Brother Grime. But does "Bogard indorse Bogard?" You heard this today and the record will show it. You quoted from Bogard's Baptist Waybook on page 83, the Baptist Waybook. Here is what he correctly read, "The evidence of salvation is shown in the Holy Fruits of repentance and faith." If you can find any Baptist on earth who does not believe that, I would like to give you a reward. I stated that we believe what is in the Baptist Waybook. What are the fruits of repentance and faith? What fruit do repentance and faith produce? They produce the fruit of a good life. Repentance and faith *produce obedience*. Repentance and faith *cause one to do what God says*. With repentance and faith then he has the fruit in his life of doing what God says, among other things, *baptism and faithfulness to the cause of Jesus Christ*. The man who has the repentance and faith has the fruits of repentance and faith. I don't charge you with undertaking unfairly to meet me on this, but will you please understand that I meant what I

wrote. Repentance and faith *are not fruits but produce fruits*, and when we see, the fruit of repentance and faith that is evidence that we have passed from death unto life. And we will have some more of that when we get on the subject of baptism tomorrow. These things all dovetail together, as it were. When you pray for bread, does God use miraculous power to give bread? No, but God uses his ordinary power in addition to your work to give bread.

I was out in Texas holding a meeting after a terrible drouth. I preached how God gave us all things. A man said: "I don't believe what you preached on that. I have to work like a mule for what I get. How is it that God gives to some and not to others?" I asked, "Did you not cultivate your corn?" The man answered: "I did. I laid that corn by in good shape." "Why then did you not raise corn?" "The drouth killed it," he said. I thought you said that God had nothing to do with it. You can work your hands off, but unless God adds his blessing, you will starve to death; so pray, preach, and sing, and unless God's power comes in addition to what you do, you will never produce any results in salvation of souls.

Why use "for" power of God? Because those are the exact Greek words, the gospel is for power of God, the gospel *for* power of God to salvation to everyone that believeth. I am not afraid to stand on my part of the ground. I am talking here in the presence of one of the best Greek scholars on the face of the earth. He doesn't dare to contradict that translation, Dr. J. L. Guthrie, who taught four years in the Jackson, Tennessee, Union University, and he reads Greek and Hebrew as freely as most of us read English. I know what I am talking about, and Professor Hardeman will not contradict it. This possessive case suggestion doesn't help him a bit.

Now I come to the questions, my friend's answers to my questions. First do you believe that the Holy Spirit is in the world today? He says, "No, he is in the body," but Jesus said I will send the Comforter and he will *abide with you and they were in the world*. If he abides with them, he is in the body and in the world also. The Holy Spirit does not do anything? He is with the body. Very good, if he

does nothing, then he is just an interested spectator. He is not even doing his works through the word. But strange to say *you didn't find a passage where anything was said about the Holy Spirit working through the word*. It is not in the Bible. The Spirit is *with* the word, but *not one time through* the word. It is not true in the first place, if so, then Professor Hardeman would have found it. Both work jointly yet distinctly. "How in the world can they be jointly and yet distinctly?" Well, well, well! Two men are log-rolling, each one of them lifting a log. It takes both of them to lift the log. The two men working together! So when the word and the Spirit work together they lift the burden off the sinner and he is saved. They are distinct and yet work together, not separate and apart, not one handling one stick and one another stick, but both working with the *same hand stick and the same log at the same time*. Certainly Professor Hardeman can understand that.

The Holy Spirit answers your prayer—what does he do? Do you ever pray for the Holy Spirit to save sinners? Well, well, well! He says he expects it to go through *his providences*. If so, then the *providence of God comes in addition* to the word. You pray for God to save sinners. What does God do? He fixes providences and influences sinners—is that not *something in addition to the word*? Professor Hardeman, you cannot get out of it. Something besides the word. The heavens declare the glory of God, but you know even the heavens can't bring sinners to repentance by proclaiming God. Must be something in addition to the word. Well, we will try another. No. 10. If you do not pray, does the Holy Spirit bless your preaching; and if you pray to him, does he answer? If he doesn't bless your preaching and does nothing to help your preaching, is not your preaching Spiritless? No, it is not Spiritless, he says. It has the Spirit in it, and there is something in addition to the word. My! my! do you pray like Paul for the Holy Spirit to open the door for your utterance? He says "yes." Well, if Paul needed such help, don't you need it? He says "yes." If *he already had the door open to him through the word*, what was he praying for? That they might be saved, that the gospel might bring peace to them. Praying that the gospel

might be preached to them. If God answers prayer and influences somebody who, is preaching, won't there be *something in addition to the word*? You cannot get out of it, and the more he tries to answer it, the worse it gets with him. Next question: If God did anything to answer prayer, what was it, and whatever it was, was it not something in addition to the word? He answered "no." In other words, if God arranges his providence so sinners are saved, fixes it so that everything would be favorable, there still won't be anything but the preaching. Now if he does not cross himself on this, I am not here.

His answer is nothing only as the Spirit directs. Well bless my soul, that is what Ben M. Bogard says—*something can be done in addition to the word* if the Spirit directs. Why, Professor Hardeman, I do not know what to think of you. Come take two years' course in our Missionary Baptist Institute and learn something about the Bible. His honest judgment is as honest as it can be, but I asked these questions for the purpose of getting him in that mess. Did you ever hear of a sword killing an enemy by itself? The soldier and the sword never separate. In other words, the sword has power and the one who uses it has power, the distinct power in the arm of the soldier, the distinct power in the sword, the *two distinct powers brought together kill the enemy*, and the Bible says that the gospel is God's sword. Very well. When I preach, that preaching is the sword, and the Holy Spirit takes that preaching (that sword) and reading of the Bible (the sword) and tears down opposition. If preaching is the sword and the Bible being read is the sword, is it not necessary that the Spirit actually use the sword if the sinner is convicted and converted? Answer "no." Well, gentlemen, then the sword can kill a man by itself without any power being exercised with it. Do you believe the Holy Spirit actually touches the heart of the sinner? He answers "only through the word." If it goes through the word, it does not actually touch the heart at all. Only an influence like the influence of a young man who writes a letter to a young lady friend. There is power in the letter, but if he brings himself there and takes her by the hand and holds her hand while he talks, there is a distinct power in addi-

tion to anything he says. My friend said that when he held her hand, wasn't that the means? Perhaps so, but bless your soul, if he wasn't touching her, I do not know the reason why. At least the young man touched her and she felt like she was being touched and the touch of that hand had more weight than the talk.

When W. J. Bryan spoke, he was present, and his presence added power to his words. There was more if that great man was present than those words would have if simply read. My friend doesn't believe that power is there in that sense at all. As a young man writing a letter to a young lady friend, his *personal influence not there*, not touching her at all; not holding her hand at all, but only long distance courtship, so to speak, and influences her by letter, so is Professor Hardeman's idea of the influence of the Holy Spirit.

I want to read again and see what we can find here that my friend is seemingly unable to cope with. I want to call attention to these things I read to you a while ago, *eight things besides the word*. 2 Cor. 6: 6, 7. Professor Hardeman said, "It has nothing to do with the subject." Let me read it: "By pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness," these are *the nine things* that the apostle Paul says are used in the salvation of the soul. Let me read them. Pureness first, knowledge second, long-suffering third, fourth by the Holy Ghost, fifth love, sixth the word of truth, seventh the power of God, eighth the armour of righteousness, and my friend said not one solitary thing is used except the word of truth. When you, over on the other side, meet Paul, just ask him, "What did you put that in the Bible for?" Paul said there were *nine things* that enter into the salvation of the soul, where Hardeman said that there is only one thing and that is the word of truth. Paul, you have the word among eight other things, and, Paul, you ought not to have done it for that spoils Professor Hardeman's doctrine. The Bible is right when it says not only the word, but by the Spirit, so I have abundantly proved the proposition.

1 Thess. 1: 5, "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost." That

is Baptist doctrine that I am teaching tonight. My time is just about up, no time to add a new argument, for I won't have a chance to reply to his reply. I want you to give careful attention to Professor Hardeman's discussion of the "divine touch," the *hand of God is upon all of them who seek him*. If you have never felt that divine touch, you had better get it or you will be lost on resurrection day. May God help you do so. May his word reach your heart and souls be saved as a result of this debate. My friends, I thank you.

Time called.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Negative*, Fourth Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

You have been exceedingly patient through our discussion and I trust this last thirty minutes may be just as profitable to you as it is possible. I am glad, indeed, to call attention again to some of the things said by Dr. Bogard. However honest he may be, he misses far the issue of the proposition and the truth regarding it. It just shows what a false doctrine will do for one.

It is pitiable to think on the reply intended to be given on Rom. 1: 16. "I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation." He says, "Why, *the* is not in the original—it is 'gar' instead of 'to'—'gar' gospel!" "Gar" is not a modifier of power—it is not "for power." "Gar" goes with ashamed. "I am not ashamed *for!*" For what? For it, the gospel, is power! It is God's power—it is *the* power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes it. Dr. Bogard, I appreciate your invitation to come over to the Missionary Baptist Institute and take a course with you, but I would suggest that you come over to Freed-Hardeman College and take a real course in simple English grammar. The Lord knows you need it. Ladies and gentlemen, what do you think of a man's endeavoring to deal so fully with the Greek, talking about "gar" and "dunamis," and then saying "appropos" when it is apropos? Then he makes gross errors in the common everyday English, the language of our own

tongues. The word *for*—translated from “gar”—belongs with ashamed, not power. I am not ashamed, *for* it is God’s power (possessive case). It is really “the power of God.” Here we have nominative and objective. “The power of God” is equal to “God’s power.” The head of Bogard—Bogard’s head! There is no possessive case in “the power of God.” Yet, change it to possessive and you do not alter its meaning. If my friend would first learn his mother tongue, he would then have less time to get lost while fooling with Greek words. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation and Dr. Bogard has failed to prove it otherwise.

I listened again, carefully, to his nine-point program and it reminded me of the fellow who had seventeen reasons for not buying a suit of clothes. One was, that he did not have the money, and he said there was no use mentioning the other sixteen. Suppose he proves his nine-point program and that all nine of these things co-operate in bringing salvation to the sinner. Has he proved his point—that the Holy Spirit operates independently of all the others? Has he proved that the word of God is not the means by which salvation is accomplished? Elder Bogard has failed to offer one solitary instance in all the Bible where the Spirit operates upon the heart of the sinner distinct from, in addition to, the word of God. Until he finds a passage that teaches that the Spirit influences apart from the word, God’s established means of contact, there is no use talking about other things not apropos to the occasion.

Did you notice how he read along and made prominent the absolute absence of a reasonable refutation on 2 Cor. 3: 3—about the “goose quill” and “ink” application to the “word” and the “Spirit”? Dr. Bogard, why didn’t you get a pen or quill or something and illustrate to this audience how the ink could write separate and apart from the instrument? It is my conviction that if I ever have an opportunity of meeting him again in debate, there will be no goose quills in it? Now look at the passage: The writing was done in the hearts of the apostles—“in *our* hearts”—and he tries to make it the heart of a sinner! Those Corinthians were the fruit of the labor of the apostles’ hands—they

were shining examples of true Christianity! There is absolutely no intimation—not the slightest—that in this connection their becoming Christians was even thought of. “Ye are” our epistles. So the application that he makes of the passage misses far the mark again. It is not connected with the doctrine he advocates.

Now he uses an illustration to prove that the Spirit and the word work together. Why, he says, it is like two men rolling logs. One gets on one side and the other on the other, and together they go. Now look at that thing: The Spirit operates distinctly, so Bogard says, but he has, even in that application, the word working with the Spirit. Hence, it is not by itself; not away from the word. And remember the log is between them—I wondered what that log represented! Does the Spirit operate on the side of Satan or on the side with God’s word? Think of it! Here I am on one side of the log, and I represent the word. Bogard is on the other side and he represents the Spirit. Then I have the truth, but no Spirit in me. He has the Spirit, but no truth in him! Don’t you see the fallacious reasoning of that? Then talk about its being “apropos to” your proposition. It just won’t suit at all.

Now back to the subject of prayer again. I believe in prayer as much as anyone. It is impossible for one to live the Christian life without prayer just as it is impossible to live the physical life without breathing. Certainly, I pray that God Almighty may see to it that his word may have free course and be glorified. I read again from Dr. Bogard’s own book for further emphasis on this vital point. He says, “Will he sometimes heal in answer to prayer? Yes, just exactly as he gives bread to the hungry in answer to prayer; the sick get well and the hungry are fed in answer to prayer, but both are done by the use of means and not by miraculous power.” Now that’s plain, and Bogard said it. I pray, therefore, that God may use his means that sinners may be saved. And yet Dr. Bogard says, “Can the leopard change his spots?” and makes that apply to a change of heart also. Why that passage would be better on the subject of apostasy that we shall discuss later. And when I asked him about the first negro, what did he say? Nothing.

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin?" We are not studying ethnology, the science which treats of races and peoples. As Ben Franklin says: "Larger ships may venture more, but smaller boats (like you and me) should stay near shore." That thing is loaded, Dr. Bogard, and you will get into serious trouble if you fool with it. You don't believe the skin or the spots can be changed without a miracle, and yet you say the new birth is not a miracle. You'd better take one side or the other.

You try to say, "If the word of God is the means of conversion then there is no connection with prayer." You are wrong—the word is the means of contact and any other scriptural forces, no matter how many you might find, operate with, through, or by that means. This position does not discourage prayer—no more than, as he has himself urged, the use of means for the sick discourages prayer for the sick. We should take everything to God in prayer! In Bogard's own words (McPherson Debate), "when we pray for the poor we should take our prayers along in a basket and pour it out in the pantry of the poor." All right, Dr. Bogard, when we pray for the sinner, we should take along the means of salvation and "pour it out" so to speak in his heart. Do you believe what you argue? We should pray for daily bread, but there is no miracle. God gives it through the operation of physical laws. God answers our prayer, and Dr. Bogard says that isn't a miracle. The law of the Lord respecting the sick, according to Bogard, is that we should pray for them, but since "God made Peruvian bark from which quinine comes and quinine kills the malaria germs, we should pray for the one sick of malaria and then give quinine, God's remedy for malaria." When the sick get well, we do not call that a miracle. All right. Pray for the sinner, and then give him God's means, the gospel, and he will be saved, and without a miracle. We can pray that we be protected from smallpox, but we must be vaccinated—God's means of prohibition! Pray, and then submit to the doctor's orders. How foolish to pray for bread and expect God to shower manna from heaven. How foolish to pray for the sick and expect God to perform a miracle. How foolish to pray for a sinner and expect God to save him

outside of established means. Pray for the sin-sick and weary, and then preach the gospel of Christ, God's power unto salvation. He argues that miracles are things of the past, and yet, by comparison of the sinner with the leopard or the Ethiopian, he says a miracle must be performed before salvation can be had. My friend, that is the inconsistency which is prominent in your work today, and such inconsistencies will always appear with reference to a proposition of that kind. The real truth knows no such.

When I call attention to the Baptist Waybook, which states precisely what Mr. Grime says, what the confessions of faith teach, and what all accepted Baptist authorities contend, Elder Bogard changes it and says, "Hardeman, they are all wrong. I don't teach that!" The books by representative Baptists teach pre-regeneration—that the birth by the Spirit produces the fruits of repentance and faith. But Dr. Bogard says, "Hardeman, it is the repentance and faith that produce the fruit." May I truly say that is not what is written in your books. "I have always taught that in order for a sinner to be saved he must be born again." And again he misses the point. Baptist doctrine is that one must be born again before repentance and faith. Now here is a fellow that has been born again, in that sense, but has not repented or believed. Is that man saved or lost? A tree is known by its fruits. Is this fellow a tree that will bear the fruits of repentance and faith? This Waybook so declares it. A vile sinner is regenerated, is born again, and he must now evidence that new birth by the holy fruits of repentance and faith. What a picture! And he tells me he endorses every word in the book. I believe you brethren should spend fifty cents and get it, and if you ever meet him in debate, just use it on him. It has a very telling effect! I want to tell you, Dr. Bogard, that all one has to do is simply put you against yourself, and it ruins you, world without end! There is no possibility of its being otherwise.

But listen to him again as he urges the Bible as a perfect standard. He says, "If we are completely, thoroughly, furnished for all good work in the Bible, there is no need for miracles. If something in addition to the Bible is needed to bolster up the Lord's work; then the Bible is not a perfect

rule, it is short somewhere, somehow." Now I have tried to get you to see that all day, Dr. Bogard. Why didn't you just admit it, and end the discussion? Is the conversion of a sinner a good work? If so, doesn't the Bible furnish us completely for that work? Now, according to Dr. Bogard, if it doesn't "it is short somewhere, somehow." Yes, sir, in the same debate, with Aimee McPherson, he urged that "the man who demands miracles shows he has no confidence in the Bible." Are you going to let this audience leave here tonight knowing that you are wrapped up in such inconsistencies? You know only too well that you point the finger of condemnation at yourself—you are the one who said if a "man demands a miracle" that man "has no confidence in the Bible." Dr. Bogard, thou art the man! An alien sinner wants to be converted, which is a good work undoubtedly, but he must have something in addition to the word—that man doesn't have confidence in the Bible! If, sir, you endorse your own book, and if you at the same time believe the proposition we are discussing tonight, you have no confidence in the word of God—and sometimes I really believe it! That fellow on the other side of the log, in his illustration, has no truth in him whatsoever! Unfortunately for him, he uses an illustration like that, and then frames up another contradiction that is beyond excuse—"the Spirit and the word are not apart." If two things are not apart, they must be joined together. And what is his next statement? They are joined together but they are distinct! Can you imagine two things together while absent one from the other?

I called his attention to the definition of "distinct" and I have re-urged it in every speech, and he has not noticed it one time. Distinct from what? Does it mean joined together and yet separate from? If you can get a thing in a bigger mess of conglomerations and contradictions—you take the cake! Ladies and gentlemen, if two things are joined together they are NOT distinct. If they are distinct, they are NOT together.

I repeat: There are only two sensible positions on the matter of the operation of the Holy Spirit. The first one is taken by the Hardshell Baptists. They come out and say

there is no word in it at all—the Holy Spirit operates wholly apart, separate and distinct from, and without the aid of the word. The second is that the truth of God is the means of salvation and the Holy Spirit uses that means in the conviction and the conversion of sinners. There is no middle ground—you must accept one or the other. The Spirit either operates with or without the word. And it cannot do both.

Let me call attention again to his own writing as respects the teachings of Jesus. Listen: "After the word, the New Testament, was confirmed, established, miracles were no longer needed, and having served their purpose, they passed away. What they (the apostles) taught and did, and how sinners heard and believed and became Christians, and how Christians should live, is written in the New Testament for our guidance, because we are to observe the same teaching. Therefore, when we hear the teaching of the New Testament, we hear the Spirit speaking to us; and when we obey what it teaches, we walk after the Spirit and are the children of God, saved and sanctified." (P. 76, Bogard-McPherson Debate.) Now if Bogard was right when he stated that, and he says he endorses every word of it, then he is wrong tonight! There is nothing separate and distinct from the teaching of Christ. That is the Spirit speaking to us! Those words are our guide today in every good work! Elder Bogard, I am ready to say that I endorse every word of this particular statement of yours. So on this proposition we have really gotten somewhere. There is not a shade of difference between us on that point. We are perfectly agreed that the Spirit operates through the word! Therefore, when we preach the word of God, it is the Spirit speaking through us! When the sinner hears that truth, believes and obeys it, he becomes a saved man, sanctified by the word of truth! Brethren, I believe what Dr. Bogard says, and, if he does, I think he should leave off all else and say that the means of our salvation is recorded in the word of God, the Bible, and that he has, in his books, presented just what happened in connection with conversions recorded in that book of God!

Now I urged him in my third speech to give notice to this matter—that there was not to be found anywhere in all the New Testament one solitary reference to the Spirit's operat-

ing by himself and without the word in conviction and conversion, and yet he has not given the matter attention. Every single step in the divine plan, from the time the sinner decides to become a child of God until he sweeps through the gates into the heavenly realm—every step is effected by God's word! There is no such thing as the Spirit of God operating away or distinct from the written word. Wherever men are converted, the gospel is always there as God's power unto salvation to everyone that believes.

The case of the Ethiopian eunuch is no exception to this truth. The very same process took place there as in all other conversions. Just as Peter preached on Pentecost, Philip preached to the eunuch. Just as Saul had to "hear the word" whereby he would be saved, so the eunuch did not understand, and did not become a Christian, until Philip preached Jesus unto him. That same thing is true not only in this case, but in every case of conversion revealed in the New Testament. There is first the teaching of the word, then faith, and when faith expresses itself in full obedience, the new birth is consummated. The Holy Spirit operated—certainly! But how? Through the word preached! Dr. Bogard has stated this exactly as my brethren believe and teach it. I thank God, therefore, that we are making some progress. So then, the word of God is brought in touch with the sinner, and such passages as "the hand of the Lord was with the preacher" do not conflict with that idea.

As we come to the close of the talk tonight, in advance of the reading of this debate, I just want to ask each of you to think what passage of scripture Dr. Bogard used to prove his position—just what passage has he given that teaches that the Spirit operates separate and apart from the word of God upon the sinner's heart in conviction and conversion? You will ransack your brain in vain even to imagine that you have heard a single, solitary passage evidencing the truthfulness of his position.

Let me re-stress the fact that this debate is not a question as to whether the Spirit operates or not, whether it influences the sinner or not, but rather that it does or does not have use for the word in its operation. The Spirit, as the ink, never touches beyond the instrument through or by

which it operates. I claim to have driven Dr. Bogard away from 2 Cor. 3: 3 where the ink illustration is found. I asked him to bring his pen or a goose quill and show the audience how the ink could write separate and apart from the instrument, and where did that ink idea go? It left the debate as inconspicuously as possible. So that falls, and the truth regarding the influence and work of God's word stands without contradiction.

I sincerely appreciate, friends, your presence and the very fine attention you have given, and I congratulate myself upon having as an opponent Dr. Bogard, whom I respect highly, and I know if Baptist doctrine could be upheld successfully, he could do it. However, on the proposition tonight, the man doesn't live who can sustain it. God's Spirit does operate in conviction and conversion upon the heart of the sinner, but it comes in touch with the heart through the word, God's ordained means of contact, and not one-quarter of an inch beyond the word. Every illustration of the Bible is a confirmation of that fact. In the presence of high heaven, let truth prevail and I trust it has in this discussion, for I desire no personal victory whatsoever. I love the truth, and the truth will make us free. If I can believe it, obey it, and be faithful to the end, I will be saved and heaven will be mine to share while eternal ages roll on and on. I thank you for today and tonight.

THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Affirmative*, First Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

After the night's rest, I am sure that we all rejoice to be back, intensely interested in vital matters that have to do, not only with our relationships here, but with joys eternal or miserable failures in the world to come. I appreciate the privilege of entering into this discussion, and most especially with Dr. Ben M. Bogard, whom I consider the greatest debater the Baptist Church can furnish. When he passes on, I know not what other can take his place. He is skillful, experienced, and well versed in all matters pertaining to what he conceives to be right. I rejoice because of the high-toned discussion that both of us agreed to have. It was an understanding between us that nothing objectionable would be tolerated or allowed to enter into this debate from beginning to end. I just want to say that I would not knowingly have a part in a discussion unless that gentlemanly agreement were had in advance. I am not in this business as a profession. I care nothing about the popularity nor the fame that might go out from the same. I believe what I speak to you. I recognize that in the fear of God I must speak the truth and then stand upon the pains of eternal judgment to render an account for the things here spoken. And I want to say that, if at any time, in the midst of enthusiasm, I break loose and say something objectionable in the least to Dr. Bogard, I offer an apology in advance, and I am now reserving the right to expunge from the book all expressions that are used by me that might beget prejudice toward religious investigation on the part of those who read it. With these announcements at the beginning, I state the proposition for discussion.

"The Bible teaches that baptism, as taught in the commission of our Lord, is for, in order to, the remission of sins, to the penitent believer." With all of my heart, I believe the Bible teaches that, and I will do my best to define all the terms satisfactorily, and will simply state the points at issue in this discussion between us. By the "Bible" I mean God's word and a faithful translation of the same. By "teaches"

I mean it imparts and instructs and conveys the thought. By "baptism" I mean an immersion in water into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Such is the baptism authorized in the commission of our Lord. And it is, not *was*, but present tense, that it is for—or *unto*, in order to, or with a view to. I use those synonyms as explanatory of what I mean by "for the remission of sins."

The next and final statement is "to a penitent believer." The exact position is this: that baptism, ladies and gentlemen, is not something to an innocent baby; I am not affirming that; it is not something authorized to be done to an untaught heathen, or an irresponsible imbecile, but unto a man who believes with all of his heart that Jesus is the Christ, God's Son, and from sins resolves to turn away. Unto that man, the Bible teaches that Baptist is for, unto, or in order to, the remission of sins. Now if that is not clear, I hope that Dr. Bogard will call attention to any matter wherein I have failed and I pledge him most careful consideration and an earnest effort to make my contention plain.

I do not believe, ladies and gentlemen, that men are saved by the works of the law of Moses. I have never believed that men are saved, in the gospel age, by obedience to that law. Furthermore, I do not believe that man is saved by his own righteousness, which Isaiah declares is as "filthy rags"; nor do I believe that any man can earn salvation or merit it or purchase it. With these statements clear, we may avoid confusion, and repetition of those things.

I'd like to have another matter clearly understood. While it is not of the works of the law, I want in this preliminary speech to suggest that, in the New Testament, there are two classes or kinds of works mentioned. There is a class of works excluded, found in Eph. 2. Hear it. Verses 8, 9: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." Now Paul, of what kind of works is it not? It is not of boastful works; it is not of man's device. If I could scale the heights, and pierce the vaulted canopy of heaven, and walk in upon the throne of Jehovah, independently of God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, I could ignore them and say: "This is what I have done"; and hence I could boast of the

salvation that might be mine. Paul said there it is not of that type of works. So, that's the class excluded. Then in Acts 10: 34, 35, Peter, at the house of Cornelius, said: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him." So there you have a class of works that is included. Now getting to the point. Two classes are mentioned in the New Testament. Class one: boastful works, works done by man, originated by man, and of which he is the inventor. It is not of this type lest a man should boast.

On the other hand, it is of a class of works, designated by Peter as works of righteousness. Whatever comes under the head of righteousness is included in the gospel plan of salvation. David said, Psalm 119: 172: "For all thy commandments are righteousness." Hence, the works that are obligatory upon mankind are works of God, to which man but submits.

Now, furthermore, in this preliminary, may I say that I believe just as strongly as Dr. Bogard dare express it that salvation is by faith. There'll not be a solitary passage introduced on that line but that I'll endorse, in advance, 100 per cent. But a question at this point: Is it by faith *alone*? Is it by a faith not yet made perfect? And may I further suggest some things about faith. There are different statements in the Bible regarding it. There is what is called in God's book the common faith, as was Titus, Paul's son, after the common faith. Well, that implies an uncommon faith. If a man has faith so that he can say to that sycamore tree, "Be thou plucked up and cast into the sea," it would be uncommon faith. The Bible speaks of a dead faith, and a faith made perfect. There is a common faith and an uncommon faith. There is a dead faith, and a faith that is alive. There is a perfect faith, and one that is imperfect—each one has its opposite. Faith without works is dead. Faith, based on the words of God that prompt obedience, is a live faith. I believe in being made perfect by obedience unto the teaching of Christ. Faith is the result of teaching and acts of obedience are the results of faith in God. Therefore perfect faith is made so by obedience.

Hence, I call attention to a further statement in Gal. 3: 26-29: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," which was made in 1921 B.C. when God said to Abraham, "In thee and thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed." Hence Paul declares that we are "justified by faith (Rom. 5: 1), we have peace with God." But note the faith connected with the argument that is made in chapter 4: it is the faith used in chapter 4, verse 12—a faith that "walks in the steps of Abraham," who, when he was called to go out in the land concerning which he knew not, obeyed God, and went out not knowing whither he went. After Abraham had been walking in obedience to God's word, it is said: "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness"; but bear in mind that statement was made eight years after Abraham left Ur of Chaldees and had been walking in the command of God. Then 2 Cor. 5: 17: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; and all things are become new." Eph. 2: 10: "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." I am reading now from Gal. 5: 6: "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision." But what does, Paul? "But faith, a faith that works—by love." Hence it is an active, obedient, energetic faith, which takes God at his word, believes what he says, does what he requires, and becomes what he demands. That's the faith which, when perfected, leads to salvation, and no other kind is worth while.

Now with that, I come to make one other statement. The plan of salvation, the principle of it, has been the same in all ages of the world. Elder Bogard has well discussed that in the McPherson Debate on page 15, and I endorse and subscribe to his argument regarding the plan of salvation—always the same. While it is an act by which men obey God, the act is different in different ages of the world. Now,

another statement. No man in any age has ever been blessed by God Almighty on account of his faith until that faith expressed itself in some sort or some kind of a bodily act.

With these preliminaries, I come to argument number one, based upon Mark 16: 15, 16. When the time had come, Jesus burst the bars of the tomb and came forth triumphant o'er the powers of the Hadean world, and brought life and immortality to light, and then, calling about him his disciples he demonstrated his identity and began within them a new hope. Unto those on this solemn, serious occasion, he said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Here is a statement, friends, so clear that it looks next to impossible for a man to misunderstand it. You take just what God says about it, and there can be no misunderstanding regarding it. PREACH THE GOSPEL, God's power unto salvation unto every one that believeth. Then the responsibility—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be damned." Hence, I am calling attention to that and placing on the board a simple diagram, and I beg Dr. Bogard to pay especial attention. I am diagraming that in a simple manner.

$$\left(\begin{array}{l} \text{He} \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{that} \\ \text{believeth} \\ \text{(and)} \\ \text{is baptized} \end{array} \right. \\ \text{shall be saved.} \end{array} \right.$$

"He that believeth *and* is baptized"—note just what is said about it. Now then, the next statement, "shall be saved." That's the statement of God's word, and I beg Dr. Bogard to note carefully. I want to insist that this is the scripture and applies to sinners. Boys and girls, and young men attending the "Missionary Baptist Institute"; you, professors and all, I challenge you to find a single error in the analysis of that sentence. Here it is: That is a complex, declarative sentence, of which "he that believeth and is baptized" is the complex subject. "He" is the simple subject, modified by a limiting and restrictive clause, "that believeth and is baptized," a simple, adjective element of the third class; but

this is also a partial compound, subordinate declarative sentence, of which "that" is the simple subject unmodified, of which subordinate sentence also "believeth and is baptized" is the compound predicate; of which principal sentence "shall be saved" is the simple predicate unmodified. Christ Jesus our Lord has such to say regarding some men. "He shall be saved," that's the principal sentence. Now *what* he? Had there been no modifying qualifications, any "he" could share the promise. But not so! Christ Jesus offered salvation. And note here, it is the restricted kind, it is limited; not any *he* shall be saved, but a *certain* he. Now, describe your man, Lord. "He that believeth and is baptized." Lord, did you say, "He that believeth shall be saved"? No. Did you say, "He that is baptized shall be saved"? No. Well, what did you say? I said, "He that believeth *and*"—what does "and" mean? "And" is copulative, coupling, additional, not just one thing, but the additional part. "He that believeth *and* is baptized *shall be saved.*" Therefore, Jesus Christ predicates salvation to a certain character. And who is the character? Well, it's a "he," and the he, usually masculine gender, is now common. Hence, any person. Well, "what kind" of a person? Any person accountable and responsible unto God, that believeth and is baptized—that's the man that "shall be saved" as Jesus Christ thus declared.

Now then, I hope, and earnestly so, that Dr. Bogard will not do a schoolboy stunt, as some have the habit of doing, and let this alone while he goes elsewhere and says: "Yes, but here is a passage that contradicts him." That's what makes infidels. Now first, as to a correct exegesis of God's word, let Dr. Bogard feel the obligation that is upon him. Go over the very passage, show that the passage itself does not teach what is plainly there and for which I have argued. Therefore, let us not at any time try to weigh one passage of scripture against the other. Let me say to you that this was the final message, the last message, of Jesus Christ, the immaculate Son of God, and the spotless Son of Mary. It was his last statement to those whom he had selected. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel"—not preach philosophy, not preach theories, not preach opinions, "but "preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and

is baptized shall be saved." I assume this afternoon that Dr. Bogard claims to be under that commission. That is his authority for claiming to preach God's word. It rests upon the declaration of Jesus Christ, who said "preach the gospel to every creature!" That one who believes it and is baptized—well, what about him? That man shall be saved!

Now then, every passage of scripture in the Bible bearing upon the subject of salvation must, of necessity, correspond, coincide, and acquiesce in the sentiment as here expressed. So, I just want to suggest to you that when salvation is predicated upon any condition whatsoever, that condition is essential. There might be more conditions added, but there never can be less. I beg you to think over that statement, I repeat it. Wherever salvation is promised in God's book on any condition, that condition stands between man and God and with it he must comply. There may be more than that involved, but there never can be less.

Hence, it is not possible for it to be possible for salvation to be promised upon fewer conditions than those mentioned in this great commission. Christ, therefore, said he that believeth and is baptized—that's his language. Well, Lord, what about it? What man? The man that *believeth* the gospel, God's power unto salvation. The man who believes that, *and* is baptized—what about him? A man believes the gospel. Lord, did you promise salvation to him? No, sir! But here is the man that has been put under the water, that was not a believer. Did you promise anything to him? Not a thing. Well, to whom did you make the promise? Unto that man that believeth and is baptized, said Jesus Christ, I here pledge and promise salvation. So then, friends, baptism is not for an innocent baby, it is not to an imbecile, it's not to an untaught heathen, because teaching must precede it, faith must precede it, and all the things God has mentioned must come as its necessary antecedents. Unto the man therefore who is conscious, accountable, and responsible unto God, baptism is a condition of pardon. If that man believes in the Christ with all his heart—and without that it is impossible to please God—if that man coolly and calmly confesses that faith, and is baptized, having turned from his sin, that man shall be saved. Is that a believer to whom God

has promised salvation? Certainly so! But what kind of a believer? A baptized believer. And that is the person unto whom salvation in the book of God has been promised by Jesus Christ, our Lord, our priest, our king.

Hence, in the Bible, that's a work of righteousness. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Now then, hear it. Whenever any man, properly prepared in heart and in mind, walks down into the water, and there, in the name of the Sacred Three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is baptized, that man can truly say, "Jesus Christ, God's Son, baptized me." In the fourth chapter of John, there is a direct reference to matters of that kind. "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though he did it not himself, but his disciples." Therefore, whenever one walks down into the water, and there as a penitent believer is ready to submit to God's righteousness, and that man is baptized *into* the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and arises to walk in newness of life; he can put his hand upon John 4 and say, "Jesus Christ baptized me." Whose work is that? It's a work of the Lord. What's your part in it? I have but submitted unto it. I cannot boast of it; I never invented nor set up the idea of baptism. When I repented of my sins, I did not discover the idea of repentance; that's God's work. When I believe the gospel, that's not my own idea—I did not suggest that as the condition, but God did it. I but submit unto the things therein found. This is the truth of God. I appreciate the fact and the belief that Dr. Bogard will come with an exposure and I hope he will make it as forceful as in his power lies.

And I thank you very kindly indeed.

THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

BEN M. BOGARD, *Negative*, First Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend's speech was an excellent one, and it seems a pity to have to destroy it with the word of God and cold facts of logic. But I shall not hesitate to do it, because of

the interest of truth, and the value of human souls at stake. My friend said that a certain class of works is excluded, that would not save, works of which we might boast. He knows the works that we might boast of; if we were to do anything that would get salvation, any works that would save us, certainly we could boast of them. One who makes a great invention but could boast of his invention. If I can do this or that or the other to save my soul, certainly that is greater than any earthly invention. So, then, nothing we do can save the soul, no work at all that we can perform can save the soul; because, if so, then we could boast of having performed it.

The next thing of which my friend speaks is from Acts 10: 35, where Peter said whosoever "worketh righteousness is accepted with him." The man who works righteousness is accepted. I want to drop a question right here. My friend may take it up or not, the record will show it, whether he does or not. Is there any work of righteousness performed by a man before baptism? *Works of righteousness* and works of *unrighteousness*, works of righteousness and works of sin. Did you do anything except sin before you were baptized? If you did *any works of righteousness* before you were baptized, you being judge, and the apostle Peter being judge, then baptism does not save nor help to save, but you reach salvation before baptism, because those who work righteousness have been accepted of him.

My friend said it's a class of works which Peter calls works of righteousness. Exactly. Are there any works of righteousness before baptism? If my friend says "yes," then you've got salvation, the remission of sins before baptism. If he says "no," then there is *no good thing acceptable to God* before baptism. He may take either horn of that dilemma he pleases. Then my friend said he affirms that salvation is by faith, and on that we heartily agree. But he says it must be a *faith that is made perfect*. A faith that is alive. I want to know if your faith was alive before baptism? It is not right to baptize on a dead faith, and you very plainly said there could be a dead faith, as well as a live faith. When you baptize, is it on a *live* faith or a *dead* faith? If it is alive, a living faith saves. We are agreed on that.

Now he says, "When does faith save?" He quoted Gal. 3: 26: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Notice that all who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ and he concludes that we are saved when baptized. I want to lay down this proposition. Professor Hardeman is a Greek scholar, having taught Greek, and taught young preachers for years and years. Mr. Thayer says in his lexicon that the Greek preposition, sometimes called "eis" (long i), and sometimes called "eis" (long a), for short we will call it "eis" (long i)—there are two schools of pronunciation. That Greek preposition, translated "into," in Gal. 3: 27: "Baptized into Christ," those same words in Rom. 6: 3, same words in Acts 2: 38. E-i-s—eis. Mr. Thayer is the greatest lexicographer in the world and has written the greatest Greek-English lexicon on the face of the earth. My friend no doubt uses it in the college of which he is president. Mr. Thayer says that the word "eis" when it refers to place, location, means "into." You come into a house, location; you go into a city, location; go into heaven, location; go into the water, a location. When it refers to a location it means "into." Mr. Thayer said in that same connection, when it expresses relationship it means "with reference to," "as regards," and with Mr. Thayer comes the great Dr. A. T. Robertson, who wrote the greatest Greek grammar that has ever been published. Robertson agrees with Thayer. All right. Then I want to know that when you become saved, does that change your relation, or does it change your location? If my friend was saved at Henderson, Tennessee, I don't know where he was saved, it didn't change his location, it didn't put him in Little Rock, he remained in the same location; but his relationship to God changed. Now, Mr. Thayer says that when the idea "of relation" is expressed, it means "with reference to." Very well, put that down.

The Greek word "*enduo*" in Gal. 3: 27 means to imitate, to impersonate, to act like another. Very well, as "many of you as have been baptized into Christ," what does that word "into" mean? If it meant place, that would be a very correct rendering; but if it expresses the idea of relationship, we must render it as Mr. Thayer says, "with reference to." The Greek word "*enduo*" means to imitate, act like, to perform

like; let's read it that way. "Were all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus"; here is an exact translation according to Thayer and according to Robertson, the greatest grammarian that has been produced since the Greek language has been taught. "As many of you as have been baptized with reference to Jesus Christ have imitated Christ." That is precisely what it means. Now if it means "into," and has reference to place, then by the physical act of putting a man into the water, you change his location, and by the hands of the preacher he becomes the child of God. He can't baptize himself, and must depend upon human help in order to be saved. That's sufficient on Gal. 3: 26, 27.

My friend quotes Rom. 5: 12: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." There is no mistake about that. But he asks when does that faith bring justification? When it is alive? I ask him: Is it alive before baptism, or did it get life by being baptized? If so, you are baptized on a dead faith, and the faith becomes alive by the act of baptism. If you have a living faith before baptism, you have that which saves before baptism; and now, my friend says *when faith acts, then faith saves*. Did faith perform any act before baptism? If it were not a good work when you came by and gave your hand to the preacher, and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," and made the good confession; if that was not an act of faith, what was it? If it was an act of faith, *was it not a work of righteousness? Was faith acting?* If so, then, *when faith acts, faith saves*. My friend says so. When faith is alive, faith saves. My friend says so. I am taking him at his word and using the arguments against him as he has presented them.

Then my friend quotes from 2 Cor. 5: 17: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away." Very well. Eph. 2: 10: "Created in Christ Jesus unto good works." The good works we get there come from the new creation. I want to know if you worked yourself into creation, or were you created into good works? Well, did you *work your way into creation* or were you *created into the good work* like the Bible says? You got the creation first, and it didn't take baptism to get it. Then comes my friend

with a passage of scripture that I am just a little surprised at his bringing in just here; but I am glad that he did. Gal. 5: 6: "Faith worketh by love." He just said faith had to work, faith had to be alive; now he quotes the scripture as to *how* faith works. Faith works *by love*. I want to ask my friend, did he love God before he was baptized, and was his baptism an act of love? Was *faith acting as an act of love* when he was baptized? He can say yes or no. If baptism was an act of love, and he *was baptized because he loved*, then 1 John 4: 7 says he "that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." So you have the love of God in your heart, shed abroad by the Holy Ghost, that produces work, hence, born again before baptism.

Then my friend comes to the plan of salvation, and says the plan of salvation has been the same in all ages, but the act that must be performed to obtain salvation may not be the same in all ages. I am going to maintain that there is no act at all that any man in the Old Testament time or the New ever had to perform in order to be saved. Salvation is received by faith, and *faith is the only thing you can do without doing anything*. Faith submits to the Lord and doesn't pretend to do; as long as you attempt to do, you are working it yourself and not depending upon the Lord. My friend comes to Mark 16: 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"; now, he has himself in a pretty predicament. He says on the board here (pointing to the blackboard): "He that believeth AND is baptized shall be saved," putting the word "and" in right here. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Very well. Now he says there must be believing AND baptism in order to be saved—there must be two things done there in order to produce salvation, because the conjunction "and" is used. I wonder if he has forgotten what he said all day yesterday in his hard fight when I brought up the scripture, "Ye know not the scriptures, neither the power of God." He said there was not two things there, but only one. I wonder if he remembers when he said, "They preached AND the hand of God was with them?" He said yesterday there was only *one thing, just preaching*, not something extra because of the hand of God. Now he has made an argument here showing

that when you use the word "and" it means something else in connection with it, and contradicts the argument of yesterday about being *nothing but the word*. I gave scripture after scripture showing the gospel *and* the power of God, the "word *and* the spirit," and our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power and the Holy Ghost. Which time is he right, yesterday or today?

I am not debating yesterday's proposition, but showing how he's gone back on his argument of yesterday in order to uphold this proposition today. I am amused at the gentleman and I think those who read the book will be amused also. More along that line just in a moment when I notice what he has said about Mark 16: 16.

He hopes Dr. Bogard will take up this passage and argue it and not argue other passages to show a contradiction of it. Mr. Bogard, in all of his debates, and this makes 227 debates that I have held, has never tried to make one scripture contradict another. The Bible says that no "scripture is of private interpretation." What does that mean? It means that you must *not interpret a passage of scripture by itself*, but you must interpret a scripture in harmony with other scriptures. But my friend, undertaking to prove his position by one passage of scripture, and in order to make the others harmonize with it, tries to make fifteen or twenty or twenty-five passages harmonize with this one passage. I'd rather turn that around and make this one harmonize with twenty-five or thirty others, that are unmistakably clear. "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." Is that a contradiction to Mark 16: 16? No, but an explanation of it. And Rom. 5: 1: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God." Is that a contradiction of Mark 16: 16? No, it is an explanation of it. In Acts 10: 43: "All the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Is that a contradiction of Mark 16: 16? No, but rather an explanation of it. And so I can quote at least twenty-five scriptures that plainly state that when you have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, you are saved.

Now, are you going to have all of those scriptures contradicted by the one? Why, no. I want to harmonize them

altogether, for no "scripture is of private interpretation," but each scripture must be interpreted in harmony with every other scripture. When you take all the scriptures on the subject of salvation, it forces Mark 16: 16 to mean that when you exercise faith in Jesus Christ, you are saved. The baptism doesn't take it away from you. It doesn't enlarge upon it, but merely an expression, "he that believeth and is baptized," and you might add fifty other things that you should do—he that believeth and is baptized, and takes the Lord's supper, and gives his money to the poor, and gives to the widows and orphans in their affliction, and keeps himself unspotted from the world, and on and on, name every duty that belongs to a Christian life, shall be saved in heaven. Of course, the Bible teaches a *present salvation* at faith, and a salvation in heaven at the end of this present life.

It doesn't say salvation depends on all these things. If so, then my friend hasn't obtained it even when he was baptized. For he hasn't yet taken the Lord's Supper at the time he is baptized, and he hasn't yet given his money to take care of the poor at the time he is baptized, he hasn't yet visited the sick, and he hasn't yet done all these other numerous duties laid down in the word of God at the time he is baptized, and *one of them is just as important as the other, and all refer to the future, and not to the remission of sins.* Very well, more of that when we get further along in the discussion. Just merely taking up what is said, showing how I'll not try to make one passage contradict another, but try to show that one lone scripture should certainly harmonize with the many others that can be quoted with equal force.

Then, if salvation is promised, he said, on conditions, the conditions may be increased, but never diminished. Now that's a funny principle. I promise you a house for \$1,000. My word is, "You may have my house and lot for \$1,000." My friend says I can honorably raise the price, but can't honorably lower the price. I wonder where he got that kind of logic? If I say you can have my house and lot for \$1,000, and you come and claim it, and I say, no, I've raised the price. You'd say, "Mr. Bogard, you lied to me. You said I could have it for \$1,000, now you want \$1,500 or \$2,000.

You've raised the price on it." An honorable man wouldn't do it, his word is out, and he stands on his word. No, my friend Hardeman, I can lower the conditions but I could never increase them honorably. You come to me and claim the house. I told you you could have that house for \$1,000, but I have decided you can have it for \$500. That would be honorable, but dishonorable to raise the price after my word was out. So, if I can find anywhere in God's book where salvation is promised, then God must keep his word or go back on it. It would make God a falsifier, to add to the condition first mentioned.

So, go to the sixteenth chapter of Acts and read where the jailer cried out, "What must I do to be saved?" A fair and square question to ask a preacher who ought to know. For he asked an inspired man. And the apostle answered back, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Now, there's a fair, square statement, "What must I do to be saved?" Answer: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." If after he believes and complies with the condition laid down by the apostles, then if the conditions are raised, God certainly becomes a dishonorable God. You can't make anything else out of it. When you have a promise of God, he is going to stick to that promise.

My friend said Jesus really baptized when the disciples did the baptizing. We'll not discuss that, passing on for there is really no argument in connection with it that is really worth noticing, and if my friend should bring out something that makes me feel that it ought to be noticed more fully, we have several other speeches in front of us and I can answer. Now having answered everything my friend said, I could stop at the end of this twenty-one minutes and say no more. I am under no obligation to go one inch further, having replied to everything he said. However, in debating, my friend and I both, and all reputable debaters, after they have replied to what has been said by the affirmative, will go on and make some negative arguments. I intend to make some of those negative arguments now.

The Bible requires fruit bearing before baptism. Matt. 3: 7, 8. John the Baptist said to those who came to his baptism, "Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance."

John wouldn't baptize unless they brought forth fruits, meet for repentance. Now, a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. Matt. 12: 33 says make the tree good and the fruit will be good; then the tree must be good before there can be good fruit. You have to have good fruit before baptism. Hence, a fruit bearing tree, figuratively speaking, before baptism. Well, who can bear fruit? John 15: 4: "The branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine." Jesus Christ is the vine, and therefore you must be in Christ before you can bear fruit. You must bear fruit before you are baptized. Hence, you must be a fruit bearing child of God before baptism. Now that will be before you in the very last speech that I make tonight in the closing of this part of the debate.

Then again, Jesus baptized "disciples." He brought that out a while ago, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples. Jesus really did it when his disciples baptized, did it by the apostles. Jesus baptized, but he did it through the apostles. Luke 14: 33 says we must forsake all to be a disciple. Now what happens when you have forsaken all? Matt. 19: 29: Who forsaketh all inherits life. Who can be baptized. Disciples. Who is a disciple? One who has forsaken all. What comes to a man who has forsaken all? He inherits life. Hence, nobody is baptized except those who have inherited life. Hence, baptism does not bring the life. Another argument I am now presenting as a negative is that we are baptized for identically the same thing that Jesus was baptized. Why was Jesus baptized? John 1: 31, John the Baptist said he came baptizing that he might be made manifest to Israel. My friend, in your being baptized, you did not follow Christ, for you were baptized in order to obtain the remission of your sins; it was not like Jesus. If you are baptized in order to become a child of God, you can't be following Jesus Christ. Why? Because Jesus Christ was not baptized to make him the Son of God. He was already God's Son, baptized that this fact might be "made manifest." Then, when one becomes a child of God by faith, as we read in Gal. 3: 26, he is baptized to *imitate the Lord Jesus Christ* because in Gal. 3: 27 it says, "As many as have been baptized with reference to Jesus Christ have 'endued,' have imitated

Christ," precisely that. You are not following Jesus Christ if you are baptized in order to become a child of God.

Now, that brings us to another argument as a negative. Paul said, "I have begotten you by the gospel." Very well. The word "begotten" there comes from the Greek word *meaning to be born again and come into life*. It is the word that Jesus said to Nicodemus. Except a man is *born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Very well. Paul said I have *brought you into life by the gospel*. But coming back to the first chapter of First Corinthians we read. Paul said, "*I baptized none of you, save Crispus and Gaius . . . and the household of Stephanas,*" but I begot *all* of you. Now what does it say that Paul said that he had to do to get them to be saved? "I have begotten you." You haven't many fathers, "*I have begotten you by the gospel.*" Very well. If Paul did it, then if baptism is necessary to becoming a child of God, if baptism is necessary for the new life, then Paul told a falsehood, for he said, "*I did not baptize you, but I did beget all of you by the gospel.*" He begot all of them by the gospel, and baptized none of them except two or three mentioned; begot all of them, then undoubtedly baptism is not necessary to the new life. For you to get up and say that Paul baptized some of them and other people baptized the others won't meet this case, for Paul said, *I begot you, I didn't start you on the road*, and let somebody else finish the begetting, but *I begot you by the gospel, but I baptized none of you*. So that shows that people were saved under the ministry of Paul without baptism. And that their baptism became simply an imitation of Christ. And so I read in Rom. 6: 3 that as many as have been baptized with reference to (eis) Jesus Christ were baptized with reference to his death. For that reason, we are buried with him by baptism. The Greek preposition eis means "with reference to" when it refers to relationship. It means "into" only when it has reference to place or location. In changing our relationship, no matter how it is done, it means with reference to. So, we are baptized with reference to Jesus Christ, and also baptized with reference to his death. For that reason, we are buried in the water because that is the picture of the burial and resurrection, a picture of death. That is therefore

the likeness in the sixth chapter and the fifth verse of that same chapter. Rom. 6: 5: "If we are planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

Thank you.

Time called.

THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Affirmative*, Second Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It's a genuine pleasure to appear before you again, and to review the address to which you have listened, then to proceed with other arguments along the line. For me to say to you, friends, that Dr. Bogard has disappointed me in his speech is but mildly expressing it. I believe that in the debates that I have had with him, which are two prior to this, there was less real combat and refutation of facts today than I have ever known him to present. I do not believe that he is up to par, but that does not in any sense reflect upon Dr. Bogard respecting the matters before him.

He first referred to the "works" that I presented, but in the plan of salvation there are two classes of works, one of which was *excluded*, the type of which a man could boast; and another class of works was *included*, that which represented works of righteousness. Then he gave me a challenge, viz., to name some of the works of which a man could boast, and I could but be surprised at his harboring a suggestion of that kind having the experience that he had. Dr. Bogard, in the far distant past, when the sons of Noah settled along the lower course of the Euphrates River, they soon became unmindful of God, and undertook to ignore Jehovah, who had carried them across the boundless ocean, untouched by a single shore, and they decided that they'd build them a tower. They started out, and according to tradition, they laid the foundation of it 272 feet square, and built it up pyramid-like until they reached the height, according to the best evidence, of about 153 feet. Now, their idea was by physical power and force to build a tower by means of which they could pierce the very canopy of heaven and walk in

upon the throne of Jehovah. Now, had they done that, they could have said: "Look what we have done by physical hands, God had nothing to do with it, Christ was ignored, the Holy Spirit discarded, and we've done it." And then for 4,000 years, God withheld the sending of his Son, during which time the Greek philosophers spent their time in reasoning out and trying to fathom the depth, and to comprehend the breadth, and to scale the height, of the immortality of the soul. They could have boasted of all of that, but God let man go to the extremity, trying every possible way, and when absolute failure had characterized his effort, in the fullness of time, God sent forth his Son, and taught us that it is not by works that we do and of which we can boast.

Now, is there any work of righteousness performed before baptism? If there should be one, then the conclusion would be, we are saved before we are baptized because we do a work of righteousness before we are baptized. So says Dr. Bogard. Well, let me just answer that. Dr. Bogard teaches that repentance is first, and that faith comes second, and that men are saved when they believe. I just want to put the matter back. Can a man do any work of righteousness before he believes? Now, if not, then the impenitent man, or the man who repents of his sins, is not doing a work of righteousness, but that is contrary to God's word. Now, Dr. Bogard, there isn't a thing on God's earth to that. It isn't "apropos" to the occasion. Now, he said, "Hardeman, you just take either horn of that dilemma you want." Why, ladies and gentlemen, that thing is a mulley. It never did have a horn to it.

Now, to go on to the next thing. Do I baptize a man on a dead faith or a live faith? I baptize a man whose faith is alive in the sense that it is acting, carrying on, seeking to do God's will. And so long as the man is thus performing the act and hastening to render obedience to the gospel of Christ, when the act is consummated, his faith with respect to salvation is made perfect. Hence, a live faith all the time he is in action. I do not baptize the man that is stopping and hesitating, who does not believe, and who is not working at it and seeking obedience to the gospel of Christ. Of all matters that have been presented to me, may I say that the

weakest one and the one least supported by any semblance of authority, in anybody's translation, is the comment made on Gal. 3, respecting being baptized into Jesus Christ, and having put him on. He says the Greek word "enduo" means "imitate." Why, Dr. Bogard, the word is "clothed upon." "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." They first get into him as a newborn babe, and then do not go around like the swimming-pool folks, but are clothed upon. And hence, Christ is the clothing that is put upon the man when he is baptized into him. He then puts him on and that's the fact respecting his misuse of the word. I'd just love to warn Dr. Bogard, he'd better study English because he lacks that as yet. "Larger ships may venture more, but smaller boats like us, Dr. Bogard, should stay near shore," and study our English before we undertake to get into the Greek.

He wants us to imitate Christ. That verse doesn't say anything about that. All translations known to me say: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ," first you were not in him, and now then what? You are baptized *into* him, transposition from the outside to the inside, passing from one to the other, baptized into Jesus Christ, and as a newborn babe, then what? Put on Christ, and thus you have Gal. 3: 27. But he calls my attention now to some statement I made regarding Eph. 2: 10: "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Why, Dr. Bogard, salvation is the creation here referred to. It is not a miraculous affair, but it is brought about by obedience to the gospel of Christ; and since, therefore, if a man be in Christ, he is a new creature, it is spoken of under that plan, and under that likeness. Then, I quoted Gal. 5: 6: "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." Now, he asks me, "Does a man love God before he is baptized?" If so, you have man saved before he is baptized. Well, let me ask him: Dr. Bogard, does a man love God before he believes and at the time he repents? If so, you have a man loving God before he complies with the necessary conditions of salvation. Don't you see that? A man

cannot love God until he believes, but here is a man that repents before he believes. Hence, this penitent man hates God, because he has got to believe in him before he can love him. But repentance comes first, and it won't do for him to try to get by, saying, "No, repentance and faith are conjoined." Now there are two things that are distinct, Elder Bogard, and distinct from, they are two separate words, and two separate acts. So, that answers that.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, when it comes to Mark 16: 16, what on earth has the man done with it? Nothing but put the "and" in the wrong place. That's all on earth that was done to that. I had the "and" in it just where God puts it, but he seems not to understand common English, and yet tries to employ Greek. Now, Elder Bogard, just why you did that, I can't understand, but you are of age and I am asking you. What on earth did you mean by missing a thing or, to use a more expressive term, messing it up? Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Dr. Bogard is not approaching Mark 16 after his old fashion. I have seen him when he came out and made a fight on it. But this afternoon—what did he say about it? Nothing whatsoever. He absolutely passed it by. I guess that is merely not "apropos" to the occasion.

Friends, I would ask Dr. Bogard, and get the records straight regarding it—do you accept Mark 16: 16 as genuine or is it spurious? You have been on both sides of the fence. How is it in 1938? Do you believe that Mark 16: 16 is God's word, and authorized by Jesus Christ; or is it a spurious passage, as you declared in days gone by? Let's get the records straight regarding those matters.

It was amusing for him to bring up what happened yesterday. I knew that Dr. Bogard wasn't satisfied with that, and God knows everybody could see why; and I don't blame him one particle for trying to bolster up something that went down in absolute failure. But there's no contradiction whatsoever when I affirmed in another speech that the Holy Spirit with the word, the Holy Spirit and the word, but not separate from it, not distinct from it, operates upon the sinner's heart. And so the reference to that is purely gratuitous and wholly amiss. But he says, now, he doesn't want some pas-

sage to contradict Mark 16. Well, that's a fine statement, and yet he said we'd better have Mark 16 to harmonize with others than to have fifteen or twenty others to harmonize with Mark 16. Well, let's see what we have then for Mark 16 to harmonize with. Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now John 3: 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Jesus, did you say anything contrary to that? No, sir. Well, what kind of a believer has everlasting life? He that is a baptized believer. And there's no contradiction in it. So, if Christ said he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and then said he that believeth is saved, and excludes everything else, there is an un-get-overable contradiction. And so all passages must harmonize with the commission. "Therefore being justified by faith, we are at peace with God." What kind of faith? A faith that believes what God says and does what God requires; hence, a faith walking in the steps of Abraham, an obedient faith, and by that we have peace with God.

But again, Acts 10: 43: "To him give all the prophets witness, that *through his name* whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Give me that man who believes in Christ, who has put on Christ by that act which takes place *through his name* and that man receives remission of sins. What about it? That man shall receive remission of sins. But, he says, baptism is not in those verses. Well, neither is love, nor prayer, nor repentance. They are not in it either. So, if baptism is excluded on the ground that it's not mentioned, what about it? Don't you see that repentance would have to be excluded from the plan of salvation? Don't you see that love would be cut out, and that all not specifically mentioned would be excommunicated on the very same principle?

His illustration about the house and lot is a bit amusing. He said, "Hardeman, if you offer a man a house and lot for \$1,000, and then go up on the price, you are dishonest," and he just couldn't conceive of a thing of that kind. Well, let's see about that. God said that he had granted unto the Gentiles repentance unto life. All right. God had promised life unto the penitent, but Dr. Bogard goes up on the price and

says, in addition, you have to believe on the Lord. Dr. Bogard, who went up on the price? Just think about it a minute.

Repentance is granted unto the Gentiles unto life. Life is granted upon repentance. But here is a man that in addition to his repentance wants to add to it, after God promised life unto the Gentiles on repentance. Dr. Bogard comes along and says, "I am going to be dishonest, I am going to add something to it. I will go up on the price, and I will add faith to it." Well, we'll see what we'll see.

He called my attention to the jailer, but touched it lightly. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, said Paul, and thou shalt be saved and thy house. And then what? He spake unto them the word of the Lord, first giving them something to believe; and what happened? The jailer took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes and was baptized, he and all his straightway; and when he brought them into his house ("up into his house," Revised Version,) set meat before them, and rejoiced. Now, when did the man rejoice? After he had been baptized. Now look here, friends. The Bible says "believe and baptized" and "and" means plus. Look at it. Belief *plus* baptism equals salvation. That's the Bible. Dr. Bogard: "Belief *minus* baptism equals salvation." There never were any two terms any more opposite than *plus* and *minus*. But, God said belief *plus* baptism equals salvation. Dr. Bogard said, No, Lord, you've got that wrong. It's belief *minus* baptism that equals salvation. Friends, that is a predicament. Dr. Bogard is not to blame, but he is advocating a doctrine that no living man can prove, and none dead ever did. But, he said John commanded them to bring forth fruit for repentance. That's exactly right. Now hear it.

There went out unto John many from Jerusalem and Judea and the region round about, and were all baptized of him in Jordan. What's the fruit? Confessing their sins. Now, Dr. Bogard says, "You have to confess that you don't have any before I baptize you." But John demanded as fruit a confession, or an acknowledgment of their sins, and upon such they were baptized.

Well, he asks, were they baptized for the same reason that Jesus Christ was? But he said that was not in order to salvation. No, and Dr. Bogard, it wasn't "with reference to" salvation, nor "because of" salvation either. Why on earth can't you read simple English? No! "It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." What is righteousness? God's commandments are righteousness. Hence, it becomes the Christ to fulfill all righteousness. If that is true with Christ, it is equally true with reference to us. He said we were to baptize disciples. I am sure that Dr. Bogard knows that the word disciple has two meanings. Its primary meaning is a learner, the Greek word from which we get "disciple" is the same word from which we get "mathematics," and that means a student, a learner. Hence, everybody who is a student of God's word, whether saint or sinner, is a disciple. Some of the brethren have had a post-graduate course, and have quit studying and learning, and no longer are disciples. Hence, when you read about a disciple, it might be one that is not a Christian, it might be one that is a Christian. So, we have that much out of the way.

Again, he said the word "begotten" is also the word "born." Paul said, "I have begotten you in Christ Jesus." So, I guess according to that, Paul said, "I have born you, brethren, and brought you forth." But doesn't Dr. Bogard know—of course he does—that "begetting" was the word used if it referred to the father; and if it referred to the mother, it was the word "*born*"? If it referred to both of them, the word born takes the precedence in the matter. Listen: "Born unto Mr. and Mrs. John Jones, a bouncing baby boy." When both parents are brought to view, the word *born* is the correct one.

Now, he says that Rom. 6: 3 means "with reference to." I deny that most emphatically. The word does not mean anything of the kind. No translator has ever so translated it, and that's purely Dr. Bogard's hope of palming off something that is not standard and that is not in the records of the very best scholars and translators of the entire world.

Now then, in the few minutes left, I introduce argument No. 2, based on Acts 2, and thus we have the occasion.

Christ had ascended to the throne, had dispatched the Spirit from heaven to earth to consummate the work of redemption, and when Peter stood before a great throng of people assembled, and caught their attention, he spoke unto them the gospel of God's Son. Consider Acts 2: 22-24, 37. The resume of the passage is: First, the gospel was preached unto them; second, they believed it and were cut to their hearts, and right there they cried out, "What shall we do?" Let me put it here on the board, just a minute. "What shall we do?" Well, do for what? Now, here is the answer. What shall we do *for the remission of our sins*? That's the thing of which we are guilty. We have killed and crucified the Son of God. That fact has been brought to bear upon us. Now then, what shall we do, not about the negro's skin, not about the leopard's spots, not about this thing, not that or the other, BUT what shall we do to have our sin remitted?

Then Peter said to them, "Repent, and (more besides) be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Peter answered this question, or else he misunderstood them. Now then, let's be a little particular and careful along that line. I know that Elder Bogard will say, "Oh yes, repent ye, that's second plural." That's correct in English. Be baptized everyone of you—that's singular, third. That's correct in English. But I'm calling his attention to some matters that ought to weigh heavily upon him. In the original language, the rules of grammar do not correspond with our rules in English, and Elder Bogard's mistake will be, as I anticipate, that he'll take the original language, the Greek, and try to interpret that by a rule that governs English; and in that, consciously or otherwise, make a sad mistake. I am reading to him a Greek grammar, Hadley and Allen, one of the very best, on page 204, with reference to two or more subjects connected by "and." Well, that's this situation: repent ye and every one of you be baptized. "If the subjects have a different person, the verb is in the first person rather than in the second, or third, and the second rather than in the third." Now note. "A collective noun or subject denoting

person [like 'ye' for instance, and 'every one of you'] may have its verb in the plural number." Now, again.

"Such words as 'ekastos' [that's 'each one of you,' in Greek]—have the construction of collectives." Hence, this third is in the plural number. Repent ye, and every one of you be baptized. That's also plural according to Greek grammar. Now then, I am calling his attention to Mr. Thayer, whom he loves so wonderfully, and not without merit. Dr. Thayer says when the word "ekastos" denotes individuality, "as every one of you"—or as many—then what? It is added appositively. What does the word appositive mean? It is explanatory, meaning the same as the other. Dr. Bogard, the preacher, is here. Now what is *preacher*? It is a noun in apposition with Bogard. "Bryant the poet." Poet is in apposition with Bryant. Now then, what about this "each one of you"? In apposition with "ye." Therefore, the verb baptize is in the plural number. Well, let's see Liddell and Scott on the very same word. "The singular of *ekastos* is often joined with a plural verb." Here is the illustration. "They went home, every one of them." Now, there is "they" plural. Watch it. "Every one of them," and he says it means the same thing. But Dr. Bogard may suggest that a verb must *agree with its subject*, in person and number. Why, friends, that's not always true in English, much less in Greek. Let me demonstrate that. You were a stranger. "You" is singular, and "were" the plural form. Neither do pronouns always agree with their antecedents. *It* is they; it is singular, *they*, plural. Now, Dr. Bogard ought to learn those things. It would avoid confusion, and help him to get matters straight.

Now, believe plus baptize equals salvation. Repent *plus* baptize equals salvation or the remission of sins. That's the Bible. Now let's quote Dr. Bogard over here. Belief *minus* baptism equals salvation. Repentance *minus* baptism equals remission of sins. That's just the difference between the Bible and Dr. Bogard! But in this I have anticipated him. I am now suggesting some parallel sentences for his consideration. Suppose I say, "Turn ye and be vaccinated every one of you in the name of the doctor for the prevention of smallpox." I challenge him to find an iota of distinction in

the grammatical construction of this and Peter's sentence. And again, "Desist ye and be conciliated every one of you for the restoration of peace." And again, for a perfect parallel, as respects students, "Matriculate ye, and every one of you be instructed for the reception of a diploma." And thus you have the parallel of the Bible in the statements thus made.

So I suggest, friends, that all through the Bible there is perfect and absolute harmony in matters of that kind.

So, having answered, I think, every thought that has been presented, I rest upon two passages, Mark 16: 16 and Acts 2: 38, which beyond a shadow of doubt teach just this: The necessity of baptism in order to the remission of sins—"Believe *and* be baptized, and you shall be saved." This is the commission of the Son of God, and when Peter made the keynote speech to the great throng on Pentecost, it was the declaration of God's Spirit, regarding the promise of salvation unto dying men and women.

I thank you very kindly indeed.

After the debate was over, Elder Bogard suggested that, since neither Acts 22: 16 nor 1 Pet. 3: 21 had been used in the discussion, each of us have a word to say about them. I agreed with him and hence this comment.

In reply to Saul's query, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" (Acts 9) the Lord said: "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." When Ananias reached him and saw that he was a penitent believer, he said: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." This means that, when a man believes the gospel and repents of his sins, he should not tarry, but he should arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord.

Noah lived in a wicked world and was vexed by the corruption and vice of evil round about him.

By means of water he was transferred from the old world of sin to a world made pure by the flood. The water of separation came between him and the old sin-cursed world. Hence Noah was saved in a figure or in type. Peter says the like figure or in the antitype baptism saves us. The

sinner is surrounded by sin and by it corrupted. Therefore by means of water he is transferred, as was Noah, from the old state of sin into a newness of life.

THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

BEN M. BOGARD, *Negative*, Second Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

For a great scholar and college president as my good friend, Professor Hardeman, is, I am not only amused, but amazed that he undertakes to get before you what he regards as parallel passages of Acts 2: 38, where it says, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." My friend very correctly says, anticipating me, for he knew I would say it, that "repent" in that passage is second person plural; and that the word "baptize" is third person singular. He anticipated that, and now he says, I am going to show you how that third person singular can be joined by the conjunction "and" to a second person plural. Now that's Professor Hardeman, an excellent teacher in English, and a teacher of Greek, and now mark his dismal failure, as I read the very passage, he wrote off, verbatim. I beg him to let me have the slip of paper lest I might have misunderstood. (Hardeman passes paper to Bogard.)

"Matriculate ye, and be instructed every one of you for the reception of a diploma." There is the singular and the plural, but not the second and third persons. Second person both times. I am going to offer a reward to Professor Hardeman. He studied over this. I'll give him a \$5.00 bill, if I have to borrow it from my friend Joe Warlick, if he will find any passage in English or Greek or Latin or any other language where the second person plural is joined to the third person singular, same predicate, with the conjunction "and." Can't do it to save his life. Now the second sentence, "Turn ye, and be vaccinated every one of you for the prevention of smallpox." Second person in both sentences. Not second person in one clause and third person in the other clause; but second person in both clauses. Now, he reads from Hadley and Allen Greek Grammar, very correctly, where you can join the singular and the plural together with the

same predicate in Greek. But he couldn't read from Hadley and Allen's Greek Grammar where you could join the third person and the second person together by the conjunction "and," and he won't do it next time. This goes to record, and scholars will read this debate. I am aware that I am in the presence of and debating with a real scholar, and if that is the best that he can do, then it will just have to go for his best. I know what I am talking about. You can't join the second person plural to third person singular by the conjunction "and" with the same predicate to save your life without violating the rule of Greek, Latin, and English grammar.

So then, it follows in Acts 2: 38 you are not repenting for the same thing which you are baptized for; you can't join them to the same predicate. Correctly he quoted from the scripture in his last speech that "*repentance is unto life.*" Very well. Now let me give you the exact rendering that Professor A. T. Robertson, who wrote the greatest Greek grammar that ever has been published, and I shouldn't wonder that my friend uses it in his college. It is used in practically all of the colleges. Robertson's rendering in his notes on Acts 2: 38, now I am giving the exact wording: "Having reached life, upon the basis of the life reached, be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." That's precisely the words of Professor Robertson, the greatest Greek scholar that has lived since the language became a dead language, and wrote the greatest Greek grammar that has ever been published. Then what does it mean? Repent, which brings you into life, having reached the life, then be baptized *upon the basis of* that life or with reference to that life, as Professor Thayer says in the lexicon that we have been quoting.

Thayer said, and he didn't deny it, and if he denies it, let him bring Thayer here or I'll bring it here and show where Thayer says the word "eis" when it has reference to location means "into." Who's Thayer? The greatest lexicographer that ever lived that I know anything about. I don't believe Professor Hardeman will put anyone ahead of him. Hardeman concedes I have quoted correctly from

him. What did he say about "eis" again? But when it expresses the idea "of relation," then it is translated "with reference to or as regards."

So, Thayer, the greatest lexicographer; Robertson, the greatest grammarian; one an Episcopalian, the other a Baptist—nobody disputing their scholarship—agree with Ben M. Bogard. I don't put myself up as a scholar, but I know what I am talking about. I don't talk at random, and I don't guess. I have been too many times in controversies of this sort to be trapped on anything, not even by my great and personal friend and scholar, Professor Hardeman. So that takes Acts 2: 38 away from him; *life reached first*, and upon the *basis of that life*, and *with reference to that life*, he baptized every one of you for, with reference to, the remission of sins.

Having noticed this first, because it is fresh on your mind, I want now to take up the speech in the order in which it has been delivered, item by item, and offer some more negatives.

"What works could be boasted of?" I asked him, and he answered that such work as building the tower of Babel. That is the most farfetched stretch of the imagination that I have ever heard my friend Hardeman express. Would building the tower be a work of righteousness or work of the devil? Building a tower of Babel was not a work of righteousness, but in opposition to God. Why, Professor, I am ashamed of you. I want that to go into the book, ashamed of you because your reputation as a teacher is at stake. Anything that we might do to produce our salvation could be boasted of, for what more wonderful work than the salvation of the soul? You can't do any kind of work, not even obeying a command that requires work, lest you boast, for it produces salvation.

My friend finds fault with me for referring to yesterday's debate. I know I'm ahead in the argument. He says "Repent AND be baptized" makes both necessary to salvation. That just knocks in the head everything he said yesterday about there being nothing but the word, when it says the "scriptures AND the power of God," and they "preached AND the hand of the Lord was with them." Yes-

terday, it was only one thing, the word, and he didn't add anything because of the conjunction "and." Today, on the other side of his mouth, he says it does. He said I ought not to call attention to it, that I am not satisfied with yesterday's debate. Eminently satisfied, so tremendously satisfied, that I want it to go in the record of the book how you crossed yourself. My friend complains that I go back to yesterday's debate. Before God, if he didn't refer to it three times about my pronunciation of a word, I called "apropos" instead of "apropo." Did that happen yesterday, did I bring that up, who did? Professor Hardeman. Again my friend found fault with my grammar yesterday, and now he brings that up today. Who did that, Ben M. Bogard? No, Professor Hardeman. There's an old saying that "sauce good for the goose is good for the gander." If it's good for me, it's good for you.

By the way, I was right on my grammar yesterday. Since you brought it up, you are the man who brought the grammar up today. Right on my grammar. All the difference between us on the grammar yesterday was that I said that it was in the possessive case. He says today it is nominative. Now then, the record will show, and he must not change that part of the work. If so, my warning will be unchanged or it will show that he did change it. *He was the man who said it is in the possessive case.* Down in black and white by the stenographers. The transcription will show it. He says if I say Bogard's head, does that mean he has two heads? That's in the record. I got back at him by saying if it is the possessive case, what of it? That doesn't change the meaning of the word "*gar*," which means *for* and not *the*, I didn't bring that up, but it shows that he has only one hope, and that is a psychological effect last night to make an impression; that I didn't know grammar, hence, ought not to talk Greek. I know grammar, and Greek and English, all three, thank you. I went to school to Professor C. P. Shields of Bethel College, one of the best grammarians in Greek that ever lived, and under John P. Fruit, the best English grammarian I know anything about. Of course, my language, like all of us who don't keep up, gets a little rusty; but none the less, I know what I am talking about, and

Professor Hardeman knows I know what I am talking about. I am sure he wishes he had not brought that particular grammar stuff up.

On what I said, whether any good thing is done before baptism, he says that faith acts; well faith does act, does good work and that sort of faith saves. I asked him does faith do any good work before you are baptized? He made real answer, but, skillful in polemics, he comes back and *answers by asking* the question, "Did you do any good work before you believed?" I answer, "No." I have made an answer. Come on now and make an answer to my question. I have proved by the word of God, in Rom. 8: 8, "without faith, it is impossible to please God." And certainly if they did a good work before baptism, it would please God. Again, I'll read 1 Cor. 10: 31: "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God," and the man who does anything that he does not do for the glory of God commits sin. That makes every act of your life before you believe in Jesus Christ an act of sin. I have answered him by giving my word, then quoted two passages of scripture. Now, be the man that I believe you are, Professor Hardeman, and answer me. Can you do any good works before you are baptized, any work of righteousness? You being witness, if you can do any good work before you are baptized, then you are saved before you are baptized. Why? Because faith saves *when it works*, so you say. I asked him a direct question, was it a good work and a work of faith, when he makes the good confession? He made no answer, and the record will show it. If that is a good work and a work of faith, it saves before baptism, he being judge. If it is not a good work, it is the work of the devil, and you have got to do the work of the devil according to Hardeman in order to be saved!

He said I didn't come up to myself in my last speech. Oh well, if I had, what would have happened to him? If I didn't come up to myself, and did what I did, if I'd really come up to myself, what would have happened?

On Gal. 3: 26, 27: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." I gave Thayer's definition of the word "eis" used in that and in Acts 2: 38, also other places, which,

when it refers to location, means into; relationship, it means with reference to or as regards as Professor Robertson says. Very well. We are all children of God by faith. Well, as many of you, you children of God, of course; you who? You children of God by faith; as have been baptized with reference to Christ "*enduo*" imitated Christ. What's the word "*enduo*"? It means clothed upon. My friend said, Why, Mr. Bogard, didn't you know that "*enduo*" means clothing, to be clothed? Exactly. And if I clothed myself with the clothes of a clown, I'd act like a clown. If I should clothe myself with the gown of the supreme court judge, I'd be acting like a supreme court judge, imitating him. If I'd clothe myself as a racer on the track who runs the race, I'd be imitating one of these racers. If I should clothe myself as a prize fighter, I'd be imitating a prize fighter. And if I act like Jesus Christ, I am imitating (Greek "*enduo*") Jesus Christ. So, we are all children of God by faith, and as many of us as are baptized with reference to Christ, acted like Christ, clothed ourselves like Christ ("*enduo*"), imitating Christ. I'd let that go before any company of scholars on the face of God's green earth, and I have got Professor Robertson and Professor Thayer, the greatest we have, on my side; my friend, Hardeman, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

He said, Bogard, you had better stay off the Greek and stay in the English. How in the name of heaven are we going to discuss the Greek proposition and stay in the English? The New Testament was written in Greek, and if Professor Hardeman is not able to discuss the Greek, then let him say so, and I'll quit it. If he is, let him walk up like a man and meet the Greek that I laid down here. If he is not able to do it, I'll have mercy on the dear brother, and not discuss the Greek if he will confess that he can't do it. But he won't do that, and if he thinks that he can, come on and try it, and meet the argument.

So, I put "and" in the wrong place. I confess I did. When I make a mistake I own it; I won't dodge. I thought he had "believe" up here (pointing to the board) and "is baptized" down here, but that does not change the argument. He says where I put the word "and" indicates some-

thing else, and I was running home on the argument you made yesterday, and said that it didn't mean something else. I know I meant that.

Take the next, for I want to answer everything carefully. That's my business. The jailer was baptized, he said, and straightway obtained the promise that came with belief. Paul said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." When he believed, he got what the promise called for. He heard the word of the Lord and rejoiced. How did he rejoice? He rejoiced because he did his duty, and nobody ever rejoiced any more than I, when I was baptized in ice water on a cold February day. I was happy because I had faith and love, and imitated my Lord. Anybody else will be happy when he imitates the Lord, and obeys the Lord. But do you mean that rejoicing is necessary to salvation? If so, we will have to turn you over to the Holy Rollers where you have to get up and shout before you are regarded as saved. Professor Hardeman went back on himself when he made that argument.

On being baptized for the same reason that Jesus was baptized, my friend said, "You weren't baptized for the same reason that Jesus was baptized. People were then baptized confessing their sins, and Bogard was baptized confessing he had no sins." Since when did you get that information? There has never been a Baptist of intelligence that I ever heard of but what was baptized confessing his sins; but he didn't confess unforgiven sins, but he confessed the sins forgiven by the work of the Lord Jesus Christ and cleansed by the blood. When are they forgiven? When he is saved. All sin and come short in the glory of God, and I confessed that I was a sinner when I was baptized. A sinner but saved by grace. He doesn't profess perfection at all. Now, why was Jesus baptized? To make him manifest to Israel as the Son of God. Why was I baptized? To make it manifest that I was a son of God, child of God. You can't imitate Jesus Christ if you are baptized in order to the remission of your sins. You can't imitate Jesus Christ if you are baptized in order to make you a son of God, but if you imitate Jesus Christ you are baptized because you are sons and daughters

of God. Otherwise there is no following of Jesus in it. Now having noticed everything my friend said—my duty to do that—I pass to another argument on the negative.

My Bible tells me that now is the time. 2 Cor. 6: 2. *Now* is the time. My friend and his people can't preach that passage of scripture. Why: Because they can never tell sinners that *now* is the time. When salvation is by faith, you can tell them *now* is the time. Instantaneously you can accept Jesus by faith and be saved now; but you can't do that according to Professor Hardeman's gospel. The church where I am pastor, at Antioch Missionary Baptist Church, it takes 45 minutes to fill the baptistry. Suppose I get up and say, "Now is the time. Will you accept Jesus Christ NOW? You can be saved *Now*." A man walks down the aisle and takes me by the hand and says, "I take it." And all at once I back out and say, "My friend, I am sorry that I have preached the scriptures to you and said that you can be saved now. It will take 45 minutes to have the baptistry filled, so you can't be saved until 45 minutes from now when we get the baptistry filled; or if we have to go out to the creek it will take an hour to drive out there, and I have to put you off. A while ago I told you now is the time and now behold I have gone back on it and tell you that you have to wait until the baptistry is filled or we can go out to the creek somewhere and attend to the ordinance of baptism." *Now* means this moment. Brother Hardeman, you can't preach that and hold to your doctrine. I can. I stood out here at the penitentiary for women and preached to those women who were fenced off from me, about 10 or 15 feet from them. The warden said you must not go among them. You can preach to them but not shake hands with them because if I had I might have been guilty of slipping weapons or saws or something by which they could make their escape. I wasn't allowed to ask them to come and shake hands with me, or anybody else; I wasn't allowed to baptize them. I stood up there and I said, "You women can be saved now. Why? Because God said so. *Now* is the time. If you accept Jesus Christ, you will be saved right now, whether you ever see a church or are baptized or not." I can preach that, Professor Hardeman can't do it, he can't

say *now* to save his life, and stand by his doctrine. Again I want to give you another example. I want this to go to record in the book because I don't know that it ever has been published in books or used in debates.

Over in Kentucky, near Cave City, there was a man by the name of Floyd Collins who was a cave explorer; and he crawled in those caves day after day, and one day he crawled in one time too many, and a rock fell down between him and the getting out place. He could not get out. When the family missed him and began to search for him, they found him there imprisoned in the cave. They could get close enough to him to talk but they couldn't get him out, no way to get that rock removed. To blast it meant to kill him; they had no way to get him out and the newspapers of the United States were excited over it. "What shall we do to rescue Floyd Collins?" And they even tried to sink a shaft down by engineering to where he was and let him out that way. A preacher went in there with God Almighty's word and a flashlight, and read the scriptures to him and offered him Jesus Christ and said, "Floyd, you can be saved." Floyd accepted Jesus Christ, said he did, and was saved. The preacher offered him immediate salvation. I want to tell you that you *cannot put a rock between God and the sinner!* Salvation is offered to anybody, no matter what the difficulties or obstacles may be. Now is the time! Today, if you hear his voice, harden not your heart.

Coming to the question of the begetting. I saved that to the last, because I wanted it fresh. My friend said that the word beget in "I have begotten you" was one thing, and that the word "born" is another thing. Professor Hardeman, you know that the Greek word is identically the same when it says "beget" and when it says "born." There are not two words, one for "beget" and another for "born." And I challenge your scholarship when you answer. In natural birth, there is a begetting, and a birth; but in the stage of begetting, you get life. There is no begetting and then being born spiritually. They are the same word, and you know it. He used the passage where it says "beget" and where it says "born again," precisely the same words. And mark here: "If you are begotten," and Paul said, "I have begotten you,"

then listen to me. If I have begotten you, then life comes with the begetting. Any doctor knows that a baby is as much alive before it is born as after and so does the mother. Did begetting bring life? And Paul said, "I have begotten you through the gospel." You are actually alive in Christ Jesus before the birth, if you want to call baptism the birth, which it is not. So there is the life of God in the soul, and Paul says *I have begotten you by the gospel, but I did not baptize you*, showing that baptism did not bring life.

I am going to warn my friend now, to warn or suggest to him, call it what you will. I hope you will bring up John 3: 5 tonight in your first speech; if you don't, I'll bring it up in mine. You preach it everywhere, and I want that thing to be brought out and discussed here. Don't make it in your last speech, for then you won't have any opportunity of replying to what I say.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, my time is just about up. I have answered everything my friend has said, brought on these negatives, and you are to be the judge. The record is in the book. On Mark 16: 16 I am going to take that up fully in my first speech tonight. He says I have not done it, I will do it in plenty of time for you to make refutation in your last speech and Mark 16: 16 will be fully discussed, and will harmonize with all the other scriptures, and not contradict the other scriptures.

1 Pet. 3: 21, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Just as Noah, already a child of God, was saved by water even so we in a "figure" are saved by baptism. The water saved Noah "in a figure"—proved, demonstrated his salvation, *SHOWED* him to be God's man. Even so baptism saves us in a "figure," "like figure," says Peter. Baptism demonstrates, shows, makes manifest that we are God's children. Just as Noah was a saved man *before the water of the flood*, even so we are saved *before the water of baptism*. Baptism is the "answer of a good conscience," says Peter. And there is no good conscience until it is cleansed by the blood of Christ.

THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISMN. B. HARDEMAN, *Affirmative*, Third Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

After a period of relaxation and rest, I rejoice that so many have evidenced an interest by coming again, and thus showing that you appreciate the presentation of those matters that are vital to our eternal salvation. I want to join Brother Harper and also Dr. Bogard in suggesting that this debate is unlike some to which you have listened, and which you have had here in your city with Dr. Bogard as a participant. I would not enter into a discussion if I thought it would turn into a thing like that between Dr. Bogard and Mrs. McPherson. I rejoice that by mutual agreement this one shall not so be. I am affirming, ladies and gentlemen, that the Bible teaches that baptism, as taught by Christ in the commission is *for*, in the sense of, "in order to" or "unto," or "with a view to" the remission of sins to a penitent believer. The terms were defined at the opening address; no criticism has been offered regarding them and the position that I occupy was also plainly stated, and the precise issues were clearly pointed out. But I want to emphasize again that I believe the scriptures teach the proposition, of course; and the man to whom that is applicable is an accountable, responsible person in the sight of God, who has believed the truth that Jesus is the Christ, and who has repented of his sins. Unto that man, baptism is *for*, in order to, the remission of sins.

I made the first argument in the first speech on Mark 16: 16. I regret that Dr. Bogard has let two speeches pass, one entire session, and as yet has not given attention to the first and the only argument made in the opening address; but he has promised to do that in this session, even tonight, and I trust that he may gladly so do. We are after the truth regarding it, and with all the power of my being and with all the force possible, I insist that I have presented the truth. An honest investigation to the very depths of the matter will prove advantageous.

Passing from that I went to Acts 2, the first gospel sermon, when Peter delivered the keynote address of Christian

salvation and, in that, under the commission of our Lord, preached precisely just what the Lord Jesus Christ had authorized, and when he brought home to the hearts of his hearers the fact that they stood guilty of the most heinous crime and the most atrocious deed of all the ages, it brought conviction unto them. They were affected and cut to their hearts and cried out saying, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" In answer, Peter said unto them, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." These arguments as yet have not been replied to with that degree of sufficiency that I think they demand, and I am still waiting at the next, the third speech, for Dr. Bogard to give them his most earnest and serious consideration.

I have on the board tonight that which I repeated this afternoon and which was denied by Dr. Bogard as being parallel, but I have taken the time tonight to write the two sentences, and I want him now, as an expert in all matters of this kind, to point out the precise point wherein they differ. To those of you who can see the board, I want to call your attention to it. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you . . . for the remission of sins," of course, in the name of Jesus Christ. Now then, what's the parallel? You say to a body of students, "Matriculate ye, and be instructed every one of you for the reception of a diploma," and thus, the two stand there, side by side. I am saying that they are identical and are a duplicate one of the other and a perfect parallel in all grammatical relationships. "Repent" up here is second person plural, "matriculate" down here is second person plural. I am talking English, of course. "Every one of you" is third person singular; "every one of you" down here is third person singular. But Dr. Bogard suggests that they are all second person, and they were both singular and plural. Now then, tonight, as a matter of education and pure grammatical rendition and examination of affairs, I challenge Dr. Bogard to point out, from a point of diction, rhetorical or grammatical relationships, the difference in the two sentences; and if he is unable to do it,

as indeed he shall be, then he stands helpless, hopeless, and hapless in the presentation of an argument to the contrary.

Dr. Bogard says: "You can't join the second person plural to the third person singular by the conjunction 'and' with the same predicate to save your life without violating the rule of Greek, Latin and English grammar." He says further, "I know what I'm talking about." Friends, it has been necessary several times to expose Dr. Bogard with reference to his knowledge of both English and Greek. I regret that such is true, but the remark just quoted from him is absolutely ridiculous. He shows himself wholly unfit to be a teacher and representative of his people. Here is the audience and there is Dr. Bogard. Suppose that I say: "You (the audience) and he (Bogard) can surely see that his statement is the opposite of the truth." Here we have "you," second plural, and "he," third singular, joined very willingly by "and" to be the subject of the same predicate "can see," without violating *any* rule of Greek, Latin or English. Let it be said that Dr. Bogard's embarrassing statement and exposure thereof also "go to record." Now give me your \$5.00.

I am calling attention again: When he came to the statement of "repentance unto life," he had so much to say regarding Dr. A. T. Robertson, as the greatest of all grammarians; and then, with a note that Dr. Robertson makes, he would offset all the Bible and every lexicon and all translations that have ever been rendered in order that he might take what Dr. Robertson says in a footnote regarding these matters.

Ladies and gentlemen, here is God's book, this is King James Version. There were 47 scholars, the cream of the scholarship of the world, that had a part in its translation. Here is the Revised Version, with 101 scholars, also representing the ripest and the most perfect scholarship that could be found in all the realms of our land. Now, what has Dr. Bogard done? There are 148 scholars selected because of their ability as linguists, and well educated in both Hebrew and Greek, and now, he comes along and assumes to say that the Greek means other than these scholars have said. That is equivalent to saying to all of you 148, "You gentlemen missed it and we don't have the Bible as it ought to be."

Friends, don't you know that thing is as dangerous as can be? You let Dr. Bogard get out and preach to the people that the Bible is wrong, that in the very translation of it there is an error. Well, if there is an error in that point, there is possibly an error in every point, and therefore, he has set aside the entire Bible.

Now then, I have here, ladies and gentlemen, 26 translations of Acts 2: 38. I am calling your attention to what is said in these. The translations of the preposition "eis" are rendered "for, unto, into, with a view to, in order to, for the purpose of, that sins may be forgiven." Not one solitary time out of King James's 47 Greek scholars; out of the Revised Version's 101 Greek scholars; and out of the 26 translations of the Bible, has "eis" been rendered otherwise. Scholarly all, who put forth a translation of the Bible; not one of them gives Acts 2: 38 the rendition contended for by Dr. Bogard.

Now question: Shall this audience take him who does not stand as a scholar, or those who are so acknowledged? He is not considered such, and no scholar would dare class him with any of these 26 or with the 148; and yet, he would have you understand that the Bible had missed it and it remains for Dr. Bogard to tell you what the Greek means regarding it. Now then, summing up these renditions: Eleven times "eis" is translated "for"; 4 times, "unto"; 2, "into"; 2, "with a view to"; 5, "in order to"; 1, "for the purpose of"; and once, "that sins may be forgiven."

Now again, I am calling attention to some other matters. I have here, ladies and gentlemen, a new translation of the Bible by Dr. Charles B. Williams, a teacher of Greek in Union University, Jackson, Tenn., a Baptist institution that celebrated its 100th anniversary this year. Dr. Williams is a scholar of general note. He says (and Dr. Bogard would well envy his position) he was Dean of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, President of Howard University, and Professor of New Testament Greek; also, at present Professor of Greek in the University at Jackson. He is a member of the Society of Biblical Literature Exegesis, the American Research Society, and further, he is magazine

editor for the teaching in the classes of Greek. Here is what he says regarding it. Dr. Williams, right recently, 1938, translated: "Peter said unto them, You must repent, and as an expression of it, let everyone of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, that you may have your sins forgiven." Now, Dr. Bogard comes up with his scholarship and disagrees! Let me present, ladies and gentlemen, a word from Dr. James Hardy Ropes, Professor of Greek in Harvard University. Dr. Ropes suggests, when asked about believe "into," repent "into," and be baptized "into," that: "'Believe into' does not seem to me to be good English." "'Repent into' does not convey any idea to me at all." Acts 2: 38, "Unto the remission of sins, 'eis' the remission, may be taken as belonging to both verbs, as I am inclined to think the author meant it. At any rate, the baptism is not supposed to take place without an accompanying repentance and the remission of sins is the consequence of both verbs." He and Dr. Williams have real earned degrees and in this they differ from my friend, Dr. Bogard.

Now, you have this situation tonight. Here are 148 scholars in the King James and the Revised Version; 26 scholars that have translated the Bible and all of them are against Dr. Bogard. Not one of them translates "eis" "with reference to," or "on account of"; and yet he comes up and says all the Bible is wrong, everything about it is wrong. Dr. Bogard said, "I know Greek and I know English." Friends, I beg of him not to try to make that impression upon this audience. His effort is but sowing the seed of infidelity. Unless you and I can be governed by God's word, and accept it with full confidence, we are treading upon dangerous ground indeed.

I just want to ask: When the Baptists baptize folks into the Baptist Church is that "reference to location" or is that "with reference to relation"? Now he says "we are baptized into Christ." That means, according to Bogard, we are already in Christ; and therefore, we are baptized "with reference to." Hence, saved and then baptized. Well, let's try it again. If "baptized into Christ" means "with reference to Christ" or "on account of Christ," as Dr. Bogard says in a little book, *Modern Heresies*, page 46. Now get it. Baptized

with reference to Christ. What does that mean? *Already* saved. Very well. Believe into the Christ. What does that mean? Believe with "reference to Christ." There already saved, so believe "with reference to" what happened before you were a believer, and before you were saved. Well, it is repentance "eis" Christ. What does that mean? "On account of or with reference" to Christ. What's the meaning of it? Oh, that means we are already saved and then we repent with reference to a thing that's already happened. Therefore, on the same principle that he eliminates baptism, there must go likewise both faith and repentance and he would have his man stripped of all features and phases whatsoever. Now, Dr. Bogard said that he did no work of righteousness at all before he believed. Well, Baptists teach that repentance comes before faith; therefore, if he repented before he believed, it was without faith, because it came before; hence, it was repentance of *unrighteousness*, and he'll hardly take a position of that kind. But I anticipate he'll suggest that repentance and faith are inseparably connected. No, no. Jesus said to those in Mark 1: 15 who are believers in God, repent ye and believe the gospel, and hence the two separate acts. Baptist preachers, one of whom he is which, as somebody put it, have argued and quoted that very passage to show that repentance comes in advance of faith; but it could not be a work of righteousness according to the Doctor.

And then he says that Baptists are baptized confessing their sins. What kind of sins? Confessing forgiven sins. Why, Dr. Bogard, to confess a thing means to acknowledge a thing. John's people were not of that class. John baptized those people confessing their sins, and he baptized them for, unto, or with a view to the remission of their sins. Hence, these are not parallel by any means. And then, he comes and says, "Oh, Hardeman can't preach 'NOW is the day of salvation'. 'Today if you hear his voice, harden not your heart', because it might take 45 minutes to warm up and fill the baptistry." I just wonder if Dr. Bogard could preach to the heathens, "Now is the accepted time." No, you will have to wait until financial conditions get in good shape, until banks can lend money, and brethren pick up

in their zeal, and we can send the gospel unto them. It might be delayed one year, five years, or 10 years; yet "now is the accepted time." Friends, that's the kind of argument (?) to which you have listened.

But again, when the angel appeared unto Cornelius, he told him to send men to Joppa, call for Simon, "who shall tell thee words, whereby thou . . . shall be saved," and four days passed. Philip and the eunuch were riding along the way, when the eunuch said: "See, here is water." Now, he said, is the time. What doth hinder? Philip said if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. Now, if Dr. Bogard had been riding with that officer, secretary of the treasury, and the officer said, "Dr. Bogard, here is water, what hinders me?" Well, I will tell you what would hinder. "You sit here and fish on the bank of the creek and lend me your horse and chariot and I will go back to Jerusalem and put your case before the brethren, and unless they blackball you, I'll come back and baptize you." That would have been his condition regarding a matter of that sort. Friends, there is not a thing on God's earth to that. No man is saved short of obedience to God's word; and Jesus said, and it is not to be trifled with, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." That officer rejoiced after he had been baptized. Since Jesus Christ gave that commission, there is not a case of conversion on record where any man ever rejoiced on account of sins forgiven until after that man was baptized. Now why? Because Christ said "he that believeth," item number 1; "and is baptized," item number 2; "shall be saved," item number 3. Therefore, when a man believes the gospel with all his heart and is baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, then what? He rises to walk a new life and sings, "I am standing on the promise" of Christ Jesus our Lord. Therefore, it is time for rejoicing.

But I am coming now to what Paul said, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." Dr. Bogard said, "Why, Hardeman, you know that the same Greek word is translated both begetting and born." Yes, I know that. He missed the entire point. I suggested that when the father alone is referred to, that Greek word is always translated "begotten"; when the mother alone is referred to, it is al-

ways properly translated "born." Now then, when both of them are referred to, the word "born" takes precedence over "begot," and Elder Bogard ought to know that. Paul, therefore, had begotten them through the gospel. But he said, "Paul didn't baptize anybody." Why, yes he did. He mentions quite a number. "I baptized the household of Gaius and Stephanas, and besides them I know not whether there are others." Why did you quit, Paul? Because of a very fine reason. Why? Lest any say I am baptizing in my own name. Paul begot them through the gospel. Paul baptized them and thus they came forth, having been begotten of the Spirit, and brought forth; they are therefore born again, born from above, born of water and of the Spirit. John 3: 5. So, then, every soul tonight that hears the word of God, which is God's power unto salvation, is begotten: and then what? He goes forward and is born again. But he says, "Did you ever hear of someone begotten and not born? Yes, numbers of times, Dr. Bogard, and you know that is true. If you want to get that into the physical realm, let me ask, when does a begotten child come into the relationship of the blessings of this world? Not until after it is born. Certainly not. Now then, notwithstanding the fact it's been begotten, it does not come into this form of physical life until it is born or delivered! Just so, the sinner may be begotten by the gospel of faith. When does he come into the enjoyment of God's spiritual world? Not until he is born into God's kingdom, into the family of our Lord.

But to revert to perhaps the high point of this section of the discussion. My friends, I want to submit the testimony of a real Baptist scholar and a preacher of note. I am referring to J. W. Wilmarth, and I want you to see his standing among the leaders of his day. When asked about his relations he says: "I have been pastor of the following Baptist churches: Metamora, Illinois, Amenia, New York, Wakefield, Massachusetts, Pemberton, New Jersey, and Roxborough, Pennsylvania. I was editor of the Advanced Quarterly and other publications on the International Sunday School Lessons of the American Baptist Publication Society. Have been moderator of the West New Jersey and of the Philadelphia Associations. I am a member of the Board of

American Baptist Publication Society, chairman of its Committee of Publications, trustee of Crozier Theological Seminary, on the city mission board, and a member of the Hugent Home. I received the degree of D.D. from Carson College, and LL.D. from Southwestern Baptist College." Both of the schools are in Tennessee.

If Elder Bogard had attained such prominence, he would have given all the Bible a different translation. Now, let's hear Dr. Wilmarth on Acts 2: 38. After discussing this passage along with Matt. 26: 28 in which we have the identical expression, he says: "We conclude without hesitation, and in accordance with such authorities as Hackett, Winer, Meyer, etc., that the proper rendering of '*eis αφενω αρματιων*' in Acts 2: 38, as in Matt. 26: 28, is *unto, for, i. e., In Order to Remission of Sins.*" "As to Campbellism," he says: "Whoever carries the weight of the controversy with the Campbellites on the *eis* will break through." "When the Campbellites translate *in order to* in Acts 2: 38, they translate correctly. The world's scholarship is on their side." Friends, this is in perfect accord with the forty-seven scholars of King James, the 101 Revisers and the twenty-six other noted scholars. But Dr. Bogard would have you set all of these aside and let him tell you what is meant. Dr. Wilmarth says *eis* never means *on account of* and if, *with reference to*, it means with reference to purpose or aim. It is always prospective. With that much out of the way, I am calling attention again to Mark 16: 15, 16. That has never been touched. Is it a part of the word of God or not? Now notice "he." What he? Just any he? No, sir, but a certain "he"; it is *he* that believeth and a *he* that is baptized—that's my man, says the Lord. Well, Lord, what about that kind of a character? That man shall be saved. Well, is the believer saved? Of course, he is. What kind of a believer? A baptized believer. Is the believer justified by faith? Surely! Is he justified by the blood of Christ? Certainly! Is he justified by the life of Christ? Surely, but not by any one of these to the exclusion of all others. Friends, that's God's solemn declaration to every man and Peter's keynote speech on Pentecost endorses and blends most harmoniously and splendidly with the record as given by Christ Jesus our

Lord. I just want to ask Dr. Bogard: Under what commission are you laboring? Is Mark 16: 16 a spurious passage, or is it authentic in its declaration? And we are waiting to hear from him along that line. I am hoping that Dr. Bogard will say: "I have said this both round and flat, hot and cold, wet and dry, but I have learned something! Now, I will publicly acknowledge Mark 16: 16 as authentic scripture, by inspiration of God given." He will compliment himself if he thus does. Otherwise, it'll be otherwise, and there will be some more problems "ungetoverable" and unsolvable by him.

Now, when you come further, friends, to every case of conversion, there is not one solitary one but it is expressly said that man believed and was baptized. Baptism is expressed of everyone. A great number believed and turned unto the Lord. Now get it—they believed and turned—Acts 11: 26. What happened? Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized. Now what is that expression? They believed and turned. Another one, parallel—they believed and were baptized. Again: When the Samaritans believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God in the name of Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. What did they do? They repented and turned, they believed and were baptized. But there goes that "repented and turned." Then what? In Acts 3: 19, Peter said, "Repent ye therefore," or turn, and be converted. Therefore, beyond the believing there is the turning. Beyond the repenting, there is the turning, and every time after believing, after repenting, it's being baptized. Therefore, a turning, following faith and following repentance, is in God's book expressed by similar statements of being baptized into the name of Jesus Christ. And with this, I close!

THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

BEN M. BOGARD, *Negative*, Third Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am certainly glad of the opportunity that I now have. I am going to answer everything that my friend has said, item by item, and take all of it away from him without any sort

of hesitation, and then add some more negative arguments in this speech. Now see if I don't do it.

My friend said that when the jailer was baptized, sixteenth chapter of Acts, then he rejoiced, and you can't find where anybody rejoiced before he was baptized. Acts 10: 44-48: "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Spirit fell on all them that heard the word. And they of the circumcision that believed were amazed, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" They not only rejoiced but they magnified God, and even got the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, more than we now get, because the day of miracles is past. Rejoiced and magnified God all before baptism, and then said Peter, "Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" Had they been saved when they were rejoicing and magnifying God? Most assuredly. For in John 14: 17 Jesus says of the Spirit, "Whom the world cannot receive"; but Cornelius and his household did receive the word, even got the miraculous gift of tongues that nobody but a child of God ever got, for no unsaved man ever got one of those miraculous gifts. Got the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit, magnified God, and spake with tongues, all before baptism, and nobody but a child of God could receive that miraculous gift of tongues. For him "*the world cannot receive.*" So my friend goes down hard on that, and I will bring it up in my last speech. Another thing, my friend said the Greek preposition "eis" that he speaks of here, and I will write it on the blackboard. There it is on the board in Greek letters. He says that "eis" is always prospective and never retrospective. It always looks forward and never back. Suppose you try Matt. 3: 11. They were baptized "'eis' repentance." Always looks forward! If so they were baptized in order that they might repent. The very identical same thing is found in 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2: "Our fathers were all baptized 'eis' Moses in the cloud and in the sea." They were already under the direction of

Moses. Already led by the cloud, had already received the Passover blood, and now they were baptized *eis* Moses. Were they baptized in order to get under the control of Moses? Certainly not! But, with reference to it or on account of the fact.

My friend challenges me—I'll meet him on any part of the ground. He says I am no scholar and that he is not. I don't claim to be, but he is president of a college. If a man who is no scholar can meet a college president with ease as I am doing it; then what would happen if some big man were here sure enough? I'll just drop that thought to you as I go along. He attempted to answer to what I said about "now is the time." I made the point that the book says, 2 Cor. 6: 2, "Now is the time." Hardeman can't say "now" is the time because he must take time in the future to do something besides. I spoke of it taking forty-five minutes to fill the baptistry at the church where I preach. If I say *now* is the time, and a man accepts me on the proposition, the Bible's proposition, I can't do it if baptism is necessary. I said a while ago, "Now." But it is not now, I have to wait forty-five minutes to fill the baptistry. The word "now" means this moment and never any future time. How did he answer that? He answered by saying, "Can you preach NOW to the heathen?" If I were there, I could, and any missionary can preach right now, when he preaches to a heathen, just like I am preaching to you. "Now is the time." Whenever you get to where a sinner is, you can tell him "now is the time." My friend can't do it! I used the illustration of Floyd Collins. A rock came between him and God, according to your doctrine, up there in that cave, God couldn't save him because a rock stood between him and the getting out place. I could go to Floyd Collins, as that Baptist preacher did go, and say, "Floyd, you can be saved right now, and if you will accept it, now is the time." We have a NOW gospel. My friend has a *put off* gospel, after a while gospel. Well, he said it took four days for Peter to get to Cornelius. It didn't take four days for Peter to tell Cornelius when he got there. He said, "Whosoever believeth" on him is saved. "To him give all the prophets witness, that whosoever believeth in him will have remission of sins,"

and *while he was still talking*, the Holy Ghost fell on them and proved they had been saved. *They were not saved by receiving the Holy Ghost.* Nobody ever was, but *whenever you receive the Holy Ghost, it is proof that you have been saved*, and so during the time of that sermon right there, they got salvation and got the proof of it.

Let's see now. I am amazed at my friend on 1 Cor. 4: 15, the scholar that he is. I'll give him credit for scholarship. Paul said: "I have begotten you through the gospel." My friend says "you beget, the father begets, and the mother gives birth"—well any fool knows that; but *there are not two different words in the Bible*—one for beget and one for birth. Even he said *they were the same words*. There is *no such thing as being begotten and afterwards being born again*, in the Bible, and Professor Hardeman knows it; for he said there wasn't but one word, one Greek word, sometimes translated born and sometimes translated beget. Identically the same. No such thing in the Greek as in the process of nature where the begetting takes place and later on the birth. That's one of your fallacies you have been preaching. *The begetting is the only salvation we get.* Where the life is imparted right there—there is no afterwards, nothing comes afterwards; those are identically the same words, and Professor Hardeman says it is the same word.

Then, let me see. I really regret, but before I say that, I'll answer one more. Acts 11: 21, they "believed, and turned." He said the word turned meant baptized. If you didn't *turn in your repentance*, you are not on your way to heaven—you are still on the way to hell, since baptism is reached without turning. In order to be saved the hell-bound sinner going toward hell must turn by repentance, but he has never turned toward heaven, if baptism turns him, says Professor Hardeman! Don't you know that baptize is *passive*, and turned is *active*? Come on with your grammar now. "Turned," active, not be turned, passive, by being baptized. Every scholar knows it. Now here's what I regret. I regret that my friend brought up the objectionable word "Campbellite." I have not used it, and I just now use it. My friend read from his star witness, Mr. Wilmarth, that he and his people are Campbellites. If you prove by

Wilmarth that "eis" means in order to, your witness with equal force says you and your people are Campbellites. Well, now hold on. You say you will not take Wilmarth on that. Then what is Wilmarth, a liar? If so, you proved your proposition by a liar. But if he is not a liar, but just mistaken and ignorant, didn't know what he was talking about, then you have proved your proposition by a man that didn't know what he was talking about. Either your church, the church of which you are a member, is a Campbellite Church, or Mr. Wilmarth is a false witness; and if Mr. Wilmarth is a false witness, you have proved your proposition by a false witness. I rather think he was right when he called you Campbellites. I have that opinion and you have brought it up yourself, and you must take what comes as a result, and that goes in the book that his witness proves that he and his people are not Christians but Campbellites. They may happen to be right on "eis," your witness puts it that way. But hold on—even Wilmarth is not with you, who says you are Campbellites. Wilmarth said that that interpretation did not mean that baptism is necessary to the salvation of the soul. I'll prove that point that you have got here. Here it is. I have read every line of it. Wilmarth meant that it was in order to declare the remission of sins, and he says that we Baptists lose nothing by putting that interpretation on it. So he does not say in order to obtain, but in order to declare, even by his Campbellite witness. Thank you, sir. We are making some progress as sure as you are born.

Now coming to the parallel sentences that he puts here on the board. (Pointing to the board.) "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins." "Matriculate ye, and be instructed every one of you for the reception of a diploma." He says, "What's wrong with that?" The English of those two sentences is exactly alike, precisely, and no mistake about it. But hold on. In the Greek one in Acts 2: 38 is third person singular, and the other is second person plural; repent, second person plural; be baptized, third person singular. In this, "Matriculate ye, and be instructed every one of you" is second person, and not third as in the Greek form. That's an English form he's got there

in the two sentences and it is alike, but you put an English form with a Greek construction; and you know it's unfair, and every scholar will laugh in your face. In the Greek it is third person singular, imperative—you can't write a sentence in English like that to save your life for *our language has no third person imperative*. *Trying to write a third person imperative in English*, when there is no such form in English! But *there is such a form in Greek*. Don't try to put that over on people because there is a difference between these forms. In the Greek there is a difference in the forms and you know it. That will go to record.

Dr. Robertson's translation, he says, I put against 148 translators. No. I don't. He brings up the translation where one says "unto," and another one "with a view to," and another "into," and he says Bogard puts his word and Robertson's word against all of these. I do no such thing. I agree with nearly all these translations. Repent and be baptized *for* remission of sins. The only issue between Professor Hardeman and me is what does the word "for" mean? The translation is all right in the King James Version with "for remission." Certainly "for." But what does "for" mean? A man was sent to the penitentiary *for* stealing, but he stole first and went to the penitentiary "for" it afterwards. One laughed "for" joy, but he had the joy first, and laughed for it afterwards. One weeps "for" sorrow, he had the sorrow first, and wept afterwards. I was baptized "for" the remission of sins—had the remission of sins first, and baptized "for" it afterwards. The translation is not the thing, it is what they mean by the words they use in the translation; and I have given you the meaning.

Now he comes, my friends, with Professor Williams of Union University. Mr. Williams undoubtedly renders it contrary to what I believe, and Mr. Williams renders it contrary to what his teacher believed, Dr. A. T. Robertson. A. T. Robertson taught Williams the Greek he knows, and Williams was for a while assistant teacher in the Southern Baptist Seminary. Robertson taught Williams all the Greek he knows. Now who are we going to take, teacher or student? Dr. A. T. Robertson is against Williams and we can quote scholar after scholar, all night long, and I'll agree with most

of them; but what do they mean by the word, like "for" or "with a view to"? Like Wilmarth, "in order to," that is in order to proclaim or declare. Wilmarth is rather gifted though he fastens Campbellism on you. Very well. Now suppose instead of us trying to prove it by other scholars after we have cited these scholars, suppose we let Professor Hardeman decide it for you, about the grammar of this thing. When Joe S. Warlick and I debated, my old friend Joe over here to my right, Joe disputed everything in the world I'd say; and he said that there wasn't any such a thing as third person imperative in the Greek or English or anywhere else, and I said I'll leave it with the scholars, and we wrote to the scholars, among whom was Professor Hardeman, and I'll give you Hardeman's statement to show you that he is with me on the grammar, though not with me on the interpretation. Here is what Hardeman wrote:

"Dear Sir and Friend," writing to me, Ben M. Bogard, "your letter has finally reached me. I feel safe in the answers given below. Is the imperative ever used in the third person in Greek? Answer: Yes. (Now he's tried to make it appear there by these parallel sentences that it is not so.) Again, is 'be baptized' in Acts 2: 38 in Greek, third person imperative? Answer: It is third person imperative, aorist. Third, is 'repent' of Acts 2: 38 in Greek in the second person plural? Answer: It is second person plural imperative. I think the general rule of coordinance of thought prevails here. The Greek is filled with idioms and peculiar expressions. In English the subject of repent is you, which is a general expression. Subject of be baptized every one of you, which is specific. The meaning is the same in each case. If I were to say, 'Arise ye, and every one be vaccinated,' one expression would be equivalent to the other. I appreciate what you say, and give my idea of the points herein wholly apart from any religious bearing. Use these with me or any one else if you think good can be done. I hope to meet you some time. Faithfully, N. B. Hardeman."

I read every line Professor Hardeman wrote and I'm free to use it with him or anybody else he said. Now Hardeman agrees with me on the grammar of this thing. He doesn't

agree with me on the interpretation, but you can't logically agree with me on the grammar and disagree with me on the interpretation; for if repent is second person plural and baptize each one of you is third person imperative, you can't join repent and be baptized to the same predicate because they are different number and person. That's the very thing summed up. So, I take that from him and rejoice in having done so.

He wants to know, "When Baptists baptize into the church, is that location or relation?" I never have baptized anybody into the Baptist church. We baptize people before they join for membership in the Baptist church, just like John baptized them in Jordan, and Jesus came along and took them in the church himself. Did Hardeman know that? Well, he will know it when it goes in the record, and the folks will know what it is when they read it. He says repentance comes before faith according to Bogard, and if you do nothing good before faith, then repentance is bad. Well, listen here: repentance means the *change of the mind*. Professor Hardeman knows it, and he knows it very well. Now here is a man of unbelief, and repentance changes him from unbelief to faith. All the demons of the lower regions can't stop it. Whenever you finish repenting, you have belief. The believer has repented—they are inseparately joined together. If my friend wants to know which comes first, repentance or faith, I ask which comes first when a ball is shot through a plank—the ball or the hole? If you say the ball goes through first, I'll deny it; and say that the hole must be there for the ball to get through. Which comes first, repentance or faith? Logically, repentance comes first; but chronologically, they are simultaneous. Repentance means the *change of the mind*; from unbelief to faith: and *hatred changes to love; enmity to God changes to friendship*; and when you have repented you have done all, and the Bible says *repentance is unto life*. That's what God spoke, friends—repentance unto life! And so here in Greek, "Repent ye unto life, and you who have repented unto life on the basis of that life be baptized"; that's Professor Robert-

son's interpretation of it, the greatest Greek scholar that ever lived in the last hundred years or more. Well, I've taken that all from him.

Now, I want to go on with some negatives; answered everything that the gentleman said. I'm going to fasten Roman Catholicism on him. The doctrine you are preaching that baptism is necessary to salvation is Roman Catholicism, and you borrowed it from Rome. Roman Catholic Catechism, "Christian Doctrine," No. 1, asks this question: "What is baptism? Baptism is a sacrament which cleanses us from original sin and makes us children of God and of the church. Is baptism necessary to salvation? Baptism is absolutely necessary for salvation." I put that in the record to show you are in perfect harmony with the Roman Catholic Church, and borrowed your doctrine from the Roman Catholic Church.

Now, I come to some more. I said I'd take up Mark 16: 16 which I'll do right now. Who is to be baptized in Mark 16: 16? Well, the believer. What is the condition of the believer? Well, let's see, John 3: 14, the believer shall never perish. John 3: 18, the believer is not condemned. John 3: 36, the believer has everlasting life. Rom. 5: 1, the believer is justified, John 5: 24, he that believeth hath everlasting life; 1 Pet. 1: 9, the believer's soul is saved. 1 John 5: 1, he that believeth is born of God and knoweth God. So the believer is the one that is baptized, one who is already saved, already has justification, already has life; already passed from death unto life, and all that. When you baptize that believer, what do you do? He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Let me give you a parallel sentence. "He that enters the train and is seated shall reach St. Louis." Now getting on the train is a necessary thing to do, but being seated is the common sense and the sensible thing to do. Salvation depends on faith, and when you get faith, you have got the thing that is necessary. The other thing, like taking a seat on the train or going to the cafeteria on the train or the lunch car on the train, or the toilet room on the train, all for the comfort and convenience of the passenger; and so whatever we do, after we have got on

the salvation train that comes with faith, is for the comfort and happiness and joy and convenience of the child of God who is a passenger to heaven. So, I might put it this way. He that loveth and is baptized shall be saved. He that believeth and takes the Lord's Supper shall be saved; he that believeth and does any other good thing shall be saved; for these other good things are not the necessary things but the things that go along with us as we journey toward heaven—are not necessary for the journey but simply for the comfort of the trip.

Now I want to put it another way. The contrast between salvation and damnation. It is clearly brought out in the Bible all the way through. To what time does damnation look? Evidently to the future. To what time does salvation look? To the future, and not to the immediate remission of sins. And so, he that believes and is baptized shall be saved—in heaven! He that believeth not shall be damned—in hell. Undoubtedly one points toward heaven and the other toward hell. You might as well insist damnation here on earth immediately as to insist salvation here on earth as a result of what's done. Let me give you the affirmative and the negative now. Except you repent, you shall perish. That's the negative. Repentance unto life. That's affirmative. Now note: Believe and be saved—that's affirmative. Believe not and be damned—that's negative. The blood cleanses from sin; the positive. The negative: Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin. Next, he that loveth God is born of God, affirmative; he that loveth not God, let him be accursed—that's negative. He that is baptized shall be saved in heaven. Where is the negative? There is no such negative. Show me the affirmative and I'll show you the negative, on everything necessary to salvation.

Oh, my friend may say, and he hinted at it in his last speech, that John 3: 5 is the negative, and means, positively, to be baptized or be lost. We will have time to discuss it, and we can, at least, have it in the record. I want to read the entire passage. My friend says "baptized" and "born" mean the same thing. All right, let's read it that way: "Except a man be baptized again"—that is the way to read it, if born means baptized—"he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nico-

demus saith unto him, How can a man be baptized when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be baptized? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be baptized of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is baptized of the flesh is flesh; and that which is baptized of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be baptized again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is baptized of the Spirit." And no wonder Nicodemus said, "How can these things be?" If the word "born" means baptized, then put the word baptized where the word born is used and it will make sense. That does not make sense and there is not one drop of water of the kind that you have here in the baptistry—not one drop of water of that kind in John 3: 5.

Paul said, "with the washing of water by the word." The word of Christ and the Spirit! If that verse is true, as I preached it yesterday, and my friend denied, then it means the word. I'll read it here (Eph. 5: 26): "That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." And then I read in James 1: 18: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." Then in 1 Pet. 1: 23, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." Born of water! What does water mean? Peter said the *word* and *water* mean the same thing, born of the word (water) and Spirit. So the Book teaches it, and so we learned in our discussion yesterday. That explains John 3: 5. But let us look at the Greek word—"kai"—which sometimes means "even." Hence, born of water *even* the Spirit. So that takes John 3: 5 away from him, and we have had so much pleasure in being able to meet it.

Acts 22: 16, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." What does that mean? It certainly does not mean to *literally* wash away sins. Then it must mean to figuratively wash away sins, as Peter puts it in 1 Pet. 3: 21: "the like figure whereunto" baptism saves us—saves in a "figure," not in reality, washes away sins figuratively, not in reality. The blood of Christ (1 John 1: 7) actually cleanses, and baptism cleanses in a figure. Saved by the gospel, and the gospel

is the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and baptism is a likeness of the gospel, for Rom. 6: 5 says we are planted together in the likeness of his death and resurrection.

THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Affirmative*, Fourth Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I rejoice to come to you in the fourth and last address on this subject and to review that to which you have just listened. I regret very much that Dr. Bogard has entrapped himself in such an "ungetoutable" position as he has tonight. I have quoted from J. W. Wilmarth. Bogard was so sorry that I brought that up, because Wilmarth used the word "Campbellite." I have no objection, and it is not offensive at all, if Dr. Bogard wants to read what any author says along that line. I am calling attention, however, to the fact that Wilmarth was not commenting upon the word Campbellite, nor proposing to tell what it means. But he was commenting upon the Greek word "eis" and giving what he and the scholarship of the world said about it. But he says Harde- man cannot accept Wilmarth because he said "eis" means "in order to declare." And then with a boast, Dr. Bogard said: "I have read every word of Wilmarth and I know exactly what I am talking about." Well, Dr. Bogard, I hate to expose you, but it must be "did," as the boy said. In quoting Acts 2: 38, Dr. Wilmarth has this to say: "If Peter had meant *in order to declare* or *profess remission*, he would have said so. As he did not, what right have we to insert here a word or an idea of which there is not the slightest trace in his language? It is true that 'eis' is sometimes equivalent to 'with reference to,' but even then, it would here mean the reference of purpose or aim." Now look: "In order to declare [or symbolize] would be a monstrous translation of eis."

But Dr. Bogard said, "Wilmarth translates eis, 'In order to declare.'" You make apology to Wilmarth, and I will relay it to him; will you? You owe it to yourself to come clean on the thing and say, "I am just mistaken; and I didn't know what I boasted about." I am sorry to have to say to

you young men attending the Missionary Institute, that one of your teachers, even your Dean, is wholly unreliable in his quotations from authors. Now, Bogard says, "eis" is retrospective in Matt. 12: 41: "The men of Nineveh . . . repented at the preaching of Jonah." Well, Wilmarth has somewhat to say regarding that, and I am glad to call attention to it. "In Matt. 12: 41: 'They repented at the preaching of Jonah.' The idea is direction of the mind of the hearer toward the preaching." Hence, it's forward, never backward. The same is the idea in Matt. 3: 11 and 10: 41. That's his witness, but he said, "I knew all about it. Thus I have disposed of Hardeman." You could not have better exposed yourself, as sure as you live. Now, I trust Dr. Bogard will retract all of that. He owes it to you and to Dr. Wilmarth to make apology for this. But he seems to be presuming that "I'll get by with it," that "I'll tell you what Wilmarth said, eis in Acts 2: 38 means in order to declare." You get up please and tell them that Wilmarth said that in order to declare would be a monstrous translation of the Greek word "eis." Do you have the candor to do it? Time will tell. How can he maintain the respect of friends and not so do?

Now, back to some other matters. I forgot to say in the other address a word about Floyd Collins. Ladies and gentlemen, Floyd Collins died down in the cave. I understand that he was a member of the church of Christ at the time; hence, Bogard doesn't know what he is talking about. He ought to get informed and not presume because "I am Dr. Bogard, I have had 223 debates, and if I say it, that settles it." Yes, but you are threescore and ten, and maybe that's telling upon you. I regret to see the silver hairs bedeck his brow because we need him for years yet to furnish opportunity for discussion of these matters.

Well, he passed to our sentences up here next, and said, "Now in English they are exactly parallel but they are not parallel in Greek." Yes they are, Dr. Bogard. And then he says, "There is no such thing in the language as imperative third person." Friends, it is astonishing how little the Dean of the Institute knows about simple English. And his attempt at Greek is pitiable. All grammars that I have ever read suggest the third person imperative mode; and here is

an example, Dr. Bogard: "Hallowed be thy name." Third person imperative mode. That's the very sentence that the grammars give illustrative of that fact. Friends, you can't afford to take the word of a man that shoots without seeing the "whites of their eyes." I can hardly explain or account for such blunders. Let us try to think it due to his years and bad memory. Better be exceeding careful for I'll tell you, "When a man has a debate with one man he ought to be mighty careful because when he has a debate with somebody else, he is liable to contradict himself." No truer words were ever said than those spoken by Dr. Bogard twenty-five years ago. He has done that precise and definite thing.

Now then, I want to call attention to the story of Cornelius, and let that go to record tonight. Cornelius, friends, was the first Gentile convert to the gospel of Christ. The angel said to him, "Thy prayers . . . are come up for a memorial." Dr. Bogard, memorial of what? Of the promise that God made to Abraham away back yonder, "and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed"; and, hence all this comes up in memory of that very thing. So, in connection with the conversion of Cornelius, there are three miracles. Be it remembered that all things began by miracles, after which beginning, the miracle was withdrawn and law followed. For instance, the first old hen that ever cackled on this earth never was a pullet, but full grown—and after that, all came according to law. That's true in every phase of physical and spiritual matters. Now, the first miracle was the coming of the angel unto Cornelius. Well, what for? Now let's just count them one by one. It was for the purpose of telling Cornelius where he might find a gospel preacher, an earthen vessel. He told Cornelius to send to Joppa for Peter. "And when he comes—what of it?" When Peter comes he'll "tell thee words whereby (or by which) thou and all thy house shall be saved." Now was Cornelius saved? No, sir. Why? He was to be saved by the hearing of the words spoken by Peter, for whom he was instructed to send. That's miracle number one. Miracle number two: The vision of Peter on the housetop. There was a great sheet in which and on which there appeared all manner of four-footed beasts and creeping things of the

earth—what's the purpose of all that? To convince Peter that he ought to arise and go with those men, nothing doubting, for "I have sent them." So that miracle checks out. Now then, note the next. There is the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Well, what's the purpose of it? There never was a baptism of the miraculous nature intended for the benefit of him who received it. Dr. Bogard well said in the McPherson Debate that "the baptism of the Holy Spirit was never for the benefit of the recipient." Now note, the Bible declares in Acts 10, when Luke was giving his report, that the Spirit came *while* Peter spake these words—but remember, after Peter had gone to the house of Cornelius, and had thus spoken unto them, he was brought back to Jerusalem and placed on trial regarding that trip to the Gentile house. And the Bible has this to say in Peter's own language, "But Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning," now watch, "and expounded it *by order* unto them." Luke told the facts but gave no emphasis to *order*. But now Peter is on trial and Peter says, "I'll expound it unto you *by order*." Well, what about it? When he recited that Cornelius had told him that an angel had ordered him to send for Peter, that he might tell him words whereby Cornelius and his household could be saved—now note: "And *as I began to speak*, the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning." Now get it. When did the Holy Spirit come? *As I began to speak*. Well, were they saved at the time Peter began? No. Why not? They were to be saved by his word. Were they believers at the time Peter *began* to speak? No, sir. Why? "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." Faith came by hearing, but Peter had not spoken a word, when the Holy Spirit came on them as on us at the beginning. Now what is the purpose of it? It was for the purpose of convincing those six Jewish brethren, whom Peter took along with him, that the Gentiles were an acceptable people unto God. See the proof: "As God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God? When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto

life." "How do you know this?" "Because we have seen the like gift." "What's the purpose of it?" "To convince us of that fact." Note what they did. "They spake in tongues and magnified God," and Dr. Bogard thinks that means rejoicing on account of sins forgiven. No such thing. What are tongues for? 1 Cor. 14: 22: "Wherefore tongues are for a sign"—sign to whom? "Not to them that believe, but to them that believe not." Now on Pentecost, who were the unbelievers? That great throng assembled. What did the apostles do? Spake in tongues! For whose benefit? For the benefit of the unbelievers. Who are the unbelievers at the house of Cornelius? Six Jewish brethren. What did Cornelius do? Spake in tongues. What for? As a sign to them that believed not. Now let me tell you, friends, the reception of the Holy Spirit in its miraculous form never did and never will prove that the recipient and the possessor thereof is a child of God. Never, *never* has such been done. I am calling attention to John 11: 49 and I want you to take notice of just what is said regarding a certain character; and here we have the story: "And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and the whole nation that perish not. And this spake he not of himself." Well, what about it? "But being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation." Now what do you have? God Almighty using old Caiaphas, as mean as the devil, and yet, by God's supernatural power permitting old Caiaphas to prophesy regarding the coming of Christ, of whom, when he said, "I am God's Son," old Caiaphas rent his clothes and said, "Away with him." When Balaam's ass opened her mouth and spake, she was speaking by miraculous power of God Almighty. That does not prove that she was God's child. Caiaphas, of course, was not a member of the Baptist Church because there wasn't any such thing. Balaam's ass was only the medium through which God miraculously spoke. Well again, 1 Sam. 10: 10: "The Spirit of God came upon him, and he prophesied." That does not prove, necessarily, that the possessor thereof is a child of God. Dr. Bogard ought to

know that. Now then, when did the Spirit fall on Cornelius? As Peter *began* to speak. Before he had spoken sufficient for him to be saved, or for him to hear the word by which he should be saved. And that's the statement that we have regarding the matter. The Spirit came before Cornelius believed, came before he was baptized, came before the words were spoken, came before he was saved.

Now, I am calling special attention to John, fourteenth chapter, verses sixteen and seventeen. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive." The statement that Cornelius did receive it and was therefore not of the world is illogical, unfair, and untrue to the facts. The world cannot receive the Spirit as a Comforter. Well, why? Because to the world he is a reprover. He will reprove the world of sin and of judgment to come. Now may I call your attention to this: the word "receive" in John 14: 17 is from the Greek word "*λα βειν*" and here is the meaning, as given by Mr. Thayer. Notice: that word "receive" means to take with the hand, or to lay hold of. Matt. 26: 26, also verse fifty-two. "They took bread," that's "receive." "They that take the sword," the word *take* is "receive." Well again, it means to *take* in order to carry away, receive, to take *by force*. Now that's the meaning. Well, again, I am calling attention to John 3: 27, you can receive nothing except it be given you of my Father. Jesus said, Luke 19: 12, "A certain nobleman went into a far country to *receive* for himself a kingdom, and to return." Again, John 18: 3, "Judas, having received," there's your word, "a band of men and officers from the chief priests, came thither with their lanterns." And again, Matt. 5: 40, he that will "take away thy coat," that is the word receive. And again, "Hold fast . . . that no man take thy crown." Rev. 3: 11. So, let's get it. What does the word mean? "To seize, to lay hold of, by force, to do evil." Now then, what about it? "I'll send God's Spirit and the world cannot lay hold of him. They took me and crucified me, but I'll send the Spirit whom the world cannot take, cannot lay hold of, cannot seize." Why? There would be no sense on earth in what Jesus Christ said but for this

truth. Why can't the world receive it? Because it seeth him not. That's the reason the world can't lay hold of him; that's the reason the world can't get him; that's why the Holy Spirit cannot be taken by the world. He is not to be received of the world, because the world seeth him not, nor knoweth him. I want that in the record regarding Cornelius as the truth of God respecting the same.

But we are asked again, were not the people baptized *into* Moses—1 Cor. 10: 13. Elder Bogard, they were baptized into that covenant of which Moses was the mediator, exactly as they are baptized *into* Jesus Christ. There is the transition. The word *into*, the primary meaning of the Greek word "eis" is transition, into, in the direction of. Now what about it? You are baptized *into* Jesus Christ. You are baptized into the body of Christ; you are baptized into the death of Christ; and there is the transition from the outside to the inside, as the word clearly suggests. Now note again, the passage, they "believed and turned unto the Lord." Watch the equivalent, "They believed and were baptized." Well, the Bible says, "They repented and turned" and also it is said, "They repented and were baptized." Things that are equal to the same thing equal each other. But note some other matters. Dr. Bogard recognizes the translation of Dr. Williams, the Baptist scholar, and then says: "All I have to say about it is that it is contrary to what I believe." There isn't anything new about that, Dr. Bogard. I knew that before you said it. That's contrary to what you believe. Well, he said Williams learned it from Dr. Robertson. Suppose he did, Dr. Robertson must have so taught. Dr. I. N. Penick, head of the Bible Theological Department in that same Union University, in a recent article in the Jackson newspaper, said in commenting upon that book, "That's the best translation that the Baptists have ever put out, and it has the endorsement of Union University and of me, the teacher." But I don't think Dr. Bogard has any too much confidence in Elder Penick. If you'd read their discussion you'd find a feeling none too good. Now, let's take Dr. Bogard's definition of repentance, "Why," he said, "Hardeman, don't you know that repentance means to change the mind?" All right. Now we have it good and proper. Here is an un-

believer. He repents and he changes his mind and becomes a believer. All right. Here is a Christian. *He* repents. What does *he* do? He is a believer, he changes his mind and becomes an infidel. If a sinner changes his mind and becomes a believer every time he repents, then when a man is a Christian, a believer, repents, that man changes *his* mind and becomes an infidel. That's the logic of the gentleman's reasoning all along the line. But he has somewhat to say about the Catholic Church. Of course, the Catholic Church has no connection whatsoever with the proposition under discussion. The Bible says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and I thought surely that we were going to hear something regarding Mark 16: 16, but the only comment was "shall be saved in heaven." No, no, Dr. Bogard, shall be saved from sin. Now! And thus you have the matter. Now I want to get it into this book, and I am going to ask him even again in the last speech: Do you believe that Mark 16: 16 is spurious or not? Now let me call attention to Elder Bogard's position about this passage. Friends, it is an interesting affair. Back yonder in 1910, when he was in a debate with Dr. I. N. Penick, Mark 16: 16 was fine scripture, and Dr. Bogard used it, quoted it, as given by the command of God. That was 1910. In 1915 he had a debate with Joe S. Warlick and in that debate he said it was spurious. And again, in his own old edition Waybook, p. 41, under the topic, "The way of mission work in history," he says, "The apostolic Baptists were Missionary Baptists." Then he quotes, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." But that was back in 1929. Do you know what he "went and did"? The next year or very soon thereafter, he brought out a new edition of the Waybook, and, if he didn't leave Mark 16: 16 out, I am not here. I have read both of these. They are almost identical. There is scarcely a particle of difference in these two books except that one in 1929 has Mark 16: 16 in it. This one in 1930, or about then, has left it out. I am asking: Why did you get out this edition exactly like the other, except the one change? Well, he says, "I have learned something." Now note. Mark 16: 16 was good in 1910, bad in 1915, good again in 1929, bad again in 1930, and then what—in 1934 in his debate with

"dear Aimee," it becomes good again. So it is off again, on again, gone again, Flanagan. I want to know, Dr. Bogard, how is it in 1938? I want you to answer that. You promised to do it but in three speeches you have not. These folks are going to know whether you pass it in silence, or what your position shall be. Now notice, I am perfectly willing, and I hope tonight that Dr. Bogard, in his last speech, will come and say, "Hardeman, I believe it is authentic, and upon that I am pledging my honor." In his last book, the *Waybook*, it seems spurious, but when he needs it with "dear Aimee," he says it is good again. It just happens to be good when he needs it and bad when it gets in his way; and that's the trouble with Dr. Bogard. I am sorry that I have to make such exposures of this double-minded man, unstable in all his way.

Now he said that John 3: 5 meant "born of the word," and he wanted to substitute; well all right, let's substitute. Philip preached unto the eunuch and they came unto a certain *word*. And the eunuch said, See, Philip, here is the word, what does hinder me from being baptized? Philip said, if thou believest, thou mayest. He answered and said I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down both into the *word*, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him in the *word*. How is that for the gander? But he said "kai" sometimes means "even" and "also." Yes, occasionally, but rarely. But he said, I want to make it mean "even" here. Except a man be born of water *even* of the Spirit. All right, "He that believeth, and ('kai' *even*) is baptized shall be saved." Well, again, "repent, *even* be baptized, for the remission of sins." Dr. Bogard, why don't you see some things in advance, and not be caught in matters of that kind?

Now then, ladies and gentlemen, having answered, as I have noted, all points regarding that matter, I am glad to make a resume of the things just presented. I want to insist that in this discussion there has not been the answer unto the proposition that tends toward even an imitation of its refutation. When Jesus Christ, clothed with authority from on high said, "All power in heaven and in earth has been given me" the destiny of the human family was at

stake. He had burst the bars; he had plucked the very rose of immortality from the realm of the Hadean world, and planted it, that it might bloom in beauty, grandeur and glory, upon the bosom of his own grave. And having therefore stayed with the apostles for about forty days, demonstrating his identity, leaving no mistake about it, he finally called them, and said to them, I want you as missionaries to go into *all* the world and to preach the gospel, God's power unto salvation, unto all creatures everywhere; he that believes it, "and is baptized, shall be saved." What do you mean by that, Lord? Shall have all sins forgiven, shall receive remission of sins. "He that believeth not shall be damned." When? Right now! Damned already because of your lack of belief. Then they went to the city of Jerusalem as instructed by Christ. About ten days passed, and God dispatched the Holy Spirit from heaven to earth to consummate the work of redemption thus begun, and when Peter, speaking by God's Spirit, stood before that wonderful audience, he said: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain. Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." He has come forth triumphant, and "being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. . . . Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." When they heard this—what? The preaching of the gospel as taught unto the nations—they were cut to their hearts, they became believers, and as believers, they cried out saying, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" We who? What shall we infidels do? Oh, no. What shall we believers do, those of us that are cut to the heart, and are led to believe what Peter has said for the remission of sins. Then the Spirit of God, speaking through Peter, said, "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." What do scholars say regarding that? Out of the twenty-six translations, besides the King James and the Revised Version, all of them say it is "for," four of them say it is "unto," two of them say it is "into," two say "with a view to," five say "in order to," . . . that's my proposition, word for word with the Bible, and others say "for the purpose of," and one says "that your sins may be forgiven." Friends, the proposition stands untouched and untouchable.

Thank you.

THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

BEN M. BOGARD, *Negative*, Fourth Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend brings Professor Wilmarth up again and says he has exposed me so terribly, and seems to gloat over it and rejoice so much in it. I wonder if my friend ever read at the bottom of page 299 of this pamphlet here, Wilmarth's pamphlet, this is taken from a larger book and numbered that way—where Professor Wilmarth explains what he means by baptized in order to the remission of sins, and that it meant exactly in order to obtain the remission of sins is the wording of it. Now my friend read that and stopped. He surely ought to have known that I knew that he knew, and he knew that I knew, Wilmarth's explanation. I am reading from Wilmarth now, "Where is the example of the use of 'eis' to denote a relation between an act as a symbol and some passed event accomplished, or an accomplished fact, which that symbol is intended to set forth as emblems or declaration or commemoration? The act of baptism was emblematic of the way by which we obtain salvation." How did we obtain salvation? By the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, which is the gospel, by which we are saved. My friend Hardeman won't deny that. How are we saved? By the gospel, says Paul. What is the gospel? 1 Cor. 15: 1-5. The death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. What is baptism? It is symbolic, setting forth of the way we obtain salvation. *Symbolically setting it forth.*

So then, instead of it actually procuring our salvation in the act of baptism, the act of baptism shows in symbol exactly how we obtain remission of sins, by the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. I read the exact words where the man, Wilmarth, explained himself, but that's enough. If Mr. Wilmarth is a good witness, then I'm fastening the name Campbellite on the church of which Professor Hardeman is a member. If he is a false witness, then you have used a false one to try to prove your proposition; but I have even taken the position away from you, when he is properly understood.

Now let me take up the speech in the order in which it was made, and answer the two sentences just now. He said that the preposition "eis" always looks forward, or it is always prospective, and never retrospective. I explained in Matt. 3: 11—either he was rattled or he forgot or something, he went over and quoted it about Jonah, "They repented at the preaching of Jonah," instead of answering the passage I brought up. Matt. 3: 11 says, "I indeed baptize you with water unto (eis) repentance." That is the exact wording—baptized "eis" repentance. I ask Professor Hardeman if they were baptized in order to repent. Now if so, then you have got to be baptized in order to get repentance. If it is prospective, it is bound to be baptized in order to get repentance; but if it is retrospective, then they were baptized because they had repented, or with reference to their repentance. He made no reply to that, but switched off on how they repented at the preaching of Jonah and twisted that around. He said they repented *into* the preaching of Jonah. I wonder if they did. Did Jonah preach, and then they repent into it? I want to know if their repentance wasn't with reference to the preaching that was already done. Why certainly, at the preaching of Jonah. So baptized "eis" the remission of sins, Acts 2: 38, on account of the remission of sins. What did my friend say in reply to what I said as to the meaning of the word "for"? Not one word. Did he forget? No, for he has a good memory, and he has his tablet and pencil, and is taking notes. The word "for"—I said I agree with the translation, but what did the word "for" in the translation mean? I used the illustration, "we weep for sorrow." We

got the sorrow first, and wept for it afterwards. "I laughed for joy"—had the joy first, laughed for it afterwards. Go to the penitentiary for stealing; steal first and go to the penitentiary afterwards.

Now consider Cornelius, and let Peter explain what he meant in Acts 2: 38—"be baptized . . . for the remission of sins." Go over there and see it exemplified in the tenth chapter of Acts, where they have the miraculous gift of tongues, before baptism. The whole household received the gift of tongues before baptism. Now that's plain, and John 14: 17 says, "Whom the world cannot receive." He says that comes from the Greek word "lambano," meaning the world can't lay hold of. Well, if the world can't lay hold of the Spirit how in the world could they have the Holy Spirit there and actually speak in tongues by the Holy Spirit? The gift of tongues was never given to anybody except for a witness. That's true, and he read there what the witness was for, when Peter went up and explained to the people of Jerusalem why they got that gift of the Holy Ghost. It showed that *God* had *granted* repentance *unto* life to the Gentiles. That's Peter's explanation of the fact; and that they got the baptism of the Holy Ghost there proves that he had granted repentance unto life to the Gentiles. Well, then, if it proves it, they must have had repentance unto life or it wouldn't have been proved. And, if it was proved, then when they got the proof, they must have had the fact or you have proved a lie. Well, certain as the world they had the baptism of the Holy Ghost, my friend being a witness, and the Bible being witness. What was the baptism of the Holy Ghost for? Peter said "to prove." To prove what? That God had granted to the Gentiles "*repentance unto life.*" (Acts 11: 18.) Repentance reached life and therefore they had the repentance that brought the life and the baptism of the Holy Ghost proves it. So then they had life and had it proved, what more? And *had it all before baptism.* Then Professor Hardeman answered that they were not even believers at that time. Bless my soul, not believers? Let me read to you Peter's explanation, the same scripture I quoted a while ago. Now Peter is preaching to the household of Cornelius. My friend, my dear friend Hardeman, said at

the time they got the baptism of the Holy Ghost, they were not even believers. Unbelievers getting the baptism of the Holy Ghost—that's what he said. Now let me read, beginning at the thirty-fourth verse (Acts 10: 34), "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Of a truth, I perceive what? That God has accepted you Gentiles; had the proof of it! Very well, that "word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: . . . that word . . . ye know, which was published throughout all Judaea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." My friend said that Cornelius was not a believer, and Peter said, "*That word . . . ye know.*" He knew the word and yet he didn't believe it? Such nonsense! Flatly contradicting the word of God. Here is a man baptized of the Holy Ghost who knew, so said Peter, "*that word . . . ye know!*" Know what? Well, here is what it says, "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree: him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly." Peter says, You *knew* that, Cornelius. My friend said, Why, he is not even a believer; why he hasn't any knowledge of it. Seems to me that my friend has gone wild on that point.

Very well. I would like to ask: What did Professor Hardeman say regarding the argument on Acts 2: 38, as respects the difference in number and persons? Why he *agreed with me on the grammar of the passage*, but then read from one of my books to prove the contrary. Now arraying me against myself would not find the truth. Professor Hardeman, which time were you right—when you agreed with me on the grammar of the passage, or when you thought you found something that contradicted my present speech in a former debate or book? With a difference in persons, we cannot place on each word the same

interpretation—it is positively an impossibility. But he says that I said, “I, Ben M. Bogard, am right on the grammar of the thing.” Yes, I am right on the grammar of the thing. Repent is second person, plural; and baptism—or be baptized—is third person, singular. You can use it so with me, or reply to my argument regarding it.

I gave sentences here that are exactly alike—and, Professor Hardeman, you cannot show that they are not exactly alike. These are parallel. You cannot speak the third person imperative in the English. But the New Testament is written in the Greek. Professor Hardeman’s sentences to meet my argument are purely English. Why cite the parallel passages you know are written in English over against the Greek—what you really know is in the Greek. You know that I am presenting the Greek rightly, and yet you appeal to the ignorance of the audience by saying that my effort “fails to impress itself on those who do not know Greek.” Very well. My good friend is a scholar—he *knows Greek, and he should be impressed with it.*

Let’s examine the references which he used. “Hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life,” and “repent, and be baptized . . . unto the remission of sins.” What could Paul have meant regarding the Gentiles except they received life at repentance? Since repentance was unto life, then those who repented in Acts 2: 38 had life and their baptism was with reference to the remission of sins! I brought Thayer out here tonight, but he asks: “Why didn’t you read all that Thayer says?” I was ready to read it anytime. He, Thayer, shows, as I pointed out, and that’s the issue of discussion, that “eis” may be used “with reference to,” “in respect to,” and “as regards.” This is its use as it relates to baptism. Thayer is with me on that; Robertson is with me; and, best of all, the word of the Lord is with me. I am perfectly willing to rest the case there.

Now we come to the case of Cornelius. Was he a saved or an unsaved man? I will give him two minutes of my time to prove that he was an unsaved man. (The speaker paused with watch in hand waiting, but Mr. Hardeman was silent.) Now if he was saved when he received the Holy Spirit, he was saved before baptism. If he was not saved until after

baptism in water, he had the Holy Spirit before he was saved—and the world cannot receive the Spirit. Why, bless your soul, Cornelius had come into the presence of God; his prayers were heard; and an angel appeared unto him; and he had the fellowship of God before baptism. Cornelius was a saved man! When the Spirit of God comes into a good man, in the Old or New Testament, he is in covenant relationship with God. Very well. I have pointed out that men in the Old Testament and in the New have had the Spirit. Were they saved, or unsaved? What about Elizabeth—she was “filled with the Holy Ghost!” (Luke 1: 41.) Were people lost in hell before Pentecost? He quoted about Balaam and the Spirit speaking through the ass—why, *Balaam’s ass did not receive the Holy Spirit*; only a medium through which God spake to influence Balaam. If you deny that the Holy Spirit came before Pentecost, or that remission of sins could be had before the cross, why should you cite Balaam’s ass as an example of the Holy Spirit’s working? That will look pretty in a book, and that part must not be changed. We will make some slight revision for those little slips of the tongue, but not that!

Now we come to 1 Cor. 10: 2, where Paul refers to the Israelites as having been “baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.” He says the “Israelites were baptized into the covenant, of which Moses was the mediator.” Why, bless your soul, the *covenant was not made until they got to Sinai*, long after they had crossed the Red Sea—yet he speaks where the Bible speaks. The Bible says they “were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.” That is the exact language. “Baptized unto Moses”—not baptized unto the covenant of which he was mediator. In connection with this, I quoted Rom. 6: 3-5, to which he made no reply. Paul said to the Romans (and here the word “eis” is used)—let’s read it again, showing that it is with reference to. As “many of us as were baptized into (with reference to) Jesus Christ were baptized into (with reference to) his death.” This refers to relationship! Verse four undoubtedly means the same thing. Buried in baptism with reference to the

things Christ did for us—he died, was buried, and rose again, for our justification, and we are baptized with reference to those things.

Then, again my friend comes and says that when a man repents, according to Baptist doctrine, he doesn't have faith. I pointed out that the meaning of the Greek word from which "repent" is translated means to change your mind. You have a Greek lexicon right there, read it yourself. But, he argues, "if changing the mind of a sinner from unbelief to faith is repentance, why by the same process—changing the mind—when the child of God repents he would change from faith to unbelief and become an unbeliever." Hence, his conclusion, he would become an infidel. No, my friend. God is the one commanding repentance. God has been wronged or offended. The sinner is repenting—changing his mind toward God because of his transgression. His faith toward God is not in question, when he is a Christian, and repents. When he was an alien sinner, he believed not in God. He repents—changes—from that state of mind unto faith; changes from hatred of God to love of God; changes from unlikeness to imitating the Lord, putting him on in his life and affections. When you change your mind from that of an unbeliever to a believer, you change also your life—you pass from "death unto life." When that is done, you have been born again, as is taught in John 3: 5. No one denies that you must be born again, but what is the new birth? My friend Hardeman substitutes the word "baptized" for the word "born"—or born of water—and thus all one has to do to be born again is to be baptized. I want to go over that passage in John 3: 5 again, with emphasis on such a substitution. I want that to go into the record with force. If born of the water means to be baptized in water, then you can put the meaning of the word in the text without doing violence to the passage. And so it would read: "Except a man be baptized again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And again: "He that is baptized of the flesh is flesh, and he that is baptized of the Spirit, is spirit." Don't you see you can't hold to John 3: 5, and put it that way? Incidentally, this was before Pentecost, and would not apply anyway, for the kingdom was not established, according to Harde-

man. But we will discuss that tomorrow. Yet he gives that as a reference in proof of baptism for salvation, which, according to his own argument, could not have been, because the gospel of Christ was not yet preached, so he says, and no one was entering into the kingdom at that time.

Next we pass to Gal. 3: 26, 27. "For ye are all the children of God by faith"—now note, we are children by faith—"for as many of you as have been baptized into (with reference to) Christ have put on (enduo, imitated) Christ"—have already been saved and now imitated him. Who then are saved? Those with faith! They have Christ, and were baptized with reference to that. Then he brings up Mark 16: 16 again, and says that I think these words are not found in the original manuscript. I am not debating that question, but I suggest this for those who will flare up and say that he didn't call attention to that matter. I proved my proposition—and took that passage away from him—by using it just as he thinks it is. No one is saved except those who have faith—"he that believeth not shall be damned." So, the one repenting, the one with faith, the one born again, is saved—saved by faith. When you are saved, then you are baptized, just like you observe the Lord's Supper or any other good work. You purchase a ticket for St. Louis, and get on the train. You may or may not take a seat—it is there for your comfort just the same. Faith makes me a child of God; baptism, the Lord's Supper, and other things are for my joy and convenience. Saved by faith is the necessary thing, then having been born again, we are baptized; that is the point. It doesn't refer to remission of sins at all. So I have discussed it. When you believe and love, you are saved. If you do not believe, you are damned; if you do not love, you are accursed.

Faith worketh by love, Gal. 5: 6. Faith will not do a thing until love comes in and makes it do it. 1 John 4: 7 says, "One that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." If you have been born when you love, and you love when you have faith, then he that loveth is born and hence born again before baptism. He asks, Does faith save? It saves when it acts. But doesn't it act before baptism? Did it not act as you walked into the water? If you are not saved

until the ordinances are obeyed, you are not saved until you take the Lord's Supper; until you contribute of your money; until you visit the widows and orphans in their affliction. Faith, as we have seen, acts before baptism—through love. The household of Cornelius is a splendid example of that love and faith. Those people were saved like the rest of us. All come to that. It was proved! What was proved? That repentance unto life had been granted to the Gentiles. So the proof is that Cornelius, a Gentile, was saved, had life before baptism.

I am perfectly delighted with the discussion that has gone on today, and the record of it has been taken, and you will read it in the book later. Thank God, we are not saved by works which we have done, but by the grace of God through a faith that worketh by love. I thank you.

Whenever the Bible seems to teach that baptism saves or washes away sin it is always figurative language. Nobody denies that figures are used in the Bible. Since the blood of Christ literally, really washes away sin, then, unless there are *two washings*, one must be the actual, literal washing and the other figurative, symbolic. Since we are saved by the blood of Christ actually, literally, then baptism must be symbolic salvation. "By grace are ye saved *through faith*," not through baptism.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

BEN M. BOGARD, *Affirmative*, First Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad of the opportunity to come before you this afternoon. I have really forgotten the wording of the proposition. The church of the New Testament was set up and organized by Jesus Christ during his personal ministry on earth. That's only one of my habits of forgetting the proposition. It doesn't matter much about that anyhow, as we say what we please, regardless. The meaning of it is that the church of our Lord was in actual existence, permanently established, before he left this world for heaven's glory. My duty is to define the terms: By church I mean a company or congregation of baptized believers under the authority of Jesus Christ and to which he gave the great commission. By established I mean firmly fixed so as to not be destroyed or brought to an end. During his personal ministry I mean while Jesus was on the earth. The meaning of the word church is "called out," and hence I mean Jesus had called out a company or congregation which was associated with him and under his control during his personal ministry and to which he gave the great commission. Jesus said in his wonderful prayer, "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me. . . . I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world." John 17: 6-14. Again Jesus said that a company or congregation actually existed and that it was "clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you." John 15: 3, 4. In 2 Cor. 5: 17 we read, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." Now of this company, now clean, and they were in Christ, and they were new creatures. Jesus made but one exception. That was Judas when he pronounced him not clean in John 13: 10, 11. He said: "Ye are clean, but not all. For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean." Thus it is clearly established that Jesus had a company, a congregation, called out from the world and that

they were in Christ, and hence were new creatures. There was only one exception and that was Judas who was pronounced not clean because Jesus knew in advance who should betray him. That the congregation or company was secure and permanent is seen by the statement made by Jesus in John 18: 8, 9, where Jesus said, "I have told you that I am he: if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way: that the saying might be fulfilled, which he spake, Of them which thou gavest me have I lost none." Thus we see a company of baptized believers called out from the world, and they with the exception of one man were clean, and were in Christ, abiding in Christ, and hence new creatures in Jesus Christ, and were saved, secure for Jesus said not one of them was lost, and Jesus prayed in John 17: 11: "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me." Called out, baptized, under the control of Jesus, have received his word and were clean, actually in Christ, hence new creatures, and none of them were lost and they were given by the Father unless Jesus prayed a prayer of sin and not of faith when he prayed, "Keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me." Jesus gave a limited commission to this company. Luke 9: 1-6 in which he told them to preach, and share troubles and later he came to the end of his earthly career and gave them, this company that had come with him all the time, the great commission to evangelize the world, giving the commission to preach and baptize and promised to be with them to the end of the world. If he did not give the great commission to the called out company, to whom did he give it? I ask Professor Hardeman to please tell me to whom the commission was given. If he *did* give that commission to that called out company, then it follows that it was a *firmly established company to continue to exist to the end of the world*, existing before Jesus left the world. He authorized this company to baptize during his personal ministry. John 4: 1, 2 where Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, and Professor Hardeman and I agree that that baptizing was done by the disciples, under Jesus' authority. Thus we see thy disciples did baptize in the name (by authority) of Jesus during his personal ministry on earth. This company was

called out from the world with authority to preach and baptize; also received the Lord's Supper during the personal ministry of Christ on earth. Read Luke 22: 19, 20 and see how he gave them the bread and the wine and told them to observe this supper until he came back to the world again. Thus we see that it was a company of baptized believers *at work under the authority of Jesus*, and they baptized and observed the Lord's Supper. That the church was organized is seen by the fact that this company or congregation was with him as he took that company or congregation with him up into a mountain where he gave to them a spiritual gift, the apostolic gift, for it says, "*Of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles.*" He did not set or start the church upon the mountain, but he gave that church, that called out company, which he took with him up on the mountain a special gift while they were on that mountain. Luke 6: 12-17. And this company, called out congregation, that went with him upon the mountain and there received this apostolic gift, came down from the mountain with him and were recognized as a distinct company from the multitude of people that were gathered at the foot of that mountain. So we read, "And he came down with them, and stood in the plain, *and the company of his disciples, and a great multitude of people.*" This clearly distinguishes between the *company of his disciples* and the *great company of people* who were there. A company within a company, so to speak, *in the world but not of the world*. So that harmonizes with 1 Cor. 12: 28, where it says, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles." After organizing his church, after making it a company very distinct from the multitude, after giving to that company his word, after cleansing them by the word, after giving them the limited commission, then he gave that company the apostolic gift, by setting the apostles in the church. I maintain that you could not set benches in this meetinghouse where we are holding the debate before the house is here. I maintain you could not confer a gift on an individual unless the individual exists. It is equally certain that Jesus could not have set the apostles in the church unless the church was actually there. Hence the church *was in actual existence*

when he set the apostles in it. That this company was made up of saved people, actually saved, is seen in the fact that their names were written in heaven. Luke 10: 20, "Rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven." This company actually had the Spirit during the personal ministry of Jesus. Read Matt. 10: 19, 20. "When they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." Hence they had the Spirit and even spoke by inspiration, it is because they were alive in Christ and not a dead company, not a dead body, as is alleged by Professor Hardeman and his brethren. Jesus said some were in the kingdom and some outside the kingdom during his personal ministry. Mark 4: 11, "Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables." This language is senseless unless the disciples were in the kingdom and the rest of the world were on the outside; some within and some without.

Jesus had all authority while he was here on earth during his personal ministry. Matt. 7: 28, 29, "And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one having authority." Then in the great commission, Jesus said, "All power (authority) is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations." Matt. 28: 18-20. If he had all authority while here on earth, what more could he get on the day of Pentecost or any time later? Jesus had his flock while on earth. Matt. 26: 30-33 says that this night the shepherd shall be smitten and the flock scattered. Whose flock? The Lord's flock, of course. What is the flock? 1 Pet. 5: 3 says the flock is the church. Then the flock or the church must have been there else it could not have been scattered on the night of the betrayal. Jesus left his company, his church, when he left the world. Mark 13: 34, 35 says, "The Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the

porter to watch. Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning." What is the house? In the scriptures, 1 Tim. 3: 15, "The house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." Paul said the house was the church. Jesus said he would leave his house when he left the world. The church was undoubtedly in the world when Jesus left else he could not have left it. The affairs of the kingdom were turned over to the church by Jesus as he was leaving the world. Luke 22: 29, "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me." Mark you, Jesus did not say I will appoint unto you a kingdom when the day of Pentecost comes, but "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me" a kingdom—already done. He said that during his personal ministry on earth. God had appointed to him a kingdom, and now he was turning the kingdom over to the church; he turned over the keys of the kingdom, the affairs of the kingdom, the keys of the kingdom means possession. When a contractor does a turn-key job it means that he finishes the house, and then turns over the keys to the owner. Jesus, having fully established his church, turned the keys over to his disciples. In Matt. 16: 19 he said, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom."

Jesus told the Jews that the kingdom would be taken away from them and given to the Gentiles. Matt. 21: 43. Here is the way it reads: "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits." I could not take your purse away, Professor Harde- man, unless you had one for me to take. I certainly couldn't take that purse away from you and give it to another unless the other was there to receive it. I could not take your purse from you unless you had it. So the Jews, within their nation, had the kingdom, entirely made up of Jews, that belonged to the Jews. Jesus came to his own and his own received him not; but he took the kingdom away from them and placed it in the hands of the Gentiles, practically alto- gether in another nation.

It is prophesied that Jesus would sing in the church. Psalm 22: 22, in the midst of the church, said he would sing. Matt. 26: 30 says they sang a hymn, and went out. They who? What's the antecedent of they? Jesus and his apostles, after they had observed the supper. The singing was done during his personal ministry; hence done in the church or congregation. Professor Hardeman will acknowledge that the tabernacle set up in the wilderness was a type of the church. He will also acknowledge that the *tabernacle was set up, completely finished, before the sacrifice was offered*. The sacrifice was a type of the sacrifice of Christ, and was *made after the tabernacle was completely finished*. He will also acknowledge that the High Priest was the type of the priesthood of Christ. *That being true, it follows that if the type is fulfilled, and is a true picture of the church, and the priesthood was a picture of Jesus Christ, the type of Christ, he must also acknowledge that after the sacrifice of the lamb, a type of Jesus Christ, then the priest, the type of the priesthood of the Christ, took the blood of that sacrifice, and went through the tabernacle into the Holy of Holies, and put the blood on the mercy seat, which is a type of heaven. Unless the picture is a false picture, unless the type failed of the fulfillment, then Jesus established his church, then offered himself in sacrifice, then as High Priest took his own blood through the church into heaven. Read Leviticus, first four chapters, and read about these sacrifices, how they were offered in front of the tabernacle, and how the priest took the blood of the sacrifice and went through the tabernacle into the Holy of Holies, type of heaven. This is precisely what Jesus did. He fulfilled the picture to a letter. He first established his church, then offered himself in sacrifice; then went as the High Priest through the church to heaven with the blood of the sacrifice. How do I know and how does Professor Hardeman know that the tabernacle was a true type of the church? We know it by reading Heb. 9, where it plainly says that the tabernacle was a figure of the more perfect tabernacle, the church. And these things were "figures of the true," said Paul in Hebrews. We also read in verse 21 of Heb. 9, that after establishing a perfectly completed tabernacle, actually finishing it, then*

Moses took the blood of the sacrifice and sprinkled it upon the tabernacle; and verse 21 says that the vessels of the ministry were also sprinkled. Then the tenth chapter of Hebrews, verse 1, says that all of this is a shadow of "things to come." The tabernacle is established, a completed tabernacle, then dedicated by blood. See verses 17 to 20 of chapter nine. It reads, "For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." There is the first testament dedicated with blood, "for when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." Thus we find that the Old Testament law was completed, entirely written, the tabernacle built, entirely finished, and then the sacrifice, and the *dedication by blood on the tabernacle after it was finished*. The law of Moses was not to take effect until the sacrifice was made, and the tabernacle dedicated by blood. But the law of Moses was fully written and the tabernacle was complete, and the sacrifice, and then the law went into effect with that sacrifice. Exactly so the entire New Testament was completed, for Jesus said as I have just quoted from John 17, "I have given them thy word"; that he had given this company the word, given his disciples God's word. *What the apostles wrote later was no addition to the testament that Jesus had completed before his death on the cross*. But merely a recording, and a recording only, of that testament that Jesus made complete before he died. A reducing to writing what Jesus had spoken, the testament complete before the death of Jesus, then by his death on the cross he took it out of the way as we read it in Col. 2: 14-17, where the law was "nailed to the cross and taken out of the way"; and now that the old law is out of the way and the new law is in full force, we have not only the company of called out ones; but to that company he gave the commission with full authority to represent Jesus in all the world. Jesus administered for himself while he was here on the earth, and when he turned the kingdom over to his company, having given them the kingdom, the

Holy Spirit became the administrator over the church, instead of Jesus the former administrator. Jesus, having left his estate over which he had been administrator, his new will went into effect, and had no effect until he did die, and turned it over to the Holy Spirit. It did not come into existence at that time, but only had a new administrator. Here is a man, for instance, in Arkansas, who has an estate, which he manages himself, telling his servants what to do, and they are subject to him while he lives. Before he dies he makes a will, writing out every word of it, and appoints an administrator. While he continues to administer for himself, the will is of no effect because he is administering for himself; but so soon as he dies, the new administrator takes up the work exactly where the owner left off, and the will by which the new administrator is to be governed goes into effect immediately. Thus we see that Jesus established his church, and managed the affairs of his church while he stayed on earth; and during the time he stayed on earth, he made his will to his successor and appointed the administrator, and every jot and tittle of it was made, and then he offered himself as a sacrifice and went to heaven, *leaving behind a completed church, a perfect will*, which is called by the apostle the "perfect law of liberty," as the apostle called it in another place, and then dedicated it with his blood. As well to say the *family to which the will was made had no existence when the man in Arkansas made the will. The father made the will to an existing family. The family existed fully and completely*, the father, knowing that he must leave, writes the will and names the administrator, and the family is to be governed by that will. So the Son, Jesus, as he died, went and left a complete will, a complete testament, and named the administrator, the Holy Spirit; but it *does not bring the family into existence when the will goes into effect*, and the church did not come into existence when the Lord's will, completely made before he died, came into effect; it only had a different administrator. *No new law is made by changing administrators. No new family comes into existence by the will going into effect. No change of administrator changes the estatà.* It goes right on through the different administrators. So the will to the church, the

Lord made, did not bring the church into existence any more than a will to a family would bring that family into existence.

That the kingdom existed during the personal ministry of Jesus is clearly seen in Luke 11: 20, where Jesus said, "If I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." If Jesus said there is no doubt about it, why does Professor Hardeman deny it? Jesus plainly says that the kingdom was among the people while he was here in his personal ministry. Luke 17: 20, 21 says, "When he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you." This could mean but one thing, that while the Pharisees thought the kingdom would come into effect at some future time, like Professor Hardeman and the Adventists, Hardeman saying it came on the day of Pentecost, the Adventists saying in the future, but these Pharisees were corrected on the future idea, not coming any time in the future; but it is already in your midst right now. It doesn't come by observation, nothing to attract attention, as it would have done on the day of Pentecost, or as the Adventists say it will come at the trumpet sound when Gabriel blows his horn. Why that would be coming with observation; but there it was, right in their midst, and they have not observed it. And so, the kingdom cometh not with observation, but it is already in their midst. Jesus had fixed that during his personal ministry. "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" Matt. 10: 25. This was spoken before Pentecost, and Jesus said they *had* called the master of the house Beelzebub, not would do it after Pentecost, for they had done it. If Professor Hardeman had been there, he would have said: "Why, Jesus, don't you know that you've got no house, and never have had a house, and you won't ever have a house until the day of Pentecost? Don't you know that there is no house now, and how could you be the master of the house, when there isn't any house? And it will be two years in the future before you have a house."

In prophecy we learn the church would become a widow. Isa. 54: 3-9. The Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel shall be called. The Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken, and grieved in spirit, and the wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith the Lord. And that same connection says, "Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed: neither be thou confounded; . . . for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood." At no time has this picture been fulfilled except the time when Jesus died on the cross, left his church in confusion, and crushed. They thought everything was ruined, but when he rose from the dead, like a widow happy when her husband comes back, they were refreshed and had a lively hope renewed within them. Now I define the church to mean a company or congregation of baptized believers, under the control and leadership of Jesus Christ, and hence new creatures in Christ, and all that, and none lost except Judas, and therefore I am going to tell you when that company began. Acts 1: 21, Peter said, "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection." If this is not expressing in a clear statement that there had been a company, a called out company, which had been with Jesus all the time during his ministry on earth until the very day he was taken up from them, it says nothing, if it doesn't say that. Right where John left off his work, right there Jesus took the material that John prepared, and made ready for him. Why the very names of the first members of the church are given. Mark 1: 16, 17: "Now as he walked by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew his brother casting a net into the sea. . . . And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men." Then what happened? We find that he went on a little further, and they came to James, the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, and straightway he called them, and they left their father Zebedee and went after him. Here we have the names of the called out. The word church means called out, and the word church means a called out

company. A called out company beginning right where John left off and the very names given. John did not organize the church but he prepared the people made ready for the Lord, and the Lord took that material, and organized it into his church. Right where John left off, Jesus began, and formed his company, and that company stayed with him all the time through his personal ministry, until that same day he was taken up from them. And to that company he gave the great commission, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." That company started, beginning right there where John left off, and the names which I have called stayed with him during his personal ministry; he gave the commission to them, and promised to stay with them always, to the end of the world, and one day when he comes back, that church will be here to receive him.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Negative*, First Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I count myself happy to appear before you and to review the speech to which you have just listened. It's rather lamentable, I think, that a man of Dr. Bogard's experience would make so many blunders and contradictions in a speech of just thirty minutes. And without hesitancy, I call your attention to the remarks just made. In defining the proposition, Dr. Bogard said that by the church he meant "a company of baptized believers under authority of Christ and called out by him." Ladies and gentlemen, you can find a company of baptized believers back of the time Dr. Bogard, in his last remark, said that the church had begun. And then he said further in contradiction of that, mark you now, it's a company of baptized believers called out by Christ. Then he quoted John 1: 12 to show that "Jesus Christ came unto his own." The very minute he came into the world, there was his own; and hence Dr. Bogard has the church in

existence before Christ ever baptized a single soul, and hence a bold contradiction of affairs just there. But in John 15: 3 where he had a company, he said they were clean through the word, and then, if a man be in Christ he is a new creature. He thus coupled matters that were far apart. When he said "Ye are clean through the word," that was a company of disciples, but no congregation anywhere round about. Then he told us in Luke 10 they were under a limited commission, and asked me to whom did God give the commission. The answer is right on the face of it—he had gathered about him the twelve, and he sat at meat with them and reprov'd them for their hardness of heart and unbelief, and he said unto them. The commission, friends, was given unto the twelve apostles. But next he says the disciples of the company received the Lord's Supper. I just wonder if they also didn't receive the washing of feet? If that was the church back there, where the supper was instituted, there was the washing of feet at the very same time, and why, therefore, accept the one and not the other? And does he not know that many principles governing an institution are given in advance? If not, I call attention to the fact that both circumcision and also the Sabbath were given before the law ever came from Mt. Sinai. But they were given in anticipation of that which was to be done.

In Luke 6: 17 where he says the company was thus formed, he turns and makes his argument from 1 Cor. 12: 28, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles," and then asked can you put seats in the house if there were no house. Of course not. Can he give something unto a people if there were none? Of course not. It's strange to me that Dr. Bogard persists in subjecting himself to exposure. I positively know that he has had his attention called to this point, possibly a hundred times. Now let's get it: "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers." Now then, just for your information, once more, Dr. Bogard, when—and that is the point at issue—when did God give some apostles, some prophets, and some teachers? In Eph. 4: 9, 10: "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that

ascended." He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists and some teachers. Now when? After his ascension, this was done. The Bible is so clear on that as to prevent any possibility of misunderstanding regarding the same. Well, Dr. Bogard tells us that they actually had the Spirit. That's not so. Not a syllable of it. And he quoted Matt. 10: 19, 20, where Jesus said, "When they deliver you up"—now notice, Jesus said that—"when they deliver you up" before magistrates or before those before whom you might come to give account, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak." Now then, I challenge him to find where that scripture was ever fulfilled until after the death of Christ. Where were these apostles ever brought before magistrates and before kings and before authorities? And unless he can show that, the passage absolutely passes from him.

But again, in John 14: 16, 17, Jesus said, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, . . . even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive." Now note, God's Spirit is *with* you and shall be *in* you. The Spirit of God was with them, but Christ said it is not in you. And let him find now where it was ever *in* them until after Jesus Christ died on the cross. But again, in the seventh chapter of John, we have a direct statement, right on that point. Verse 38 beginning; hear it. Jesus said unto them, "He that believeth on me, . . . out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given." Well, why wasn't it? "Because that Jesus was not yet glorified." When was the Spirit given? After Jesus was glorified. Well, when was he glorified? 1 Pet. 1: 11: The prophets searched "what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." And on the day of resurrection those two disciples—Luke 24: 26—were talking, and they said, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" Now when was the Spirit given? Not till Christ

was glorified. When was he glorified? Not until after he suffered. Down goes the proposition, world without end, and Dr. Bogard is hopeless, helpless and hapless.

But again, in Mark, let me turn and read just the argument that was given respecting that. That's Mark 13, verse 34, commencing with verse 32; Christ is teaching the need of watchfulness: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed, watch and pray: for . . . the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey who left his house." And calling unto him the various servants, he said unto them, "Watch." Who was it that left his house? Why, Dr. Bogard would have you think that Jesus Christ left it. But the going from this earth and the departure from this world is pictured in this connection as a man leaving his house; and, therefore, he wants you to understand that Jesus Christ had a house, and that it was the church of the Lord. Now in support of that, he calls attention to 1 Tim. 3: 15, where Paul said, "How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God." I just want to suggest to you this. Friends, the word "house," in the New Testament, is used 195 times. The context shows it refers to the church five times; but in every case, there is a phrase or a clause indicating that it is the church. For instance, "How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God"—now watch—"which is the church of the living God." Well, all right, now note again. Heb. 3: 6, Christ is Lord over his house. What do you mean by it, Lord? "Whose house are we." Again, Ye also are built up a spiritual house, and again in Heb. 10: 21 where you have this statement that Jesus Christ is unto us a priest over the house of God. And furthermore, If judgment begins at the house of God (which is with us) what shall be the end of them that know not God? Hence, every single time that the word "house" is used in the New Testament, referring to the church of God, there is something in that passage further explanatory of that idea. But if he had turned to the nineteenth chapter of Luke he would have found a parallel of that passage, in Mark 13, where it is like unto a man that is going into a far country, a nobleman,

which is Christ; a far country is heaven. For what intent did he go? To receive for himself a kingdom and to return. Friends, this is the same scene as is pictured by the prophet. "Behold I saw in the night visions," Dan. 7: 13, "and one like unto the Son of God came with the clouds of heaven," now watch it, "and came to the Ancient of days, and was brought near before him." Now note, after Jesus Christ left this earth, and he comes to the Ancient of days, God Almighty, and there was given him dominion and glory, and the kingdom; hence, he went to receive a kingdom and to return. I want to ask Dr. Bogard, "Are you a member of the one he left or the one that Jesus Christ went to heaven to get and with which to return?" Tell us regarding matters of that kind.

But again, with that out of the way, he says the keys of the kingdom were given. Yes, sir, but they were never used until after Christ died upon this earth. Again, he said they sang a song and went out. Therefore, it must have been the church. Dr. Bogard has a happy way of skipping things, and not telling when they occurred. I am reading from Rom. 15: 9, a comment upon that very thing. Here it is: "And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy; as it is written, For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name." Now you show where the Gentiles were ever in the church during the personal ministry of Christ, and I'll grant your contention. Well, he passed next to the tabernacle, a type of the church, and I want to call your attention to some things about it. Let's roughly draw the tabernacle here in this shape. You must agree that it is a rough drawing. That tabernacle was divided into two parts. One, the first, was called the Holy Place, and the other, the Most Holy. Now then, Dr. Bogard says that Jesus Christ was the High Priest, that the sacrifice was made at the brazen altar, and then as High Priest he went into the Most Holy Place there to offer it. Therefore, he wants to know: Wasn't the church in existence? Well, let's see about it. The first department represents the church and the second represents heaven. Look what it has done for Baptist doctrine. He has absolutely proved that all of you Methodists and Presbyterians, and the rest of you, al-

though you are saved, can never get to heaven unless you go through the Baptist Church. But that doesn't fit Dr. Bogard's idea when not in debate. Furthermore, does he not know that when Jesus Christ went into the Most Holy Place to offer the sacrifice, there was not a living soul in the Holy Place? Let me read it to you. Lev. 16, I am calling your attention to what is here said. Lev. 16: 17. Now hear it, "And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel." When the high priest went to offer that sacrifice once a year, everybody had to vacate the first department. But that's the church. Then the church was knocked out of existence; there wasn't a soul in it; there couldn't be anybody in there while Jesus Christ was offering in the Most Holy. But next.

He said a testament is of force after men are dead. And I just wondered what on earth the man means. What are you teaching here, Dr. Bogard? The church of the New Testament. What kind of a church? "The *New Testament church* was set up and organized when? During the personal ministry," and if he didn't come in the first speech and say the New Testament was not in existence until after Jesus passed out, I am not here. So you have a New Testament church before there was a New Testament. Now listen to the reading. "Where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of the testator." Who's got to die before there can be a New Testament? The testator. Why? Paul said, "A testament is of force after men are dead," and Dr. Bogard says, "That's right, Paul." Now Paul happened to agree with him once! When is the New Testament in force? After death! What's he trying to prove? A New Testament church, a thing that could not exist, he being the judge, before Jesus Christ died, and yet his proposition says "during Christ's personal ministry." This is a clear contradiction appearing in his first speech, which was written out deliberately. But Dr. Bogard has a terrible habit of making more egregious, unnecessary blunders, and doing it deliberately than any man I know of his experience.

Now he hasn't told you his real position this afternoon respecting the church. In this book here (Borden-Bogard Debate), Dr. Bogard says that the church was at hand when John the Baptist came, Matt. 3: 2. And at that time, when John said the kingdom of heaven is at hand, that means, "has approached, past perfect tense." Now that's written down. Ladies and gentlemen, it's rather pitiable that Dr. Bogard doesn't seem to know one thing on earth about grammar. I think I can truly say that, in all of my experience with him, I have never had an English sentence up for discussion, but Dr. Bogard was full of blunders regarding it; and notwithstanding all that, he will set aside every Greek scholar that has ever written or translated the Bible, cast him aside, and say, "The Greek is otherwise." Now then, Dr. Bogard, do you know what the past perfect tense is? Let this line here—you'd better look, because you need it about the worst of anybody I know—represent the present tense. Now, everything back of that is past. All right. Everything back of that up to a certain definite past time is "past perfect." John is here in the flesh, and John said the kingdom of God is at hand, "has come," according to Bogard. And he says it is "past perfect tense." Then it already existed before John ever got here. But the truth of the business is, he doesn't know what the past perfect tense is. Dr. Bogard said "the kingdom has come," and he says "has come" is past perfect. It is no such thing! Now if you had simply said that, I'd let you off; but you wrote it down, and looked at it, and then got up and looked wise; but when attention is called to it you prove to be otherwise. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to say it again; there is absolutely no excuse for a thing of that kind. This man says that when John the Baptist, whose clarion voice broke the silence of the Wilderness of Judea and said the kingdom of God is at hand—what did he say about it? "That means *past* perfect tense; so then up to some definite time in the past, that thing had already existed!" But if you say "has come," you should have said *present* perfect tense. If I say a certain thing "has come," that means up to right now. If I say "had come," that means up to some definite time in the past. So then, when John the Baptist

said the kingdom of heaven is at hand, it means, according to Dr. Bogard, it "had come," was here. Notwithstanding even that in cold print, he said, I want to tell you actually when it began—"after John quit, then Jesus Christ took it up and right there it started." In heaven's name is that what we are up here for, and is that what it's all about? If so, I must say that I'm wonderfully and woefully and sadly disappointed in the kind of argument that is thus presented.

But he calls my attention to the next idea, and that's amusing. Here's a little book, the McPherson Debate. After he got through with it, he wrote an appendix. Now that thing was already ruptured and should have been taken out a long time ago. But he says, "The Holy Spirit had worked with men and *in* men all through the history of the world." That's not so. He had worked with them, but he had not worked in them. "But his administration over the kingdom and his miraculous baptism did not exist until the Pentecost after the resurrection." That's page 81. "But the administration of the Spirit and the baptism of the Spirit began at Pentecost." Well, he said Christ was administrator while he was here, and on Pentecost he turned it over to the Holy Spirit. Dr. Bogard, who was the administrator while Christ was in the grave? They didn't have any, did they? And from the ascension until the coming of the Holy Spirit, about ten days, who was the administrator then? What does administrator mean? One acting or serving in office. So there is a thing not organized. No administrator anywhere about it. But he said the change of the administrator does not change the law, and again he is mistaken. Absolutely. The priests were the administrators over the house of God, and Heb. 7: 12 says, "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Hence the law had to change every time that he changed the administrator in God's book, and that's not answerable.

But again, he calls my attention to some other matters in Isaiah, chapter 54, and it is again a little bit amusing to see him turn. "The Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith thy God." Now he says that's the church, and it is represented as a widow. Let me just ask,

where and by whom was she ever married again? And so, friends, that's one example of the egregious blunders in which my good friend ought not to be caught. But he calls attention again in Luke, chapter 17, where the kingdom cometh not with observation. Of course, not. It doesn't come with great ostentation and as a physical affair. It's a spiritual matter. But he thinks that refers to something already in existence. Jesus said in Luke 12: 32, "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." And, therefore, "seek the kingdom!" It isn't here yet, God will give it.

Well, furthermore, Dr. Bogard is out of joint with the leading representative Baptists of this country and of the Baptist faith. I am calling attention now unto some matters that I desire him to notice. I am reading here from "Baptist Principles Reset." I just want to call the roll, and let you see a number of the great Baptists that are back of it: Jeremiah Jeter, Henry G. Weston, Alvah Hovey, E. Y. Mullins, Howard Osgood, Franklin Johnson, B. O. True, J. B. Gambrell, A. E. Dickinson, Madison C. Peters, W. R. L. Smith, R. H. Pitt, B. H. Carroll; real men! Note what they say regarding the church. "John baptized the penitent for the remission of sins; but he organized no church among his disciples." Again, "The personal ministry—see that word in his proposition—the personal ministry of Jesus was preparatory to the constitution of churches. His preaching was eminently searching, and fitted to reform men and make them spiritual and devout; but, *during his life* no church was organized, and his disciples were subject to no discipline." Dr. Bogard is in the habit of saying: "Oh, Dr. Jeter said it was there in germ." Doctor Jeter didn't say anything about germ. Bugology wasn't known then, Dr. Bogard.

Again, I read here, from Mr. Harvey, a statement regarding the church. Harvey is another great Baptist historian, and he is professor in Hamilton Theological Seminary. Hear him: "In the fullness of time, Christ the King appeared, and his kingdom *after his earthly humiliation*, and was fully inaugurated at his ascension when he was enthroned in heaven." That's the story of it, friends, as

here told. But again, reference has been made to the "Rev. M. E. Ham." Here is the Arkansas Democrat, not the Republican, but the Arkansas Democrat, Friday evening, April 1, 1938. That's this month. I understand that during Dr. Bogard's radio announcements, he has been praising Ham, and saying all manner of good things about him. He can correct that if he wants to. This paper here informs us that Ham preaches at the Memorial Baptist Church, and he is, therefore, in good standing with the Baptists of Little Rock, so far as I know. Hear the article: In a report of his sermon that he preached on a certain night here beginning at 6:30 o'clock, Dr. Ham said, "The church was not in existence before the resurrection, because the members are partakers of the resurrection life. The church could not have been established before his ascension." Now then, we've got the thing in pretty good shape. Brother Harper seems to think that none of us can get into a debate with Ham, and I think he is right; I just wonder if after this is over, we couldn't turn those tabernacle services down there into a debate between Bogard and Ham and let two Baptist preachers have it out. Dr. Bogard, I am glad to hand you that article, if you want to see it. That's from your own city. Now say what you want to about Ham; I think much more of you than I do of him. I am ready to say that, and I never met the man; but I know of him. There is the statement. "Oh," he says, "you are meeting Bogard." No, I am meeting Baptist doctrine. He must not hide behind himself as an isolated character.

Furthermore, I am calling attention, ladies and gentlemen, to some other things that I have noted down. Dr. Bogard suggests that Jesus Christ was not in the church, could not be, and he tells why. The kingdom had come in the days of John, and yet, he said Christ responded to the baptism of John. His statements contradict each other. He says again that the first five members of it are found in John 1: 35. Well, the first five members were not *in it*, if it "had come" (past perfect tense) when John was here. So, he declares further that John was not in it, and the first five members were not in it. Jesus Christ was not in it because John said it is "at hand." What does that mean?

“Had come?” And yet he said “there cometh one after me.” Ladies and gentlemen, Jesus Christ was not baptized for six months after John commenced his work, and the church was in existence, according to Dr. Bogard, all back there, so Christ was not then in it. Well, all right, John wasn’t in it; the first five members couldn’t have been in it; the apostles were not in it, because they were not yet called, Matt. 10: 1; and next again, the priests and the elders were not in it, Matt. 21: 23-25. And, furthermore, the scribes and the Pharisees were not in it, Matt. 23: 13. And the only folks that Elder Bogard can find that were are mentioned in Matt. 21: 31 where it’s said “the publicans and the harlots were in,” but all the rest of them stayed out. But just let me call your attention to some matters further. The kingdom, friends, has always existed, and let’s get some things about it that will help us to understand it. It existed in *Purpose*, in the mind of God; it existed next in *Promise*, as delivered unto the patriarchs, and it existed in *Prophecy*; and then it existed in *Preparation*; and last of all, when the New Testament went into effect, it existed in *Perfection*. Those statements kept on the board may help you to appreciate all that’s said regarding this matter in the New Testament. So with the Doctor’s speech answered, there are some advanced matters that I want to get before you. Christ was not head of it during his personal ministry, because he wasn’t made head until after he ascended to God’s right hand; the Spirit was not in it, and the law of Moses was in effect until Christ died on the tree of the cross, and he would have both the law of Moses and the law of Christ in existence for the same people at the same time and that thing can’t be. But time is out and I thank you.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

BEN M. BOGARD, *Affirmative*, Second Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have heard a great many speeches made by great men where they show utter inability to meet what had been said; but with all the skill of Professor Hardeman, he couldn’t dodge that fact he was trying to camouflage, rather

than come out in the wide open; using sarcasm, which is contrary to the rules of honorable discussion, by saying that Jesus was not in the church, that the apostles were not in it; bold assertions without proof, and that nobody was in it *except the publicans and the harlots*. A slur that I promised my brethren that Professor Hardeman would never stoop to. I say this, *if the publicans and the harlots were in*, then undoubtedly it existed, and he said they were in. I never brought that up at all, made no reference to the publicans and harlots; he was not answering what I said but answering what he *had hoped I might have said*. Now if that's the best he can do, he is welcome to it, but the record in the book won't look so well. He can't make that smile. I will take up the speech in the order in which he delivered it, then go on with my affirmative. My friend said that Jesus came to his own, quoted the scripture to prove it, and according to Bogard, the church was in existence before he got there, for he came to his own. He came to the Jews which *were his own people, nationally*, and from them, he called out certain ones to go into his church spiritually. I think even Professor Hardeman can see that. He gave his commission, Professor Hardeman said, to the twelve apostles. I asked him to whom he gave the commission. He answered, the twelve apostles. Take it deliberately now. If he gave the commission to the twelve apostles, the apostles are all dead and have no successors. Hence, the commission died when they did. But the *ones to whom he gave the commission, he promised to be with always to the end of the world*. There hasn't been but one thing that has existed from that time till now, and that has been the church. He couldn't have given it to the apostles, because they are all dead. He gave it to the organization, called the church, and said, Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world.

Instead of answering in that noble way that I hoped Professor Hardeman would, when I read the scripture from the twenty-second chapter of Luke where the Lord gave the Lord's Supper to the church, that company of baptized believers, he said, "What are you going to do about foot washing?" Isn't that a wonderful answer? Suppose the

Lord gave the Lord's Supper and foot washing both, what has that to do with the argument? He evaded by asking a catch question. I will tell you what he did to foot washing. He never gave it as a church ordinance one single solitary time. It is not so regarded in the Bible. Purely an act of a servant serving his disciples. He took the place of a servant and never intended to have foot washing perpetuated, but he did say, observe the Lord's Supper until I come back again. If it had said wash feet until I come back again, it would have been a different proposition. Such effort to camouflage, excuse me, I don't want to use a hard word, but to me it is contemptible. Why not answer my argument? The Lord gave the Lord's Supper to the church. His answer: "What are you going to do about foot washing?" Suppose I don't do anything, what's that got to do with giving the supper to the church? I might ask what are you going to do about missionary work? What're you going to do about visiting the fatherless and the widows in their affliction? You could ask a dozen questions. What's that got to do with the fact that the Lord gave the Lord's Supper to the church? You can't grin it off, old boy, over there. (Pointing to a young man who was grinning.)

Now, 1 Cor. 12: 28, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles." He said when? I read you Luke 6 where he actually called out the apostles and gave their names, "Of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles." My friend says he didn't do it until after he arose from the dead. Well, he went over there and quoted from Eph. 4, tried to make an answer, by saying, "Why, he did that after he arose from the dead because he gave gifts unto men, some apostles, and one thing and another after he arose from the dead." Why certainly, he *gave the gifts to some besides the ones who were already apostles*. No mistake about that. During the apostolic age, many had apostolic gifts that lasted for about forty years, when miracles ended. Spiritual gifts are talked about in the twelfth chapter of First Corinthians during the apostolic age, he gave those apostolic gifts to the people, not all but large numbers of them, and all the apostles of the church, and he *gave the gifts that belonged to the apostles* during his personal ministry to others after

he arose from the dead. I am perfectly willing and delighted to see the record in the book which shows the answers I am making to him on this.

Well, he said, when I said that they had the Holy Spirit during the personal ministry of Christ; and I quoted where Jesus said—under the limited commission, that they were not to think what they could say, but it should be given them that selfsame hour what they should say; “for it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.” He said that couldn’t have applied to that time for they never appeared before kings and all that during the personal ministry of Jesus. If that is so, then it was not under the limited commission which it is plainly stated that it was. So this commission was not to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. They had the Spirit in them, but, my friend says they couldn’t have had for the Holy Spirit wasn’t in anybody before Pentecost; and he quotes a scripture which says that the Spirit is with you (Greek “*para*”) and *shall* be in you, and if he doesn’t know enough, I believe I will write it on the board here. The Greek preposition, “*en*,” sometimes when used with the dative is translated “*with*,” and other times translated “*in*.” The Holy Spirit is in among you and shall be in you is what it really says. Very well. But he says the Holy Spirit wasn’t in anybody, not in anybody, until Pentecost. No such thing as that. Well, it is a pity to have to expose a great scholar, president of a college. The Holy Spirit was not in anybody until Pentecost. Let’s turn here and read, and we’ll see about that. Right over here to Luke 1: 41, “It came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was (I spell the word, f-i-l-l-e-d) filled with the Holy Ghost.” He said that the Holy Spirit wasn’t in anybody until Pentecost. Then again, in verse 67, “And his father Zacharias was (I spell the word again, f-i-l-l-e-d) filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying.” My friend said that the Holy Ghost was not in anybody until after Pentecost, for the Holy Spirit had not yet been given. The Bible says, in these two at least, and by the way, I think I have a faint memory, and I will refresh your minds so that you will remember that

John the Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb." Yet, the Holy Spirit was not in anybody until Pentecost, so says Professor Hardeman. He says the Holy Ghost had not yet been given. All mixed up. If there is anything in the world that my friend and his people know nothing about, it's the Holy Spirit. They get all mixed up when you name the Holy Spirit, and he doesn't know the difference between the Holy Spirit being given as on the day of Pentecost when they spoke with tongues and all that; doesn't know the difference between the *baptism of the Holy Ghost* and the *ordinary work of the Holy Spirit in filling men and women* and giving joy to their hearts. Doesn't know it. I have answered it and pass on to the next and take up each thing that my friend has said, showing you how he has failed to answer me.

In John 20: 22 I will give you another scripture, Jesus "breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Why didn't he say wait until Pentecost and get the Spirit? The *receiving* of the Spirit is one thing and the *baptismal power* of the Holy Spirit is another thing. And that is what is meant when it says the Holy Spirit is not yet given; means the baptism of the Spirit. Here comes something that's pitiable, and I would hate to have my reputation at stake like Professor Hardeman has on a thing like this. Mark 13: 34 and verses following says Jesus Christ was a man who "left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh." If Jesus Christ was like that, then he had to leave his house, or else he wasn't like that. If he left his house—what is his house? 1 Tim. 3: 15, "the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." I don't care if "house" is used in 10,000 different ways, here Jesus "left his house" and gave *his servant authority, and a work to do*, and commanded them to watch, for you "know not when the *master of the house cometh*." You can't say that applies to the Jews, for certainly he didn't leave authority with the Jews as a nation nor did he give them authority and a work to do; and certainly he didn't tell them as a

nation to watch for him to come back again. He is telling only *his house, the house he had organized*, that company of baptized believers. As long as that scripture remains in God's word, then the house of God is the church of God, which was in actual existence during the personal ministry of Jesus Christ, which he left when he ascended to heaven and to which he promised to return.

My friend said the parallel scripture to that is in Luke 19. They are not parallel nor anyways at all related. In Luke 19 we read, Jesus went into a far country, heaven, to "receive for himself a kingdom, and to return," and he has gone there to receive for himself a kingdom and he *has not yet returned*. Well, what's the kingdom he is going to receive? Well, he will receive a kingdom, another kingdom, Rev. 11: 15, when the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ. Didn't say that he was going there to establish a kingdom; but going there to *receive* a kingdom. Then the kingdom is already in existence. These kingdoms of the world that already exist—Jesus is going to take them over, and he has gone up to heaven to receive a kingdom, and when he comes back to the world he will *have all the world under his control*. Well, then, my friend, it's like reading in a brand-new chapter when he came unto the Ancient of days and received a kingdom. (Dan. 7.) He began to read entirely too far down in Daniel 7. Began to read from Daniel about Jesus coming up in the cloud to the Ancient of days. When was that? Let me read: Start back at the ninth verse, seventh chapter, and read it: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and

time." When? When these kingdoms fall! When these thrones fall! When the books *are opened*. And when the *judgment is set*. Then Jesus will come to the Ancient of days, and that is when he is going to take possession of this world. That's when the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdom of our Lord the Christ. *Not set up a new kingdom!* Certainly not. He already has a kingdom—the only one he will ever set up. *He has it now*. But he's going to *receive another!* Great Britain is a kingdom now. Suppose Great Britain should take over China, or Japan, or some other country. They would be *receiving* a kingdom—*not establishing the British Empire*. Jesus Christ has his kingdom and "the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains" as Isaiah said (Isa. 2: 2), and the word "mountain" means government. The *government* of the Lord's house will one day be *over all the other governments*. That's when the kingdoms of this world will become the subjects of our Lord. That is what is meant in Daniel the seventh chapter; and that is what is foretold in Luke, nineteenth, about Jesus going to receive a kingdom, not establishing a kingdom.

Now the tabernacle. Watch what he's done. All right I'll make the argument. It won't take long. I'm an expert on the tabernacle. Not much of an artist but I'm an expert on this part of the job. (Draws picture of tabernacle on blackboard.) Here's the Holy of Holies. Here is the main tabernacle. That tabernacle was built, complete, absolutely finished before any sacrifice was offered out here. That was not denied. He does not deny that this is a type of the church. And, further, the tabernacle being established first, and then the sacrifice afterwards, here in the picture of God's church in the tabernacle, and Jesus Christ shed his blood, after he built his church and how perfect is the church! Just like Moses dedicated the tabernacle. That's a matter of history. By that method of skillful argument by which Professor Hardeman undertakes to camouflage, he says, "Just look what becomes of Baptist doctrine," says nobody got into here, the Holy of Holies (pointing to board), except they went through the tabernacle to get to Holy of Holies, and hence can't get to heaven except through the

church! I will remind you of the fact that nobody at all ever did get into the Holy of Holies except the High Priest and nobody ever went through the church to heaven's Holy of Holies! The picture, the tabernacle, shows that *no man will ever go through the church to heaven*. That's not the means by which you get there. What does that do for Baptist doctrine? Baptist doctrine or not, the *church was set up first!* Absolutely established first. The sacrifice was made afterward! He agrees to that. Then the *church was in actual existence* when Jesus Christ offered himself as a sacrifice, and then with his own blood, as High Priest, went from this place, here (pointing to blackboard, the offering was made, and then through the church, the tabernacle, into the Holy of Holies. Jesus established his church, and offered himself as a sacrifice, and being both the priest and the sacrifice, took his own blood into the Holy of Holies, and nobody except the High Priest ever did go through that tabernacle to the Holy of Holies. Not one! I'll give up the debate if Professor Hardeman will prove I am wrong and I will never have another debate as long as I live. No human being could ever go through this tabernacle into the Holy of Holies except the High Priest. That shows that the church is not the means of salvation. Thank you very much, but he shall not get by on this kind of sophistry and insinuations and things like that.

What is the next one—that the testament was not in force until after death of the testator. I've brought a new argument to my friend that he never heard in all of his life before, and he was confused over it. It was I who showed that the *testament was not in force until after Christ died*. Why? Here is a man who owns an estate. He has a family living in Arkansas. His family exists and the estate exists. He administers for himself. He writes a will. That *will* will not go into effect with his family with a new administrator until after he dies. But when he does die, that *will* goes into effect. *That will did not bring the family into existence*, but it only changed administrators. And so the will was made by Jesus Christ while he was here on earth *by what he said*, while on earth and the apostles didn't add one single solitary word to it; for when you add anything to

a will after the man is dead, they'll send you to the penitentiary if you do that in Arkansas, and get caught, so there wasn't a single solitary thing added to the will of Jesus Christ after he died. All the disciples did was to *write down the exact will* that Jesus had already made so that we could know what it was. Christ administered on his own estate while he was here, and the will and new administrator did not bring that estate into existence nor did it bring the family into existence.

My friend comes back on grammar again. Well, he dies hard in grammar. But *I have proved by Professor Harde- man himself* that Bogard's grammar was right. That ought to settle it. I quote the greatest grammarian that God Al- mighty's sun ever shined on, Dr. A. T. Robertson, and I stood by Robertson. He tried to make an impression on those who hear over the radio and the audience present and those who read the book that I am going back on all the scholars. I am standing by the scholars, and quoted the biggest scholars in the world on my side of the proposition, and he knows it and as the book will show it. Then comes my friend and makes a break, purely a camouflage, about the "priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." I quoted that. He came up and said, "Well, then, since Jesus Christ got out as the administrator, and the Holy Spirit got to be administrator there was a change of priesthood, and there had to be a change of the law." *First time I ever heard of the Holy Spirit being called a priest.* Brand-new doctrine—I don't believe his own brethren will take it. It was not a change of priesthood when Jesus Christ stepped out as administrator and the Holy Spirit came in as the administrator following him. Not a change of priesthood at all. The very same law, and same priesthood, for Jesus continues as High Priest in heaven, but just another administrator; the same law administered by another administrator.

What did he say about the widow? I quoted from Isaiah where the church was to become a widow, and yet she would not be downcast about it, for it wouldn't last always. I proved that by the word of God. What did he say? He said: "She was a grass widow." Some more sarcasm. And I wonder if Jesus Christ didn't actually die, and leave the

church in gloom and despair, and then when he rose from the dead, and came back and the husband was restored, I wonder if they didn't say there was begotten within them a lively hope by the resurrection of the dead. Such sarcasm as that is pitiable, but you shall not get away from the argument I have made. I know the ground I am on. Professor Hardeman knows I know it. I have run him out on the Bible, and here he comes with Dr. Jeter, and proves by Jeter, the Baptist Jeter of Virginia, that the church was organized after Christ's death, and on the day of Pentecost, and he proves it by Mordecai Ham. Can't prove it by the Bible, but proves it by Jeter, and proves it by Ham. Isn't that wonderful? We are discussing a scriptural proposition. But hold on here. If believing that the church began on the day of Pentecost makes you and your people right, then Ham and Jeter believing that the church began on the day of Pentecost makes the Baptists right, and so then Ham and Jeter have proved the Baptists are absolutely right as the true church of the Lord Jesus Christ. Why you know that it doesn't prove your church is the church of Jesus Christ, if you should happen to prove that the church began on the day of Pentecost. What good will it do if you prove that the church began on the day of Pentecost? The one you are in began eighteen hundred years after Pentecost. You will have to back up and hitch on to Pentecost or it won't do you any good, and if you prove that the church began on the day of Pentecost, it won't hurt the Baptists a bit, for we are the only ones that can reach back to Pentecost in history. He goes out of the Bible to these men, when we are discussing a Bible proposition.

That's all the speech my friend made, and I've taken every single one of the objections away; but, by the way, what has he done with the scriptures that I brought out? Well, he has done nothing. Luke 11: 20: "If I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." What has he done with Acts 1: 22 where it plainly says, "Beginning from the baptism of John"? He went over there and tried to read what Daniel said of the Ancient of days, and put that up instead. He might think he could answer that, but you are not answering Bogard's

argument. Why not answer what I put before you? When I bring up those other scriptures, answer them. Answer on that point. My friend can't meet Bogard now, but he is trying to meet what Bogard said in years gone by (thirty-six years ago) and that's a confession you can't meet me now, can't answer what I say now. I can put up the scripture where the church began *from* the baptism of John, not *with* the baptism of John. Why, he said, John the Baptist was not in the church, and Bogard says the same thing. Certainly John the Baptist was never a member of the church a day in his life. But he prepared the material and Jesus took that material and organized it into his church, just like Luke says, my friend put on the board here how a certain thing happens. He said there is the church in prophecy; then the church in preparation; then the church in organization; and I can give him one more, the *church endowed with power on the day of Pentecost*, and the *kingdom in glory* after a while when Christ comes to the earth again—various phases of the kingdom. But what I am talking about now is the organized church of Jesus Christ, that he said he left here, and commanded his servants to watch, and do the work he had given them.

Very well, now in the three minutes that I have left I want my friend to notice these, and we will have them again tonight. Jesus was King before Pentecost, John 18: 37. Second, his kingdom suffered before Pentecost, Matt. 11: 12. Men pressed into the kingdom before Pentecost, Luke 16: 16. Some hindered others from entering the kingdom before Pentecost, Matt. 23: 13. Had an ordained ministry before Pentecost, Mark 3: 13, 14. There was a commission given before Pentecost, the commission that I have just been talking about in Luke 9: 1-3. They were authorized to baptize people before Pentecost, as we read in John 4: 2. They had the Lord's Supper before Pentecost, Luke 22: 19, 20. They had the gospel before Pentecost, Matt. 24: 14. And Jesus said there is not a doubt about the existing kingdom before Pentecost, Luke 11: 20. And Peter said that that company had existed from the baptism of John, Acts 1: 21. And the Lord's kingdom thus begun had no end, as we read that this

kingdom shall have no end. Then the Bridegroom had his bride before Pentecost, John 3: 28, 29. All things had been given Jesus before Pentecost, John 13: 3, 4. I thank you.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Negative*, Second Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a pleasure genuine to respond to the speech to which you have listened, and in the order of its presentation, I will review it. Dr. Bogard's first remark was that I had resorted to some kind of sarcasm when I referred to the only ones entering the kingdom during the personal ministry of Christ. He might well have said that against the Lord Jesus because I quoted precisely what the Lord said, and if that's his attitude toward the Son of God, I am not responsible for such a disposition and such a spirit displayed on his part. Bogard said the church was in existence at the time John came, and he said, it "had come." Did you notice how severely he let that alone, practically saying, "Hardeman, I am just afraid to say anything about that because God knows I don't understand the past perfect tense." I was showing that if the kingdom were there, "had come" with John, that Bogard himself said John wasn't in it. Well, Christ wasn't in it, because in Matt. 3: 11 John said: "He that cometh after me." Hence, Christ wasn't in it. And then I read again that the apostles were not in it, for they were not yet chosen. Bogard said the first five members mentioned in John 1: 35 were not in it because the first five were not at that time selected. I read again from Matt. 21: 23-25 that the priests and elders were not in it. I read also from Matt. 23: 13 that the scribes and Pharisees were not in it. Now then, I am reading from Matt. 21: 30, 31, and that's the thing Dr. Bogard says is sarcasm. I just want you to note the statement as here I read it from the Book of God, "Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." And he says that's sarcasm. Well, Dr. Bogard, Jesus Christ is the one against whom you should charge such sarcastic affairs. Now then, to all of those passages, such as the "kingdom of heaven

suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force"; and so let me say: The kingdom was in existence in different stages, and in the stage of preparation, these things were done. But what did he say about this? After I put it on the board for his consideration? Absolutely nothing! Now what he said about "has come" and about the argument presented can be represented by two ciphers, three circles, and a naught, with the rims rubbed off, and if that's debating and coming up to the issue, I have nothing further to say.

Well, he says that "the commission was given unto the apostles, but they are all dead." Yes, but thank God, before they died, Paul said, "Timothy, the things that you have heard of me, the same things, commit thou unto faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." Therefore, the gospel of God's Son was given unto the apostles and perpetuated by handing it down to others. First: to faithful men. Second: to those that are able to teach others! So it goes from sire to son, and from generation to generation. Well, he said when I asked him about foot washing in connection with the Lord's Supper, "What's that got to do with it?" It has simply got this to do with it. I was showing that the Lord's Supper could exist before the church was established, and the fact that they had the Lord's Supper does not prove that the church was established. Why? Because they also had foot washing. If, therefore, the church was in existence, then he is the fellow that must put foot washing as a church ordinance in existence during the personal ministry of Christ. That is what it has to do with it. I think everybody saw that, except Dr. Bogard.

Then when he came to 1 Cor. 12: 28, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles." Now he said, "Hardeman did try to answer that." Well, I think he'll find that it was a real answer. Then turning to Eph. 4, he said, "Oh, he gave gifts unto them." Why, Dr. Bogard, your trouble is in not reading the Bible! The Bible said, after Christ descended, he also ascended far above the earth, and he gave, (he said he gave gifts—well, here is what the gifts were), and he gave some apostles, some prophets, and some teachers, after he had risen from the dead. That settles that. It doesn't *nearly* settle it. That's not *nearly* it. That's *it*. So

much for that part of it. Now, the Spirit is *with* you and shall be *in* you. I put down last night a group of scholars with reference to these terms. Let's get it: Forty-seven King James scholars; 101 Revised Version; plus twenty-four other scholars, a total of 172. Dr. Bogard comes and sets himself up against all of these of the richest, ripest scholars of the world. He says: "Let me tell you how it is," and yet, he doesn't even know simple English. Now, isn't that coming along wonderfully? He can't analyze a sentence, doesn't know the past perfect tense, says "has come" is past perfect. If you schoolboys out there haven't learned better than that, you have sorry teachers, or else your attic isn't well furnished. Dr. Bogard deceives himself by thinking he is a Greek scholar. He is but a smatterer. What he needs is a good course in English grammar.

Now he said that Hardeman said the Spirit wasn't given to anybody. Hardeman never said anything of the kind. That's all gratuitous. I know about the miraculous gift to Elisabeth, to her husband, Zacharias, to John, and to Jesus Christ; but it was not given unto the disciples until after Jesus Christ was glorified. What did he say about Jesus' suffering, and entering into his glory, John 7: 39? Absolutely nothing. He forgot it entirely, and his forgettery works so well when it is properly oiled. I am sorry he missed that, but he made no reference to it whatever. The Holy Spirit was not yet given. Why? Because Jesus Christ was not yet glorified. But when was Christ glorified? He must suffer these things and enter into his glory. The suffering first, and the glory next. Now when did the Holy Spirit come? With the glory. When was that? After the suffering. Friends, that's conclusive beyond the shadow of a doubt. Now his remarks again about Mark, thirteenth chapter, are rather lamentable. He wants to read into the gospel that which is not there; he insists that the kingdom of heaven is as Jesus Christ leaving his servants. Why no, friends, Jesus Christ is enjoining watchfulness upon his disciples, and in that, he illustrates the matter by saying that here is a *man* who left *his* house—whose house?—the man's house, and told his servants to watch. Now, I am leaving this earth, it is expedient that I go away, and I am going to prepare a

place. I haven't one here. The reason I am going is to make ready such, and, therefore, I want you to watch for you know not the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man should come. He missed the entire point of application. It is not the question of having the house; it is the question of watchfulness. But again, when he said, "Jesus Christ went to heaven to receive for himself a kingdom and return—that means when he comes back to this earth." A more dangerous doctrine could not possibly be preached. Friends, he raised the point—has the kingdom come? Well, let's just see about it. Mark ninth chapter, first verse, "Verily," said Christ, "I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Now Bogard says that hasn't yet come, and will not be until Christ returns. Well, that's been two thousand years ago. I always have understood that Methuselah was the oldest man that ever lived, but according to Bogard's doctrine those fellows to whom Christ gave that, already 1,900 years old, would make Methuselah look like a baby! He isn't out of long dresses yet. Nineteen hundred years have passed, Christ said they'll not die until they see the kingdom come with power. Bogard says it hasn't yet come! Then, what about them? Do you know any of those gentlemen that are still living, Elder Bogard? Now march up to it. Mark 9: 1. There were those unto whom Christ said, I am going to receive for myself a kingdom, and I'll return. Now he thinks it means returning in the flesh. Oh, no, but when the Spirit of God descended, filled the house where they were sitting, then what? There was the coming of Jesus Christ in that representative manner on the day of Pentecost.

Well, he said, "Receive you the Spirit," and he breathed on them, but it didn't say they received it right then. God said, "Received the Spirit," but when? When Jesus Christ was glorified; and it was not given until then. Well, again, he calls attention to the tabernacle, and the gentleman misses the entire point regarding it. He thinks that Jesus Christ while here on earth offered the sacrifice. No such thing. It did not require even a priest to offer the sacrifice at the brazen altar. Anybody could do that. The sacrifice was

not made and offered until Jesus Christ reached high heaven. But he said Christ was here and the church was in existence previous to that time. Friends, King Solomon was a type of Jesus Christ, and Solomon built the temple as Jesus Christ built the church, but look: Solomon was on his throne and had been for four years when he built the temple which is a type of the church. Now then, Jesus Christ must be on his throne in heaven! Therefore while on this earth he could not have been. The church was not builded until Jesus Christ was on his throne at the right hand of God Almighty, and the offering was made in heaven. But he said "no one but a high priest could ever go through the Holy into the Most Holy." No, nor will anybody else ever get to heaven unless he is in that heaven-born, blood-bought, and world-wide institution known as the church of the living God. There is no other possibility, that being the illustration.

Oh, he said, "I have a brand-new thing on Heb. 9: 16, 17." Well, he is mistaken again, nothing new about that whatsoever. And what will he do about it? He is affirming the church of the New Testament. Look at it—the church of the New Testament, during the personal ministry of Jesus. Friends, there wasn't any New Testament then. The Testament was not in existence then, and it was not in force at that time. Therefore, if they had a church back there, it was a dead thing, because the New Testament was not of force until after Jesus Christ died, and that fixes the matter beyond a doubt. Well, again. I want him to come back and tell us about that "kingdom at hand" when John the Baptist said: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." But he said in speaking of the widow that Jesus Christ died and came again and she was a real widow. Well, I just wonder— if that represents the matter, who was the head of that thing while Jesus Christ was in the tomb, for the Holy Spirit was not yet given as the next administrator; hence, you have a headless, spiritless, dead organization, and that settles all that.

He said, "I want to go back and hitch up to the church." Elder Bogard, you can't hitch up to a thing that never did exist. There never was a Baptist Church on the face of

God's earth. There never was but one Baptist that ever lived, and he said he was going out of business, John 3: 23. But he talks about it and he loves to get off into history and try to prove some things. Well, I'll tell you why he'd love to get back in history on affairs. On page fifty-six of his little book, McPherson Debate, he says, "I can prove any absurdity on earth by appealing to history." And that's why he wants to go to history to prove his proposition.

Elder Bogard has the boldness and the effrontery to go against every Greek scholar who had a part in the translation of the Bible. He will go contrary to all historians, and say, "You gentlemen don't know anything about it. I can take what you say (I am skilled! I am an expert), and prove anything, any absurdity by history." If he ever proves the establishment and the history of the Baptist Church, he'll make good that statement; he will have proved an absurdity, sure as you live. Now that's on page fifty-six of the "dear Aimee" book. I have answered all the arguments of his address.

Now then, ladies and gentlemen, I am calling your attention to some matters, and I bid you take notice of the objections that are filed against his theory. First, the New Testament was not in force until after Jesus Christ died. You cannot, therefore, have a church of the New Testament until the New Testament itself becomes operative. Jesus Christ said that through Paul. Bogard said, "That's correct." It's not of force; hence, it is not a church of the New Testament, for there was no New Testament in effect! Second, "Jesus Christ was not head of it," and Bogard would doubtless love to hang Mordecai Ham as high as Hamon right now for having said what he did. What has he answered about Ham, Jeter, et al.? I used that, ladies and gentlemen, to show this: (pointing to Bogard) there is the man that is out of line with the rank and file of the scholars of his own church and with the historians. Let me tell you something. I have studied Baptist histories in the library of Freed-Hardeman College where we have quite a number—hear it: I have never, never yet found one Baptist historian who declares that the church of the New Testament was in existence during the personal ministry of Christ; Dr. Bogard, if you know

one, for my information tell me. Will you name a recognized Baptist historian who takes the position that you do regarding this proposition? Name just one, not five; ONE! Will you do it? Wink your head or nod your eye; I just want to know that, I want to get that history.

Well, now again, if the church were in existence back here as he claims, it was before the apostles were "set in," because they were not put in until after Jesus Christ descended and ascended. Again, it had Judas in it, and Dr. Bogard is responsible for that statement. Turn to your Penick Debate, page 167, and you will find that Judas was numbered with the very ones that he said formed the church back in the early days. It had no Spirit in it. Look at it, it was without a head; it was without a Spirit; it was, by the way, before the New Testament became effective and not only that, it was, ladies and gentlemen, before the apostles were allowed to preach Christ. After Jesus Christ had said to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom"—hear it! Matt. 16: 20: "They should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ," and after the transfiguration (Matt. 17: 2), "Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." Friends, what do you think about the church in existence with the apostles and the members of it not allowed to say that Jesus Christ is God's Son? Now, is it the Baptist Church wherein you are not allowed to preach Jesus Christ as God's Son? That's the predicament in which the gentleman is. But notice again, Bogard, as I have already suggested, is against the real Baptists of his day. Furthermore, that thing, if in existence, had no blood in it. All that they had back there was the blood of animals. In Heb. 10: 4 Paul said it was not possible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sin, and that's all they had. Yet Heb. 9: 22 says, "Without shedding of blood is no remission" of sins, hence the blood of Christ was not in it. It was, therefore, without Christ as head; it was without the Holy Spirit as the light; it was a bloodless, headless, spiritless, dead organization, if indeed such a thing existed on the face of the earth. But what did he answer about the two laws in effect at the same time to the same folks? Zero! Matt. 23: 2, 3 shows this: in the last speech that our Lord ever

made, he said, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." Hence, what does he have? The law of Moses in existence unto the Jews up to the cross, and then Bogard has the church and the law of Christ in existence to the very same people. That thing cannot exist in any country whatsoever, and the argument is, therefore, unanswerable.

Again, according to Dr. Bogard's position, the church was in existence before they had become married unto Christ. Rom. 7: 1-7, I am not reading all, but this. "Now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." You are freed from the law by the body of Christ that ye might be married—watch it—married unto another—What other? Unto him—well, what him? Unto "him who is raised from the dead." When was the marriage? After Jesus Christ rose from the dead. But Bogard says: Here, during the personal ministry. Friends, that thing cannot be. It would have to be under a limited commission. (Matt. 10: 5.) Therefore, it was not that thing which Christ ordered, respecting which he gave the law when he said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." That's not it. If in existence during personal ministry, it was before Christ ever made the atonement. Matt. 20: 28. "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." And again, in 26: 28: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Hence, it could not be until that blood was shed, and again, "He is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. 9: 15. Well, I read again: It was before the middle wall of partition was broken down. That thing did not occur until Jesus Christ died on Calvary's cross, and then what? He took away the first that he might establish the second. Now I just want to read Eph. 2: 14-16. "He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the

middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity." What was that enmity? "Even the law of commandments contained in ordinances"; now why? "For to make"—what does that mean? I might ask Dr. Bogard to parse "for to make," but he wouldn't know anything about that. It means this—"in order that it might make." It is an infinitive with the construction of an adverb of purpose. Christ practically said: "I am tearing down the middle wall of partition for to make in myself out of the twain." Well, who are the twain? Jew and Gentile! Make what? "One new man." What is that man? That's the church! It is like a man. It has a head. When did Christ become head? God "hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body." When did he do that? After Jesus Christ was raised from the dead. I musn't forget to put with Eph. 1: 22, Col. 1: 18: "He is the head of the body, the church." And thus you have the declaration. Now, when was the new man? After the middle wall of partition was broken down. When was that? When Jesus Christ died on the tree of the cross. He took away—when? Right there that which was contrary to us, that which was against us, took it out of the way, nailed it to the cross. What for? That he *might* make—he hasn't done it yet, it's not in existence, but he was doing all this that he might make of the twain one new man, "so making peace, and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Furthermore, if the church were in existence at the time Elder Bogard tries so hard to prove, it was before anything had ever been asked in the name of Jesus Christ. John 16: 24. It was before Christ became priest. Heb. 7: 28. "The law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath," the New Testament, "which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore," for Heb. 8: 4, If Jesus "were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law." That law was in existence; it had priests who had infirmities; Jesus Christ was not a priest back there; hence, there could be no such thing as a church of the New Testament without

Jesus Christ as our high priest, our prophet, and our king. But note again right along the same line, it was, my friends, before the gospel in fullness was ever preached. I bid you hear 1 Cor. 15: 1-4—get it. “Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received”—get it! First, “how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures,” second, “and that he was buried,” third, “and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.” What is the full gospel? Not that Christ is going to die, but that Christ died, that he was buried, that he did rise. Now hear it, Elder Bogard, you and I need to get it. Gal. 1: 8. “Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.” Elder Bogard cannot stand back during the personal ministry of Christ and preach what Paul did, that Jesus Christ died, because he hadn’t died. He could not preach that Jesus Christ was buried—why? Because he wasn’t buried. He could not stand back during the personal ministry and preach that Christ rose from the dead—why? Because he hadn’t risen. Now Paul said, Bogard, if you or an angel from heaven preach it otherwise—and he would have to do that if he stood back there, then what?—God’s curses are resting upon you, and woe unto the man that does not preach the full gospel, as Paul thus declared it. Friends, what more can I say than to you I have said?

And I am closing, now, the first session of this afternoon with all arguments that I had been able to note, so far as I can recall, answered in complete form. But what has Elder Bogard left undone? A number of things, to which attention has been called. And how! By trying to say they are camouflages. It’s much easier to say that than to dive right into the heart of them and proclaim any kind of an answer regarding them. The gentleman’s position is, ladies and gentlemen, that when John the Baptist first came on the scene, the kingdom of God was in existence at that very time; that John found it here, and, therefore, Jesus was not in it,

the apostles were not in it, the priests and scribes were not in it, but the Bible says the harlots and publicans did go in—into what? Into the preparatory state! But Bogard says, “That’s sarcasm.” Well, I’d be ashamed of that, and I apologize because of his lack of ability to meet the argument. My friends, that’s a charge against Jesus Christ when he calls “the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you” sarcasm! Who said it? The matchless Son of God said it; and the spotless Son of Mary declared it; and yet to break the force of all that, he makes the effort to set it aside. Friends, that’s unworthy of the character of the debate we should have. I thank you very much.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

BEN M. BOGARD, *Affirmative*, Third Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

There are many who do not understand about the order and rules of debate. For their benefit I will say that every debater first of all devotes his time and attention to what has been said by his honorable opponent; does not lunge into something else without having first reviewed what his opponent said. I try to follow that always even at the risk of not getting in all of my argument. It is not fair to the opponent to fail to notice what he says. So I will devote myself to the speech made by my friend this afternoon before going further with anything that I may want to say. The first thing that went in on me, I knew that he and his brethren taught it, but I didn’t think he would be quite so emphatic about it, that nobody will be saved unless he belongs to the church that Brother Hardeman belongs to. He said that, and so that cuts all of us out, unless we happen to belong to the very same church that friend Hardeman belongs to. That cuts out C. H. Spurgeon, the greatest preacher in the last hundred years. It cuts out the leading men and women of the world, who profess to love the Lord Jesus Christ. I just want that fact to go into the book, that I am debating with a high-class gentleman, who honestly thinks that all Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others, who happen not to belong to his church, the one he belongs to,

will make their bed in hell. That's a rather big dose to take, but that's what he handed out, and he being the doctor, he says swallow it. But I can't very well swallow it—have to hold my nose to make me swallow that dose. I make no reply beyond saying I don't believe a word of it. He offered no scripture to prove it. If he does, then I'll try to offer something in response.

Taking up the speech in the exact order in which he delivered it—he said Jesus Christ was not a priest on earth, and could not be a priest on earth. He quoted a scripture over there in Hebrews where it said, "If he were on earth, he would not be a priest," as if that taught any such thing that Christ was not a priest while he was on earth. Jesus was a priest, and as a priest, he offered himself in sacrifice, and as a priest, he took the blood of his own sacrifice and went into heaven with it; and if he were on earth he would not be our priest, because as priest he had to leave the earth and go into heaven to make atonement with the blood of his sacrifice offered on the outside and thus complete his work as priest. Now here is the scripture to prove that. I read in that same chapter which my friend read from in Hebrews, "If he were on earth he would not be a priest." Heb. 10: 11 and verses following: "Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." He offered the sacrifice here on earth, and after offering his sacrifice as a priest, he *being both the sacrifice and the priest*, then he sat down in heaven. If he had stayed on earth, he wouldn't have executed the priest office. Just like the high priest on the outside of the tabernacle, as the type of the present situation, offered the sacrifice out there, then went through the tabernacle into the Holy of Holies, where he made his atonement; that Holy of Holies represents heaven. So Jesus on the outside of the tabernacle offered up himself as a sacrifice, then took his own blood from the tabernacle, which was typical of the church, into heaven, and if he were now on earth, indeed he would not be our priest. He had to go to heaven in order to fulfill the priest office. But mark you, no sacrifice was

made in heaven. The sacrifice part of the priesthood was made here on earth, then he finishes his priesthood by going into heaven, and there making atonement for us by putting the blood on the mercy seat. So we can approach now with a full assurance of faith.

I will take the next thing. I have carefully noted it down. He said there was no Holy Spirit in the people before Pentecost; and the record will show it, he quoted that verse where it says that he is "with you (Greek "para") and shall be in you," showing, so he says, that the Holy Spirit was *with* the people back there, but not *in* any of them. Then when I came and quoted where Zacharias, the one who magnified God, who was inspired to, and was full of the Holy Ghost, first chapter of Luke, and then when I quoted of Elisabeth in that same chapter, where she was *filled with the Holy Ghost*—not just the Holy Ghost *with* her—but *filled* with the Holy Ghost; then when I quoted about John the Baptist being filled with the Holy Ghost, my friend got up and said he didn't deny that there was miraculous works of the Holy Spirit back there, or some such remark as that. But he did deny that the Holy Spirit was in anybody until Pentecost. Flatly contradicting the word of God. So down goes his argument, when he says that if we had a church back there, it's a "dead church because it had no Spirit." They did have the Spirit dwelling in them. They did have the miraculous work of the Spirit back there. But what is meant, he asks, when it says the Holy Spirit was not yet given? It means he was not given as the administrator, he hadn't become administrator, he hadn't come in baptismal power, and that was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. He came on the day of Pentecost in baptismal power, the thing we don't have now; but he baptized the church that day in the Holy Spirit, that's what is meant when it says the kingdom should come with power—not come into existence. The Spirit didn't come into existence on the day of Pentecost, but merely came as administrator. Then again my friend says that the commission was given to the apostles, and quoted that passage of scripture where Paul told Timothy to commit to faithful men that which he had committed to Timothy. That simply means that Paul told Timothy to

teach others what he had been taught. What's that got to do with the commission being given to the church, promising to be with whoever he gave the commission to always, even unto the end of the world? Nothing exists today that existed back there at that time except the church. All else had passed away, all individuals, and the apostles have died but he gave the commission to something or somebody with which or with whom he was to be to the end of the world. Nothing back there at that time would live even to now, much less to the end of the world; hence, it must have been that he gave the commission to the church.

Then, the next thing, point by point, I have numbered them here, number three. He said that some should not taste of death until they see the kingdom of God come with power. Now he wants to know what kingdom that was. Why the kingdom was already in existence during the personal ministry of Christ; would come with power. My friend has been in existence now for sixty-three years. I have known him for twenty-five or more. We had debates back yonder in times gone by. He was as much in existence then as he is now, but he comes to this debate with power; does that mean he came into existence when he came to this debate? He has a peculiar power, tremendous power, as a man. He came here with power, and so the church or kingdom came in power, not into existence, on the day of Pentecost. Then again, the fourth point, and as a play, I am sorry to say, on the ignorance of the unlearned, Professor Hardeman has constantly tried to make the impression that I have arrayed myself, Ben M. Bogard, against all the scholars of the world, the 148 translators of the Bible, and all that. Ben M. Bogard has done no such thing. My friend, Hardeman, certainly ought to know it. Instead of arraying myself against the scholars, I have quoted the greatest of them on the face of the earth, like Professor Robertson, like Thayer, those great scholars. Then as to the translators, I don't disagree with the translators any more than Hardeman does. He won't say that the King James Version is 100 per cent correct. If he'll say that, and let it go to record in the book, he'll disgrace himself among all intelligent people. The Bible is perfect in the original,

but the translations, none of them, are perfect. Now where I might sometimes suggest that this translation means so and so, as for instance, not going back to argue the question at all, the word "for" in Acts 2: 38. My friend said it means "in order to." I say it means "on account of," "with reference to." Now neither one of these explanations is in the Bible—"on account of," "with reference to," or "in order to." He puts *his construction* on it, and says it means "in order to." I put *my construction on it*, and back it up with the arguments I have to make that it means with reference to. Neither one of us is going back on the translation. It's only a question of what does the translation mean? And it's unfair in my friend to try to make it appear that I am trying to show off my smartness and my brilliancy and my brains and all that, arraying myself against the scholarship of the world, when it is not so, *any more than he when he puts his construction on what a passage may mean.*

Now Professor Hardeman asks in the fifth place what kingdom came on Pentecost? Well, no kingdom came into existence on Pentecost, the kingdom was already in existence, but it came in power on Pentecost. What power? The baptism of the Holy Ghost power on the day of Pentecost, and so Luke 19, where it says that he went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, it was not the kingdom that we had on Pentecost, for no kingdom came into existence on the day of Pentecost; *no kingdom was received on the day of Pentecost.* But there will be when Christ has fulfilled the work he has gone to do, and the kingdoms of this world have "become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ," Rev. 11: 15. Then he'll not establish a kingdom, *but will receive it.* I've debated with Adventists and they come along and make a tremendous howl if I should say that, I speak respectfully though, and say the Lord is going to set up a kingdom when he comes back. He is going to do no such thing. *The Lord has set up all the kingdom he shall ever set up.* He did that during his personal ministry, but what will he do? He will *receive the kingdoms of this world* when they become converted to him, and turned over to him, and they'll become his property. And so in Luke 19 he "went into a far country to receive for himself a king-

dom, and to return” and when he comes back to this world, he is going to have possession of all these kingdoms of the earth, and they will be the *kingdom of our Lord and his Christ*. Adventists are wrong when they say he is going to set up a kingdom, but if they would only say he is going to receive these kingdoms, take possession of them, and instead of the devil having them, the Lord is going to run them, and they’ll become the kingdom of our Lord. Very well, it is the very same kingdom spoken of in the seventh chapter of Daniel, my friend referred to, where the Lord came to the Ancient of days, and received for himself a kingdom. When will he come to the Ancient of days and receive for himself a kingdom? After the judgment is set, and the books were opened, and 10,000 times ten thousand stood before him, and the thrones were cast down, and the beasts were slain. Certainly that didn’t come on Pentecost, nor any time since Pentecost, but it will come at the end of this world, of this dispensation.

Now on the tabernacle, in the sixth place, note the fact that we both agree that it was built before any sacrifice was offered, completed before any sacrifice was offered, and Hebrews, ninth chapter, explaining the tabernacle, shows it was a type of the church and my friend and I agree on that. And the High Priest is a type of Christ, and he and I agree on that. Then, if the picture is a true picture, the church must be established, and then Jesus offered himself in sacrifice after the church was established, and go from the church into heaven just as the High Priest went through the tabernacle into the Holy of Holies, a type of heaven.

My friend said, in the seventh place, King Solomon built the temple while he was sitting on his throne. Of course, he did, and Jesus Christ established his church while Jesus Christ was sitting on his throne during his personal ministry. Oh, you say, the throne’s in heaven—the throne is in heaven *now*, but what does the throne mean? Throne does not mean a platform like this pulpit that we are on, seated up in dignified style. *Throne means power*, and it means nothing else, and Matt. 28: 18-20 says he had “all power” while he was here on earth. So he had all the throne he is ever going to get, and he is still on that throne, he is going

to keep that throne. In other words, *power*, not sitting on a platform, and so Jesus built his church *while sitting on his throne*, being in power and having all power.

Very well, in the eighth place. The New Testament was not in existence, says my friend, during the personal ministry of Christ, for it hadn't been written at that time. Now if my friend is going to say that the New Testament was not in existence because it hadn't been written, and, therefore, we couldn't have a church during the personal ministry of Christ because the New Testament hadn't been written, I am here to tell you it wasn't written on the day of Pentecost, and it was several years after Pentecost before the New Testament was written. What was the New Testament? Not what was written; of course, *it was reduced to writing after it was made*, but how was it made? It was *made by what Jesus said and did* during his personal ministry. He made his will that way, and when the apostles went to write the New Testament they didn't add one jot or tittle to what Jesus had already said or done, and the Holy Spirit was merely to "*bring to their remembrance*" what Jesus had taught, not to add anything to it. So then, the New Testament was complete during the ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ, as complete as it is now, and if it had to be written before we had the New Testament then you didn't even have it on the day of Pentecost. That idea knocks Pentecost out with just as much force as it would the church during the personal ministry of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Then, the ninth place, my friend says that he is going to prove that the church began on the day of Pentecost—by Dr. Ham and Dr. Jeter. Now when a man resorts to that sort of thing, he shows that he can't maintain his position by the Bible. If preaching that the church began on Pentecost proves the church to be the one which Professor Harde- man belongs to, proves it to be the true church, then when Dr. Ham and Dr. Jeter preach that the church began on the day of Pentecost, that would prove the Baptist Church to be the true church, the one that began on Pentecost. Oh, you say no, that would not prove it, then it does not prove the one you are in began there. That's a purely historical question, and you might believe right on that and it wouldn't

help you; you might believe wrong on that and it wouldn't hurt you. It is a mere matter of the time when the church began. The big thing is—am I a member of that church? not the exact date when it began. But if preaching it by Hardeman and his brethren proves the church they are in is the true church, then when Ham and Jeter preach it, it proves the Baptist Church is the true church, as sure as you live; but the fact is that it does not prove it either way, and you beg the question when you come here, and try to make out that it does teach their church, the one they are a member of, is the true church of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Then Professor Hardeman, in the tenth place, quoted from one of my debates, where I said that I could prove anything, any absurdity, by history. Well, I did say that. I am going to have to revise it and ask permission to change that statement. You can't prove any absurdity by history. From history you can't prove the church you belong to started with Jesus Christ, for he can't take us back in history but a little over a hundred years. That is an absurdity that can't be proved by history. Your church is entirely too young to reach back to Pentecost, for there is no history that tells about you the other side of Alexander Campbell. So, I'll have to revise that. Next time I have a debate, I am going to say all absurdities can be proved by history except the absurdity of the church to which Mr. Hardeman belongs having started on the day of Pentecost. That can't be proved by history and it would be absurd if history did say so, because it would be unscriptural, for the reason no church started then.

He says that if we had a church back before Pentecost, Judas was in it. Well, that's true. What's that got to do with it? Well, he says, you have a bad man in it. Yes, sir, and I can go on to the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians and find they had members in the church at Corinth that denied the resurrection of the dead. I can, also, find where they were guilty of fornication such as was not named among the Gentiles; and went to law, one with another. Now look here. If having bad men in the church before Pentecost proves there wasn't any church, then there wasn't any church at Corinth, because they had bad men who denied

the resurrection and were guilty of fornication. I am going to say to you that any irregularity that my friend can find, any bad thing that he can find, back before Pentecost, *I can find every one of those bad things in the New Testament churches after Pentecost.* If it knocks the church out before Pentecost, it knocks everyone of them out after Pentecost.

Very well, now I'll go on to the next, the twelfth argument he made. They were not allowed to tell that Jesus was the Christ. He says, was that a Baptist Church? Most assuredly. Why? Because Baptists are obedient and when the Lord tells them to do anything, they'll do it and for a reason, a perfectly good reason. After he had told them himself that he was the Christ; and after Peter had said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God" (Matt. 16: 15-18), and after he had told the woman at the well that he was the Messiah (John 4), the long looked for Christ, he was building up an organization and getting them into an educational position where they could really teach. It is as if he said: "Now before you go out and proclaim this, I want you to be thoroughly indoctrinated, for the people were expecting him to be a temporal king," and he didn't want to be misunderstood. "I want to get you thoroughly drilled, and after that, when the new administrator of the church comes, the Holy Spirit takes charge, then go out and tell what I have been teaching you all the time." And a Baptist Church will always be obedient in that way.

Now, his thirteenth argument, that the law of Moses was still in force, they still had the law of Moses. Well now listen he says, how could they have the law of Moses and the law of Christ too? Just exactly like this: in Luke 16: 16 it says that the law and the prophets were until John. In what sense? They were bound by authority of the law until John. "Since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." The authority of the law was set aside by Jesus because it says his disciples were astonished. He taught them in his great inaugural address commonly called "The Sermon on the Mount"—*Moses said so and so, but I say; Moses said so and so, but I say; Moses said so and so, but I say*, asserting his authority and when he came down from the mount, they said he taught *as one*

having authority. So unto them, he set aside the authority of Moses' law, declared his independence of the Mosaic law. Then when he died on the cross, he took it entirely out of the way. It was in their way for the next three years. I'll illustrate. When the colonies of this country declared their independence back yonder, and made the Declaration of Independence the Fourth of July, 1776, they were cut loose from the authority of Great Britain; but the law of Great Britain *was still in the way*, and both the colonial law and British law covering the same territory at the same time. But when they shot that army full of holes and sent them back across the big pond, then it was *taken out of the way*. Both laws in force here in America until it was taken out of the way, yet the authority over the colonies was removed by the Declaration of Independence some seven years before that. That's an illustration that will help my friend to understand and I hope he'll accept it in that way. He said they had no mediator if they had the church before Pentecost. No mediator? What is a mediator—one who comes between you and a judge or a king, and pleads. I want to know what Jesus was doing in the seventeenth chapter of John if he wasn't mediating; if he wasn't praying for his disciples, and prayed God to keep them and all that kind of thing. So he was a mediator while he was here and he remains a mediator to this good day. Now, he says if he had a church back there, the middle wall of partition had not been broken down. Partition between whom? Between the Jew and the Gentiles. It took the death of Christ to bring the Jew and the Gentiles together but not the death of Christ to establish the Jewish church made up entirely of Jews. Later on the Gentiles came in, but they didn't come in until after the death of Christ. And he said they had no head, if the church was before Pentecost. Well, I wonder what Jesus was doing? What does "head" mean? Head means master, and I read three passages of scripture this afternoon where Jesus said, "I am your Lord and Master." Now, for his seventeenth argument, he said if it existed before Pentecost, it was before the gospel. Well, good-by, John 3: 5, that my friend brought up last night and said that there in John 3: 5 was the plan of salvation. "Except a man be born of water and of the

Spirit," he said that was the gospel and a means by which people were saved, and if that was preached back before Pentecost, then they had the gospel back there; but if that is not gospel, then you use something that is not gospel when you go out here and preach to people that John 3: 5 means that you have got to be baptized in order to be saved. So that compliments the gentleman's speech entirely, having taken all his objections away, and mark you, my speech stands practically untouched, and in my next speech, I am going to show you the things he has utterly failed to meet, and make you remember them. It is up to you now to remember, and when the book is read, you'll see if the record is in perfect harmony with what I am saying. My time is up, unless I am mistaken. Thank you.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Negative*, Third Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is fine to have such a splendid company assembled, evidencing constantly your interest in these discussions. There was much said by others respecting the fine feeling that prevails. I want to say that I'd be ashamed of myself if I could not enter into the heat of controversy without injecting personalities which leave any kind of a bad feeling as a result. I say that by way of continuing with the things that have been said by others. I have not appeared before you in an announcement of any book. I have no books to sell, I'm not a book agent. But there is one that I had thought of that would be fine in harmony with what's been said. If you'll send to the Louisville Book Concern, a Baptist company, and get Dr. Whitsitt's book on "A Question in Church History," you'll find that he proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the man doesn't live who can trace a church back to the days of John. I am not interested in Dr. Whitsitt's book except in harmony with the statements that have been made. Dr. Bogard suggests that I announced this afternoon that everybody that wasn't in my church couldn't be saved. Well, he just missed that. I never claimed to have a church. I did say, however, that

there is salvation only in the church of the Lord, and nowhere else. That doesn't spell that the church does the saving, but Jesus Christ is the Savior of the body. Ladies and gentlemen, there are but two kingdoms in which men can be. We are either in the kingdom of God, or in the kingdom of the devil. I do not believe that God Almighty has any children in the devil's family, but all of God's children, by virtue of the fact that they are born again, are born into his family. And the very minute that a man becomes a child of God, he is right then and there a member of the body of Christ, the church of the Lord, the family of God, or the kingdom of high heaven. I have no apology, but I'd love to emphasize that all over the length and breadth of our land. That's not saying that anybody's lost. I'm not sitting in judgment; nor is it saying that any particular person is saved. There is no need for an appeal to prejudice, but it is saying that if you and I are ever saved, it will be by virtue of the fact that we have been translated out of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son, which is the church of the living God. In that there is salvation and nowhere else.

We come to discuss again the priest, whether or not if Christ were on earth he should be a priest. Dr. Bogard misses the entire point. Respecting Paul's arguments in Heb. 7: 14 we have this: "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." Every priest that ever did exist on the face of this earth by the authority of God was of the family of Levi; but Jesus Christ was of the tribe of Judah, and for that reason so long as the tribe of Levi was in existence, which was until the greatest of all tragedies, Jesus Christ could not be a priest. Why? Because he did not come of the right tribe for earthly priests and that's the reason, ladies and gentlemen, that Paul said if he were on earth, he would not be a priest. Thus this matter ought to be sufficiently cleared out of the way. But Dr. Bogard insists that back at the brazen altar the high priest must be there to offer or to slay the victim. My friends, that's not true, and I called his attention to the first chapter of the book of Leviticus, commencing with verse 4. Anybody, I don't

care whether priest or not, could bring a victim to the altar, and there could slay it, but it took the high priest to offer it. Now where was the offering made? Not out yonder at the altar, but the offering was made in the Most Holy Place; so, as the sacrifice slain by his enemies, Jesus Christ was the Lamb: but Jesus Christ entered into heaven, and there at the right place, the Most Holy, is where the offering was made. Now anybody who studies the Bible ought to know that. To further that thought—listen to it. In the tenth chapter of Hebrews, which Dr. Bogard read, commencing with verse 19, "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus," now watch it, "by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh." How is that? Before you could ever enter into the Most Holy Place, you had to part the veil that separated the two compartments of the tabernacle, and back behind the second veil the offering was made. What is the application of it? By Jesus Christ's death, he has opened up that veil, which is his flesh, and made it possible for the offering to be at God's right hand on the other shore, and nobody ever entered into heaven as yet that did not go through the tabernacle; for there was but one door into it, one means of entrance, and only one way by which to reach heaven at last, and that was through the first part of the tabernacle service. Jesus Christ at God's right hand offered the sacrifice unto Jehovah; it was in heaven, and not on earth.

Again, I am calling attention to his declaration regarding the Spirit. I said today that the Holy Spirit was not given until Jesus Christ was glorified—just what has been answered respecting that one point? Not a thing on earth, but he promised to take notice of some things that "Professor Hardeman passed over." Well, have you heard one thing from the lips of Dr. Bogard regarding the suffering of Christ and the glory that should follow? Now we have Jesus Christ's word for it, that's all. "This spake he of the Spirit which . . . was not yet given," well, why wasn't it, Lord? "Because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Now, if language means anything, it simply means this: that God's Spirit was not given unto these disciples until Jesus Christ

was glorified. Well, when was he glorified? He hasn't as yet quoted 1 Pet. 1: 11, where the prophets sought diligently, searched into those things, how that Jesus Christ must suffer, and enter into his glory; and again in Luke 24: 26, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" Now watch it, when do we have the glory? After the suffering. When do we have the Spirit? With the glory! When is it? After the suffering of our Lord Jesus Christ—and that's just what the Bible says about it, all arguments to the contrary notwithstanding. But he said it wasn't given as administrator. Well, I just wonder where on earth any Bible ever said anything that looked like a distant relative to an imitation of a cousin of that? Nowhere! It is in this little book, the McPherson Debate, over in what Dr. Bogard calls the appendix. There's where you get authority for such a statement, but not in the Book of God anywhere from beginning to end.

But he passes out hard on Mark 9: 1. Jesus Christ, in the presence of his disciples, said, "Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death," that is, who will not die, "till they have seen the kingdom of God come"—and it will come with power! Now there were two things about that: first, the kingdom of God is to come, and second, the power is to come. Well, look at that just a moment. If I could locate just when the power came, I could find when the Spirit came, and vice versa—if I can find out when the Spirit came, I'll find out when the kingdom came. He said to them, "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." Thither they went; they assembled at Jerusalem, and by and by the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance! Now there is the power. What have you then? There is the power that is come with the Holy Spirit. God said the kingdom will come with the power, and therefore, in the lifetime of those to whom Christ was talking, that thing was fulfilled. What has he said about their existing until now—1938? Absolutely nothing, and there isn't anything for him to say regarding that. But then I called Dr. Bogard's attention to the fact that

he has set aside 172 scholars, and then continually refers to only two, and he misses it on them. I insist, ladies and gentlemen, that his quotation from Dr. A. T. Robertson was not Dr. Robertson's definition, but it was a footnote giving his opinion. I care nothing about his comments. When he declares Thayer says "with reference to" in Acts 2: 38, he misrepresents him. Thayer's first definition of the Greek preposition "eis" is *to, into, in the direction of*; but under the metaphorical definition, first, second, third, fourth, way down, it's "with reference to," but it is with reference to *aim or purpose*. Oh, he said, "Take our word 'for' back to Acts 2: 38, and I think it is 'with reference to'; Hardeman thinks it is 'in order to'." No, that's not the point. Out of the entire 26 translations—get it!—not one solitary one of them ever did translate "with reference to," but numbers of them did translate it "unto, in order to, with a view to"! Now that's the difference.

But he talks about Jesus Christ's going to come and save or gather in the nations of this earth. Friends, when Jesus Christ ascended unto the heavenly host, at God's right hand, there crowned as King of kings, and Lord of Lords, and dispatched the Holy Spirit from heaven to earth, to consummate that work by him begun, there was God's kingdom, Christ as king, and he will reign as he is now until the last enemy shall be destroyed. That last enemy is death. It will be destroyed by the resurrection, and then what? The kingdom of Christ will be turned over to God, the Father, who is all and in all, and there's no such thing as a kingdom yet to come. His conception of it is quite far-fetched, indeed. Did you note how Dr. Bogard wanted to put words in my mouth, and then try to make his argument? He said with reference to the New Testament's being not in force that "Hardeman said that the New Testament hadn't been written." Why, bless your soul, I never said a thing that even looked like that, Dr. Bogard. I said the New Testament was not operative, it was not effective, therefore it was a dead matter until Jesus Christ died; and, hence, if you had a New Testament church before there was a New Testament operative, then what? You had a dead church, a functionless church, and a headless church, be-

cause Jesus Christ did not become the head until after he rose from the dead. But when I quoted from Dr. Ham and Dr. Jeter and Dr. Harvey and a host of others, he said if that proves anything, it proves that it is a Baptist Church. No, it doesn't prove that, I introduced these men for this purpose. Dr. Bogard, I understand, had endorsed Mordecai Ham. I asked him if he had; he hasn't denied it. That's been my understanding, and I was simply showing that Dr. Ham is in league with the Baptists here at Little Rock, and elsewhere, I take it. Here is a record of where he preached in one of your biggest churches, and I suppose was endorsed by it, he being here in a meeting for something like two months. What does he say about it? I am just showing you that Baptists of real note and scholarship and prominence are not agreeing with Bogard, and therefore, I have called upon him for one single church historian, a recognized historian, who says what he contends for. I did not say that there was no such history, but I have never found it, and the name of it is the thing that Dr. Bogard has failed to tell tonight, and I want him to do that just as a matter of information.

Well, we are making progress. He said, "I did say that you could prove any absurdity by history, but I want to take it back." Well, you said a long time ago in your debate with Dr. Penick, "When a man has a debate with one fellow he'd better be careful because when he has a debate with another he'll have to take it back," and there she goes right now. Again, he said, "I am going to revise it." That's what he did with his little Baptist Waybook. When he put into it Mark 16: 16 and had the thing hammered into him, what did he do? He brought out a revision the next year, and left Mark 16: 16 out. That's Dr. Bogard's revision. What makes him revise? Because he can't substantiate his teaching and has to take back what he said. Now the trouble with Dr. Bogard is, he shoots and afterward begins to look. If he'd just take a little bit of aim in advance, he wouldn't make so many blunders. That's about like your past perfect tense, Dr. Bogard. You sit and actually write it down, and miss it just as far as any school-boy ever did. Friends, that's lamentable, and he has my

sympathy for having to recant, and to withdraw, and make corrections. Now if it were said orally, I could appreciate his making the error, but when he sits down, and deliberately writes out a thing, he then says, when caught up with, "I've got to take it back and I've got to revise it." You buy the original copy, friends. Don't buy that last little Baptist Waybook; you buy the one back before 1929. If you want what he deliberately wrote out in the debate with "My dear Aimee," as he calls her, you get the original. "Give the guy the toe of your boot who tries to offer you substitute—Burma Shave."

Well, now note again. He said the law and the prophets were until John. Since that time the kingdom of heaven is preached. That is on the question of two laws in existence at the same time. Friends, the law and the prophets were the only things until John, and since that, in addition, we have the kingdom of heaven preached, but what is it? The kingdom of heaven is at hand, approaching; but Dr. Bogard says that means "has come, past perfect tense." Ridiculous! And I could excuse it, I repeat, if it were just a matter here spoken, when I know that we sometimes get tangled up on affairs, but—when I sit down and write out a thing, then what? There's absolutely no excuse for such an egregious blunder. Now then, may I have your attention just a moment? I am calling his attention to Romans, seventh chapter, which he has not noticed until this hour. "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man so long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man." Now then, let's see it. There is the husband; here is the wife, number one. All right! Now so long as that husband lives, this wife is bound by the law to that husband; but if he dies, then what? That woman is at liberty to be married again. But if that woman have husband number two, by the way, on her

string at the same time—then what about her? She is guilty of adultery! Now, Paul's application: "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another." Now get it. The law represents the husband in Paul's illustration. The Jew was married to the law of Moses. Now then, just as long as the law of Moses was in existence, that Jew was married to it, and if while the law of Moses lasted, he had gone and been married to the law of Christ, what about that Jew? Like the woman, he would have been guilty of spiritual adultery. Now what's the only chance for this Jew ever to become married to Christ? It's for the first husband to die! "Ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another!" Well, what other? "To him who is raised from the dead." Not unto him during his personal ministry! They were bound by the law. You can't do a thing of that kind. Dr. Bogard has every Jew married to two husbands, therefore guilty of spiritual adultery under the doctrine that he is proclaiming. First to the law of Moses, and to him who is raised from the dead that they might bring forth fruit unto God, and fruit here means their children. Therefore, brethren, we are become dead to the law. We are freed from it.

He missed it wonderfully about the 13 colonies when he said that Great Britain had authority over them, and claimed it until the Declaration of Independence. Of all things. Doesn't he know that old King George claimed authority over them until 1781 when at old Yorktown the last battle was over, and as someone said "they had fit, bled and died" for seven long years? What for? If the authority of King George had been surrendered with the Declaration of Independence, there would have been no war. That was exactly what the colonies wanted to be done. "You give us authority over ourselves, quit taxing us without representation." But Britain wouldn't do it. She claimed that authority and because of it, this country was baptized in blood. Yet Dr. Bogard doesn't know any more about history than he does about "past perfect tense."

He said, "Just as quickly as they announced their independence, the authority was given up." Not a word of truth in it!

I said that the gospel was that Christ died, that he was buried, that he did rise and that back under his personal ministry, Dr. Bogard could not preach that. He could not stand in the days of Jesus Christ and preach that Christ died, because he hadn't. He couldn't preach that Christ was buried, because he was not; nor that he was raised from the dead. Well, what's his answer? "Good-by, John 3: 5." Oh, no, Jesus Christ was teaching things pertaining to the future, and telling Nicodemus what shall be done to enter into my kingdom when indeed that kingdom shall have come with power. And it will come before some of you shall die.

Now then, I want to continue by presenting another argument because I must get them all in this speech. My friends, in the Bible, Adam and Eve are pictured throughout as representative of Christ and the church. The fifth chapter of Ephesians as well as part of 1 Cor. 15 is devoted to this idea, as is that long argument of Eph. 5, where Paul talks about the husband as head of the wife even as Christ is head of the church, and the Savior of the body. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle." Then he said, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh!" Now Paul said, "This is a great mystery, but—" What do you mean, Paul? "I speak concerning Christ and the church." Well, all right. Now then, first, when Eve was formed, Adam was put to sleep. Second point, Adam had his side opened. Third, Adam gave up the price that the woman cost him; fourth, the woman was formed; fifth, she became his wife, and number six, she was to bear children. That's the story as told in Genesis, second chapter. What's the application of it made by Paul? Over there, number 1. Christ put to sleep, the sleep of death. Second, his side was opened when the

Roman soldier injected the spear. Third, the price was paid, the last drop of blood in his body; number 4, with that blood thus given up by him the church was formed or purchased, and after that, it became the wife of Christ, and therefore took his name as Eve did back yonder; and number 6, then God's law is "bear children." Now then, I just want to ask you, when was Eve in existence? Before Adam was put to sleep? Absolutely not. Was Eve in existence at the time Adam's side was opened? No, sir. Was Eve in existence at the time the price was paid for her? Absolutely not, and there you have it—Adam put to sleep, side opened, price paid, woman formed. Then what? She became his wife, and after the marriage, then what? There are children. Now what's the application of it? Jesus Christ put to death on the tree of the cross. Second point, his side was opened by the injection of a spear. Third, he shed the last drop of blood in his body with which the church of God was purchased. Fourth, it became therefore the wife of Christ and was therefore married unto him that is raised from the dead. And what's God's law? Multiply and replenish the earth. Therefore, if you had children, or Christians, previous to that time under the gospel age, they would not be sons of God, but illegitimate, due to the fact that the father and the mother had not been married. Friends, that's the argument and I venture to say Bogard will ignore it wholly.

Now then, having, as I recall, noticed the speech that was made by Dr. Bogard in the various points, I want to review some things already mentioned. The church of Jesus Christ could not be in existence until the New Testament became operative and effective. It could not exist without Jesus Christ's being made head, and he was not head until God raised him from the dead and set him at his right hand. The Spirit was not given until after the resurrection from the dead. The disciples were not allowed to preach Jesus before his death and resurrection. "Tell the vision to no man until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." And again, there was absolutely no blood in it (and not one word was said in response to that!). And it was under the law of Moses, therefore, two laws operative

at the same time to these same people, which thing cannot be, and that's the predicament in which Dr. Bogard is found. But I want him in this last speech, because I aim to press that in my last, to come up to the argument. Bogard says that when John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judea, he preached the "kingdom of heaven is at hand"; and Dr. Bogard wrote it down in cold black and white that *at hand* means "has come, past perfect tense." I press again, who was in it? Well, John wasn't in it; Jesus Christ wasn't in it; the first five members were not in it; the apostles were not in it, the Pharisees and scribes were not in it, and the Bible says that the publicans and the harlots went in—into what? Into the preparatory stage. And what have you heard when I put on the board in Purpose, in Promise, in Prophecy, in Preparation, in Perfection—what have you heard from that? Not a thing on earth; absolute silence has prevailed. Ladies and gentlemen, there could be no such thing as the body of Christ, the church of the Lord, until these matters to which attention has been called were presented and gotten out of the way. I thank you again.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

BEN M. BOGARD, *Affirmative*, Fourth Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

While it is fresh in your mind, I'll call your attention to what my friend said about Ephesians, and about Christ being the father and the church the mother, the church to bear children. Then the *church is her own mother*, and the *mother is her own child!* That's the most absurd piece of foolishness that I have ever heard gotten off by an intelligent man, stretching a figure which is contrary to the rules of rhetoric that my friend teaches in his college. If you got anything out of that you are welcome to it—the church being the mother, Jesus Christ the father, and I thought Jesus is our Elder Brother instead of being our father. I was under the impression that God was the Father, and the "Jerusalem which is above," which means the dispensation of grace, was "the mother of us all."

(Gal. 4: 26.) I think the Bible says something like that. My friend says the church to which he belongs is the mother. *Born of the church*, and the Bible says we are *born of the Spirit*. That's rich. I'll just pass that up for what it is worth, and let you make the most of it.

Now, I am going to take up the speech in the order in which my friend delivered it. He said if you'll send to Louisville, Ky., and get Whitsitt's book, Whitsitt's book will prove that there is no such thing as Baptist Church succession. Well, I guess you could get that book, and that book pretends to do that thing. You don't have to go to Whitsitt, go to Professor Hardeman. Hardeman says so, and I'd just as soon take Hardeman's word as take Whitsitt's. Whitsitt lost his place as a teacher in the school because of that wild guess that he made, and is not any authority among Baptists at all. But we are not discussing the church history question. We are just touching on it incidentally as we go along. However, the church to which my friend belongs he can't trace back beyond 1827 to save his life, founded by Alexander Campbell after the Baptists had turned him out of the church. Now that's so. (Laughing in audience.) Now you can laugh at that all you please, but Alexander Campbell said on page 465 of a Religious Encyclopedia that:

"It was not until after the Baptists had in 1827 declared non-fellowship for the brethren of reformation, thus by constraint and not by choice they were compelled to organize societies of their own."

I have quoted verbatim, ad literatum. Campbell said it himself. So, I think we are even on that, say what you please in your last speech. I am glad to put that in record. By Mr. Wilmarth, you proved last night that you are Campbellites, I didn't say it. You did it. Now by Alex Campbell I prove your church began in 1827.

He said he never said that you had to belong to his church, the church to which he belongs, in order to be saved; and thank God, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others can be saved without being a member of a church like the one you belong to. Well, he said, "Hold on, you have got to belong to the Lord's church." Yes, sir;

and you say the *one you belong to is the Lord's church*, and it is all the same at last. What's the use of dodging around that way? You believe that *nobody gets to heaven except the members of your particular church*. Oh, he said, "I haven't got any church." I think you are right about that. The thing you call a church is not a church at all, but you mean by that "*The Church of Christ*," and it means something denominational just the same as any other denominational name. My friend says you have got to be in that church to be saved, whatever the church is; he doesn't agree with Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ says in Matt. 5: 15 not to put your light "under a bushel, but on a candlestick." What is a candlestick? Turn to Rev. 1: 20, it says that the "candlestick" is the church. Get your light first and then put it somewhere; where are you going to put it? Hide it in some obscure place or put it on a "candlestick"? The "candlestick" is the church; there is the light of God in the soul. You become a child of God and have the light of God as your soul. Put it somewhere! Where put it? On a "candlestick." What is the "candlestick"? The church. My friend says you get the light by virtue of being on the candlestick. Thus contradicting the scriptures again.

Well, let me see now what next my good friend says. Jesus is not a priest, he said, because he is of the tribe of Judah, of which nothing was said about a priest. But my friend failed to understand when he said that thing that Jesus was a priest after the order of Melchizedek, *a priest forever*; and Melchizedek was without beginning or end of days, *a priest all of his life*. That makes *Jesus Christ a priest all of his life*; and so if he is a priest *all of his life*, he was a priest during his personal ministry, for he's after the "order of Melchizedek" who is a priest forever without "beginning of days, nor end of life." Certainly not after the order of Aaron, but a priest far better than the order of Aaron. But the Aaronic priest was a type of Christ, and he won't deny it. (Heb. 7.) So there he has proved it, in spite of other things he said that Christ was a priest during his personal ministry, *a priest all the time*, and abides a priest forever. Certainly a priest during his personal ministry. I read to him a while ago as clearly as could be from Hebrews

where we have a priest over God's house, and that priest offered up the sacrifices, and that priest made the atonement in heaven. He is all mixed up between the offering and the atonement. The sacrifice or offering was made on the outside, and atonement was made by the blood being put on the mercy seat in the Holy of Holies. That's what it says in Leviticus of the offerings and that is a type of Christ and his work, and a type of the church. Well, he says read Lev. 1: 4 that the priest didn't have to kill the sacrifice. No, but the priest had to take the sacrifice, had to be there to get it; it was on the outside there in connection with the tabernacle, and went through the tabernacle into the Holy of Holies with it and there you are. The priest stood right there and took the blood of the sacrifice and went through the tabernacle, a type of the church, into the Holy of Holies, and if Christ wasn't a priest here, he had no right to take his own blood into the Holy of Holies and make the atonement. All of you see that, I am sure you do. My friend can't possibly get out of it.

Well, he keeps on saying the Spirit was not given until Pentecost. Who denies it? But given in what sense? I do know the people were filled with the Holy Ghost, and the scriptures give you the names of them—Zechariah, Elisabeth, John the Baptist, and others back yonder before Pentecost. Then in what sense was the Spirit given? Given in baptismal power, and as administrator over the affairs of the kingdom. The Spirit hadn't been give power as administrator because Christ was not glorified. No dispute. Christ had to die to be glorified before the Holy Spirit took his place as administrator. That's what Christ said—I'll send another to take my place, and when Christ was glorified, the Holy Spirit stepped right in and took his place as administrator over the kingdom. The kingdom didn't change. Why, if Roosevelt should die today, Mr. Garner would become the national administrator, the national president; the government would be the same, but just a change of administration, that would be all, and so the church government is the same and has not changed because Christ

died and the Holy Spirit took charge. Just a different administration. Surely anybody can see that. Now, I am sure my friend sees it, and I think you do.

Well, what next? "There be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." I explained that a while ago; this makes the third time. Jesus did not say the kingdom would come into existence. No, the kingdom would come with power. I'll illustrate it, and the record will show it, that my friend, Professor Harde- man, has had an existence for the last 63 years. I know he was in existence 25 years ago for I met him in debate. But he came to *Little Rock with power!* Does that mean that he came into existence when he came to Little Rock? He is a powerful man, and he has learned more since I was with him, and has more power than he had then, and so—the kingdom came with power, didn't say it came into existence. Who told you that coming with power meant to come into existence? Now you are the man who ought to "speak when the Bible speaks, and keep silent where the Bible is silent," as you claim. And so the kingdom now, the only kingdom Jesus Christ ever had, the kingdom we are in now, the one he established during his personal ministry, the one that came in power on the day of Pentecost, the one that has continued in power from that day to this, will continue to be the kingdom of our Lord and he'll turn that kingdom over to the Father at the end! (1 Cor. 15.) But what has that to do with Luke 19 where it says he'll receive or take over the world kingdoms, making them subject to him as I quoted from Isaiah, where it said the "mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains." In other words, the *government of the Lord's house* shall be established over all the other governments, that's when he will take over these world governments. He is going to have victory by and by. That is what we have in Luke 19, that is what we have in Dan. 7, where the thrones shall be cast down, the books opened, and 10 thousand times 10 thousand stand before him; then he comes to the *Ancient of days and receives a kingdom*. He didn't say that he was going to set up a kingdom. The

time is coming, not when he is going to set up a kingdom, but when he will take over the world kingdoms, and they'll become his property. Just like one nation taking over another, just like Japan is trying to take over China now. Will the Japanese empire come into existence if it takes over China? No, sir. The Chinese empire would be taken by Japan, and received by Japan, if they are successful in their effort. Christ is going to conquer some day and that is what the seventh chapter of Daniel and the nineteenth chapter of Luke mean.

Now he said he didn't mean to say that the New Testament had to be written, but he meant it had to be operative. Very well. What is the testament? *What Christ said and what Christ did while he was on earth made the testament.* It was operating under Christ. Then when he turned it over to the Holy Spirit, *that will became a written will*, written out by the apostles, and it was no more operative as a will after being written than it was when Christ was operating it. I have explained it three times and he has made no earthly effort even to refer to it. Here is a man with a family, a father, with five or six children and a wife. He has an estate. While he lives he administers himself, but before he dies, he writes out his will, and names the administrator. Now when he dies, and the administrator comes in to make that will effective, does that bring the family into existence? It does not, and you know it. So Christ had his church, and he made the will to the church, named the administrator, the Holy Spirit. Now does that change the government, or bring it into existence when the administrator comes? Certainly not.

Now my friend came with another psychological trick. I say that deliberately. I want to say to my friend Harde- man that I majored in psychology when I went to college. I know the tricks. When I said I'd revise my opinion about any absurdity being proved by history that I'd have to take that back for I couldn't prove the absurdity of his church going back to Pentecost by history. He got up here and said I had changed my opinion like I had always done, and had to take things back, as was my habit, and all that kind of stuff, and never noticed what I was talking about. I was

showing you, sir, that the church that you belong to started a long time since Pentecost, and you couldn't prove it by history to save my life, and so my rule wouldn't apply to your church, and you know it. I can prove any other absurdity that I know anything about. He wants you to forget the point. That's *psychology*, but everybody that can see through it will see the unfairness of it. I will pass it up after having exposed it. I took nothing back on that subject at all.

Now my good friend has not answered the speech that I made this afternoon. He hasn't tried, but he went back and picked up some things that he could pervert and distort that I said thirty-six years ago, and has tried to answer them like, for instance, that "past perfect tense." I haven't said a word about the "past perfect tense" in this debate. I haven't said one word in this debate about the kingdom being in existence when John first began to preach. If I ever did say it, I was wrong. I am a man who learns as I go along; *I don't know it all to start with*, like Harde-
man, who *never revises his opinion*. A man that comes here and says that he knew it all when he first started—never had to revise his opinion; what do you think of a man like that? I'm surprised at him. Suppose I have revised my opinion, what of it? I am up now debating and why don't you meet the arguments I make now? But not being able to do it, he goes back and picks up a thing that he can pervert and change, and twist, and tries to answer what I said thirty-six years ago. Why don't you answer me now? Why not now? He has not answered and the record will show that my speech has never been touched; but he is trying to make the impression on you that I said those things in this debate. If I ever said them, I haven't said them in this debate, and he is supposed to answer what I say in this debate. Suppose I did use wrong argument back there, but learned better. What of it? Why don't you answer what I have learned since then, instead of dodging around and make believe that you are answering? The record is going to look mighty ugly against you on that, and you can't revise that part of it. We are both agreed that we are going to

revise little slips of the tongue and things, like grammatical errors and things like that, but we are not going to revise any of the things just referred to.

Now comes my friend and says, "All that took place before Jesus left the world; all these things that took place back there, what about it?" Christ had died, Rom. 7: 4, in order that we might be dead to the law that we should marry another. Christ arose from the dead, right about fifty days before Pentecost, and was with his church forty days, speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, and since they were dead to the law when the law died, and married to another when the law died, he stayed with them as husband and wife, using your argument. I am turning it on you, for forty days after he arose from the dead and then gave the commission to the church that he stayed with forty days, and said lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world, so you have got your church, you being judge, fifty days before Pentecost in spite of high water. There were fifty days after Christ arose from the dead; there were fifty days when they were not connected with the Jewish law at all—fifty days, and Jesus with them, teaching them "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" (Acts 1), and left them after he gave the commission to them, and said lo, I am with you always—to whom? According to your doctrine, that is when the side was open in Adam, God took Eve out, though when Christ had his side riven and the church came out, and was *fifty days old on the day of Pentecost, you being judge*. That's quibbling. I haven't made that argument, I am taking his argument and replying to it. Well, he said how could there be two governments at the same time—the law of Moses, and the law of Christ? Just exactly like you said. You explained it better than I could. I said that the colonies, that became states, declared their independence on the Fourth of July, 1776, and, so they declared their independence of the British law; but Britain didn't let up, Britain didn't let go, Britain held their law and held their army here until several years afterwards. *Both laws*: the colonies had a continental congress—they had their congress, they had their judges, they had their officers, they had their enforcement law, and Britain

was doing the same thing at the same time on the same territory until they were shot full of holes and sent back across the big pond. So, Christ set up his church, his kingdom, and had his own laws, and announced them, and in the great Sermon on the Mount, he said, *Moses said so and so, but I set all that aside*, and I am giving you my word. "*Moses said, but I say*," establishing his authority there; its authority was set aside, but three years after that, it gave way entirely for Christ was nailed to his cross and took it entirely away. You explained it—Thank you, sir—how they could both exist at the same time.

Now, Jesus preached his own death, burial, and resurrection, hence, the gospel was preached before Pentecost, John 10, Matt. 16. The death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ is not the gospel, but the preaching of it is, and Jesus preached the good news, the word gospel means good news, and Jesus gave the good news. He said, I am going to die, be buried, and rise again, Matthew sixteenth chapter, and it was just as good news then as afterwards, and those who believed it were saved by it. But here is the amusing and pitiable thing. I said, "Good-by, John 3: 5, if the gospel is not preached before Pentecost." He said the gospel was preached there as a future something, and not as a fact. Uh-huh! Let's read it that way: Jesus answered, Verily, I say unto you, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." My friend said all that's future. Let's read: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit. Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be? Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know,

and testify that we have seen." But Hardeman says no, no, not past tense but that will be after a while. Uh-huh! that's what Hardeman says, but that is not what Jesus said. "*We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness.*" Hardeman says all that's in the future. Bless your soul, if John 3: 5 is future, then the whole business there is future: put it all in one sentence. No, sir, that is either gospel or it is not. If it is gospel, it is *gospel before Pentecost*, and if it is not, then you *preach a lie when you stand up here and preach born of water and of Spirit and palm it off for gospel*. Take your choice.

Now I am coming where we are going to have a good time. My friend says the scholars in the Baptist Church believe that the church began on the day of Pentecost, and preach it—Ham, Jeter, and a great number of others. All right, then according to your argument that proves the Missionary Baptist Church is the church of Christ. Say, how? Just like you prove the one you are in is the church of Christ!—by preaching the Pentecost theory. If your preaching the church began at Pentecost is what makes you the church of Christ, your people, then Ham and Jeter, and the other scholars, preaching it makes the Baptist Church the church of Christ, you say, well, it doesn't do it. No it doesn't, I know. You have been palming that camouflage off long enough, and that's why I am exposing you. There's nothing to it, and I think you can see it. Suppose you could prove the church began at Pentecost it would not be the church you are in that thus started.

I want to show you some things my friend has not noticed, and he cannot do it now, because he can't bring anything new in his last speech, because I have no reply. I want to know what he has said in reply. The record shows he said nothing about Luke 11: 20, "If I with the finger of God cast out devils," no doubt the kingdom of God will begin on the day of Pentecost. Is that the way it reads? No, sir. "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." He made no reply. It will be unmanly and unfair for him to do it in his last speech when I have no comeback. He has had all day to do it in,

and I brought it in my very first speech this morning. Very well, I'll call your attention to another thing. Jesus was king before Pentecost. The record will show I put that in. John 18: 37. He said nothing in reply. His kingdom suffered before Pentecost, Matt. 11: 12. He made no reply. Luke 16: 16, he merely referred to that one time without an argument, that men pressed into the kingdom before Pentecost. Again Matt. 23: 13, he made no reply where it says some were hindering those who were entering from entering in. No reply. Mark 3: 13, 14, where they had an ordained ministry, he made no reply. They were authorized to baptize before Pentecost, John 4: 2, he has made no denial. Then, the next is that they had a rule of discipline before Pentecost, Matt. 18: 15-17, where Jesus gave them the rule of discipline about how to settle differences between themselves. He made no reply. I read these off in my last speech; he has had the whole afternoon to study about them. Then again, they had the gospel before Pentecost, Matt. 24: 14, and he made no reply. Again, Jesus said there was no doubt about it, Luke 11: 20. He made no reply as I have just said. Then of Acts 1: 21 what has he said? Peter said one must be chosen from the "company" "which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John." What has he said in reply? Now, sure enough, what has he said in reply? I don't remember a thing in the world he said, and I don't believe you do. Very well, Matt. 28: 18-20, Jesus said, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." Not even one breath of reply, not even referring to it. I have it all noted down here, and the records will show it too, and it will look mighty bad on my friend in the book. Now, then, John 3: 28, 29, he has made absolutely no reply, didn't even refer to it, and then John 3: 35, where he said, all things have been committed into my hands, not one single solitary breath of reply did he make. Now, ladies and gentlemen, what kind of debating is that? I have counted up here, oh, yes, here are two more. What did he say in reply about the widow? The church was left a widow. He did say this much: "Well, it was a grass widow," and that's all under God's heaven he did say. When I came back and said

Christ died, he didn't walk off and leave, he died, and she was a legitimate widow; he made no reply. Very well, what did he say about that argument that I made about Psalm 22: 22, where Christ was to sing in the church, and I showed the only time it was done was in Matt. 26: 30, at the Lord's Supper. You remember it, it will be in the record. Who's the antecedent of they? They sang a hymn and went out. They who? Well, the ones that took the Lord's Supper, Christ and his company. He made absolutely no reference to it whatsoever. My position is proved beyond a shadow of a doubt; but even if my friend should be able to prove the church began on the day of Pentecost, it wouldn't do him any good; and if he should prove it, it wouldn't do the Baptist Church any harm, for we are the only people who can back up and hitch on to Pentecost. We are the only ones that can reach back that far. All the other churches started way down this side of Christ, and there are only two churches between whom there is any controversy—the Catholics and the Baptists, they both claim to go back to Christ. Now which one of the two? All of the rest by consent acknowledge they can't. Hardeman says you can't neither, his church nor any other church. Baptists say you can. So then the benefit of the doubt certainly ought to be given to the one who makes the claim; the others don't even claim it. Then the Baptist Church is the church of our Lord, Jesus Christ, set up and established during the personal ministry of Jesus Christ. Christ is the King, Christ is its Master, Christ is its Teacher, Christ is its Savior. Thank you.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Negative*, Fourth Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Tonight closes this session and the debate on this proposition. I trust this speech may be an interesting and pleasant thirty minutes to you. I think I can truly say that of all the debates that I have attended, Dr. Bogard has tonight made the weakest reply I have ever heard to arguments presented. I had thought that, with the passing of twenty-five years, Dr. Bogard would have learned even more than he has

along those lines. I made the point reading Romans 7—which, by the way, he did not read to you at all, but only ridiculed by suggesting “the father and mother were the father and mother of themselves.” Well, Dr. Bogard, you have to fly in the face of Paul, not Hardeman! I read it again to you. “So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.” Now watch the application. That’s the woman and the husband; now watch the law and Christ. “Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.” Now what’s the object of marriage? For children to be born. How are Christians said to be related? Married unto Christ, and in spite of all that, without noticing it only to find fault with what Paul said, Dr. Bogard added: “Hardeman made no reference to Christ and the bride.” Is the man beside himself, and what has ailed him to cause him to make such wild and extravagant statements?

When I mentioned Dr. Whitsitt’s book of Louisville Seminary, suggesting the impossibility of his futile attempt on succession, he said, “Oh, he’s a heretic.” I am just asking Dr. Bogard this: Has not your own teacher, Dr. Guthrie, of the Baptist Institute, likewise written an article in the paper to the very same effect? I am just asking that. I am under the impression that he has. I have asked the Doctor to point out one scholar—just one, and you heard me beg him in two speeches. I didn’t say it wasn’t there, but I said, “Dr. Bogard, I have searched. I have never found a Baptist historian yet of repute that takes the position that Dr. Bogard does, and, therefore, he is out of line with scholarly Baptists.” The historians have the idea on that point that is held by the great brotherhood of the church of Christ, and that’s why it is that the “Rev. Ham” can’t engage in debate, because there is nothing to debate on this question of succession. But I just want to call your attention to this. “Hardeman is not tonight in the affirmative.” He’d love to

get me there because he recognizes his failure, absolutely, on his affirmative; but "if I can just put Hardeman in the lead on the Pentecost theory, then I'll follow." He needs someone to guide him, sure as you live, but that's not my position at present. I am simply here to show that he is wrong about it. Ladies and gentlemen, let me say to you: Alexander Campbell never claimed in the wide, wide world to found a church. Neither was he turned out of the Baptist Church. He left the Red Stone Association, of which he was a member. He went to the Mahoning Association, another sister organization of the Baptists, and he exposed the error of the entire crowd with the result that not only he but the entire association quit the Baptist outfit and went to preaching the restored gospel of Jesus Christ our Lord. That's the fact of the case. Dr. Bogard cannot be taken as authority on matters of that kind. Oh, he said, "Hardeman says he does not have a church." No indeed, I do not. I never talk as Baptists do, about "my church," and "his church," and "her church." It's the church belonging to Christ by virtue of the fact that he is the head of it, by virtue of the fact that he is the builder of it, by virtue of the fact that he is the purchaser of it. It is the church of the Lord Jesus Christ, bought with his blood, filled with his Spirit, guided by his counsel, and at last to be crowned with his eternal and matchless glory on the other shore. It is not mine, but salvation is in the church, or the family of God. What reply was made to that? If there be a Christian character possible outside of God's family, he would be by virtue of that very thing a bastard and not a son; and yet that doctrine presented tonight by the affirmative on this question. So much for that.

Why, he said, "The candlestick is the church." That's enough to make one blush. The candlestick is the light, and it represents the Bible as the light by which we are governed, and not the thing itself. Well, when he comes to the tribe of Judah, he admits exactly what Hardeman said, that it did not take a priest to kill the victim, and he said exactly what I did—that the offering was made in the Most Holy Place; therefore, until Jesus Christ entered heaven, the offering was not made; but then he tried to make a distinc-

tion and said, "The atonement was one thing, and the offering another." No, no! the atonement and the offering were the same thing! On the tenth day of the seventh month of every year thus it was.

Well, he said the Spirit took Christ's place as administrator just as if Mr. Roosevelt were to die, Mr. Garner would take his place as administrator; but I want to suggest this; Garner would take his place at once, automatically. Now then, if Jesus Christ was administrator while he lived, and the Holy Spirit was the administrator beginning on Pentecost, let me ask who was administrator from the death of Christ until Pentecost? There's a period of fifty-three days when the church, if there had been one, didn't have an administrator. There was nobody in office, nobody serving. It appears to me that any man ought to see a thing of that kind. He promised to revise his book. I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, we are getting somewhere in this debate. "If I said that,"—now I just want to ask Dr. Bogard: Why do you put that hypothetical "if" in it, when you know good and well you did say it? Listen. Here's the statement that he signed. "I said in the Borden-Bogard Debate at Mammoth Spring, Arkansas, February 22, 1906 (?) that the expression of the New Testament, 'at hand,' means 'has come,' and also that John preached the kingdom 'has come,' and that it did come, and the people entered it before the death of John. I also declared publicly that John died out of the kingdom, and was not a member of it." Then, long after that, just what year I do not know, but on page ninety-five of the Borden Debate he said, "The Elder feels rather bad over the fact that I said 'at hand' meant 'has come' and I signed it at Mammoth Spring. He expected me to go back on it when I said it up there. But when I signed it again, it rather upset his calculation, and he didn't know what to do with it. I did sign it and I did say it." Now he knows that's in this book just as well as I do, and yet he comes and says: "If I said it." Ladies and gentlemen, my hat's off to any man who admits his errors. I appreciate the fact tonight that Elder Bogard comes out, having been driven to the wall, and says, "Sir, I have learned better, I am going to revise it." A noble confession this, even if made under pressure.

That's not all we learn in this debate. He had back in 1910 Mark 16: 16 as good scripture. In 1915 it was bad scripture. In 1929 it was good scripture. In 1930 it was bad. In 1934 it was good; now then, in 1938 he says, "I'm just not going to say anything about it." As Ripley would say, "Believe it, or not," that ought to go in the "funnies." But he said Hardeman made a fine presentation of King George and the colonies. "It was better than I could do." He said that fits his theory exactly. Both the law of England and the law of colonies in existence at same time. But listen, they were at warfare, one with the other, for seven long years. Is that what you mean to teach—that the law of Moses and the law of John were in existence at the same time in deadly combat? Note his expression: "The law didn't get out of the way, just like Great Britain didn't, until John the Baptist shot it full of holes." My, my, my! what will the man say when turned loose? He made a feeble and futile effort to answer 1 Cor. 15, where Christ died for our sins, was buried, and rose again. I said, Dr. Bogard, you cannot preach that Christ died during the personal ministry of Christ because he had not, neither was he buried, neither did he rise again. Paul said if we don't preach it exactly that way, let the curses of high heaven be upon it. Well, his answer was "good-by, John 3: 5." No, no! Then he went to read John 3 and got into terrible difficulty. Hear it. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one *that is born*" — not "so is *everyone born*." That is an adjective clause; of course, he doesn't know what that means — but to the rest of you, that is an adjective clause, stating a condition or description. Hear it. Nicodemus, you that have not been born, hear me. The wind blows where it pleases and you hear the sound thereof but you can't tell whence it comes, and whither it goeth. So is everyone *that is born*. He can't tell any more about the wind than you can. The new birth doesn't have a thing on God's earth to do with teaching you physics or astronomical

affairs, and that's the point in it. How is the one that's not born—how is Nicodemus? He couldn't tell. How is the one *that is* born? He can't either. That's all there is to that illustration, and why on earth can't a man see a thing of that kind? But Baptist doctrine wants to make "so is every one that is born" mean "in a mysterious way." That's not what it says. "So" is not an adverb of manner. It's not so *is everybody born in this way*, in mysterious fashion like the wind, and as Dr. Bogard said, by miracle. Not this! But, "Nicodemus, you can't tell about these earthly things of which I have told you. Now then, after you have been born of the Spirit, you still can't tell, and that's exactly the point, the thing that I am talking about is that of physical affairs and when the kingdom of God comes, though you are a member of the Jewish body, your membership in that will not give you a passport into the kingdom of God. It's not like that thing of which you are a member. Here you are ruler of the Jews, but if you ever enter into that about which I am talking, you've got to be born again—of water and of the Spirit." So much for that.

Dr. Bogard suggested some other things right along with that line. He says that statements I quote from Baptist scholars relative to church on Pentecost prove that it is a Baptist Church, because *it* began at the same time as I contend. Now look at that logic. Bogard tells me that he is past seventy years old. All right, that puts him born back in about 1868. All right, that's when he began. Now watch the illustration. Another man was born in 1868, therefore he and Bogard are the same man because they both started in the same year. Now let me tell you, Dr. Bogard, I run a college, but if I had some students that couldn't beat that, I'd say, "Boys, the school is not a place to give brains; it is a place to develop what you already have." Oh, he said that Hardeman has made no reference to the statement in Luke 11: 20. He is mistaken about it. Does he not recall that I read Luke 12: 32 where Jesus said to that same company, "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" and 11: 20 was relative to future, and yet he said Hardeman didn't refer to it. When I took up this afternoon the kingdom of heaven suffering violence,

and the violent taking it by force, in its preparatory state, what has he said about it? Absolutely nothing. Now he said, "Hardeman never noticed Acts 1: 21, where he thinks the church began." Well, his memory is short again. I called attention to John 3 wherein a statement is found that sounds a death knell to the doctrine of the gentleman. Listen at it once again: John 3: 22, "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judaea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized." All right. Now listen. "And John also was baptizing in Aenon." They had two companies at the same time, yet Bogard said that Jesus took up right where John left off in Acts 1: 21. So he has confusion, more and more confounded, all along the line.

I have already called attention to the facts regarding the bride, and likewise to the widow. He thinks all Hardeman said was that "she was a grass widow." No, that's not all. I said that if this contention be true, then she must be married again, for the first husband being dead leaves her at liberty. Now who married the church the second time? If church was married during personal ministry, Christ later died. I repeat, when were they married again? Well, he said they sang in the church, and Hardeman made no reference. He is wrong again. I read to him from Rom. 15: 9, where they sang among the Gentiles. You've got a "short memory even if you haven't got a tough hide." Well, he said that he can trace the thing back to Pentecost, and right there he stopped, and wouldn't budge beyond it. How about getting back beyond Pentecost to personal ministry? Now the reason that Dr. Bogard can't trace the Baptist Church back to the beginning of John's work is because there never was such a thing in existence as the Baptist Church and you can't prove that which does not exist. There is no such thing as a Baptist Church in God's book from lid to lid. There never was but one Baptist on earth. The word "Baptists" (plural) is not in the Bible. There was John, the Baptist. John said John 3: 30, "He must increase, but I must decrease." There never was but one and he said he was going to quit. And the declaration, therefore, that we have such a thing as a Baptist Church is beyond the recognition of God's word.

Now then, we've made progress as aforesaid. No longer are we saying: "At hand" means "has come." I wonder if Bogard will want to revise this debate. He will have more books to sell than any fellow yet when he gets through revising; but I beg you, don't you be led away by a substitute, stick to the original! See that his books bear the original mark! There's the original, but "I am going to revise it." I wonder why? Well, he just found out in this discussion that his declarations, put down in cold print, cannot be supported. Of them he is now ashamed, and says, "I've learned better." Well, it's time to learn better, and I congratulate Dr. Bogard upon being able to learn.

Now what did he do with the argument made regarding Adam and Eve as type of Christ and church? Did you note that this was severely untouched just as I predicted it would be? Adam a type of Christ, Eve a type of the church. How was Eve brought into existence? First, Adam was put to sleep; second, his side was opened; third, from that side there came the price, and after he had paid the price, then what? Woman was formed. I raise the point: Was Eve formed before Adam was put to sleep? That's exactly what he'd have. He says the church was in existence before Christ was put to sleep. You throw the whole thing out of joint. Now Paul said, Eph. 5: I am talking about Christ and the church, and now get it! Christ was first of all on the tragic tree of the cross, put to death. What next? A Roman soldier walked up and injected the spear and his side was opened. What occurred? There flowed forth the crimson blood. Hence, ye are bought with the blood of Jesus Christ. That's what it took. Then what? After the price was paid, the church was formed, as was Eve back yonder. And then what? Eve became the wife of Adam—what about it over here? The church became the wife of Christ. What did God say to Adam and Eve? "Multiply, and replenish the earth." What did God say to these? "Bear fruit"! as you are married unto Christ. Friends, the proof stands without the shadow of a doubt, and tonight, if I were transferred into the presence of God Almighty and were standing on the plains of eternal judgment, there'd be no regret for a single statement made during this discussion.

I want to review in the minutes that I have left. First, if the church were in existence during the personal ministry of Christ, it was before the New Testament became operative. Why? Paul said a testament is of force "after men are dead." Again, it was before the disciples or the apostles were set in the church, for they were not set in until God's Son had gone to the depths of the earth, and then ascended, and "gave some apostles, etc." Now this afternoon Dr. Bogard talked about "giving gifts," and when I came back and said the gift was the apostle, he closed up like a clam—you haven't heard him open his mouth about that thing since. That settled it! Well, he came back and said, "Hardeman, don't I learn something as I go along?" Thank God, I hope you do, because there is much to be learned! And he says, "Yes, I said that, but I have learned something since! I wasn't as smart as you claim to be." Well, bless your soul, this audience knows who is claiming to be smart, and you know who has broadcast all over the land criticisms of God's word, and of every translation of it. Who has, with a wise look, referred so often to what the Greek says, and who has repudiated 172 real scholars? After such boasts, who has been forced to admit that he doesn't know even English? Ladies and gentlemen, if the church were in existence previous to the death of Christ and during his personal ministry, they were not allowed to preach Jesus Christ—"tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." What have you heard about that from Dr. Bogard? Not one solitary word.

Well, again, if the church were in existence previous to the death of Christ, then what? It had no blood in it. The blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin, and yet, "without shedding of blood is no remission." What have you heard about Heb. 10: 4 and 9: 22? Not a single word. Not one syllable! Well, again, it was under the law of Moses, two laws in existence at the same time. He said, "Hardeman, that's right, but just like Great Britain and the colonies, they were fighting at Cambridge, and Bunker Hill, and Monmouth and Concord, and on through Valley Forge, and to the sea. John shot the law full of holes at Old Yorktown, and the whole gang surrendered." He says: "That's the way it happened." Well, what further? It was

restricted and limited, wherein the Gentiles were not privileged to hear the glad sound of the gospel of Jesus Christ. It was before Jesus made the atonement, as stated in Heb. 9: 12-15. It was before the church was purchased! You are bought with a price, 1 Cor. 6: 19. This was not touched! Therefore glorify God in your bodies and in your spirits which are his! Well, what again? It would have to be before the middle wall of partition was broken down, therefore, before the Gentiles could have any part in it and it was before anything was ever asked in Christ's name! Now what have you replied about that? Not one thing. In the seventeenth chapter of John, friends, we have the last prayer of the Son of God, as in the shadow of the cross he prayed unto the Father. Now then, back in the sixteenth chapter just before the tragic death, Christ said, "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name"; and yet, there is a church, says Dr. Bogard. It has been in existence from the baptism of John, and not one single member of it at liberty to ask a thing on God's earth in the name of Jesus Christ! He would have the Missionary Baptist Church, rejecting Christ and asking nothing in his name. Again, it was before Christ became priest on earth, and my argument on that forever stands, that he could not be a priest because he was of the tribe of Judah, and not of the tribe of Levi; but he said he was like Melchizedek! He was after that order, a priest without beginning of days or end of time. Yes, but he was at God's right (Psalm 110: 4, 5), "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. The Lord at thy right hand." But he was of the wrong tribe and could not be a priest on earth. Furthermore, it was before Eve was ever formed—before the church of God was ever formed. Friends, there could not be a church of Christ in existence, established and organized, without a full and complete gospel. Oh, Dr. Bogard said, "The death of Christ and the burial of Christ, and the resurrection of Christ was not the gospel." Well, Paul missed it then! He said the gospel means good news. But hear it. "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all

that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins." Where is the good news? It's not simply in the fact that Jesus died! But when you add three words, "for our sins," there is the glad tidings. Brethren, I do not simply rejoice tonight over the tragedy of Calvary. I do not rejoice simply because Christ was suspended between the heavens and the earth as though fit for neither. But when I remember that humanity was lost, ruined, and recreant, in due time Jesus Christ died—for what intent? That I might have life, that sins might be forgiven! There's the glad tidings, there's the good news! And I am not simply rejoicing over the fact that he was buried, but thank God he burst the bars of the tomb and came forth triumphant o'er the powers of the Hadean world, having plucked, may I say again, the very rose of immortality from the Hadean realm, to plant it upon the bosom of his own grave where it may bloom in beauty forevermore and send its perfume throughout the whole world. Thank God, the gospel is the power of God unto salvation. Now then: Unless I preach that Jesus died, which could not be done before the cross; unless I preach that Christ was buried, which could not be done during his personal ministry; unless I preach that Christ did rise from the dead, which also was impossible, the curses of God rest upon me. "Woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel" of God's Son. But, friends, let me congratulate you upon your patience, upon the very courteous and polite hearings; and likewise, Dr. Bogard for the fine spirit he has evidenced thus far. And may I just say to those who might be listening in: Were you here and could you see the good humor that seems to prevail, the friendly disposition characteristic of the disputants, the moderators and all others, the objection that religious debates end in wrangles would be absolutely obliterated. I pray God that we may maintain our self-control to the end of this discussion. I appreciate what Dr. Bogard wrote me when he said: "Professor Hardeman, I am sick and tired of low-flung debates," and I thank God he has reached that point, if indeed he ever had other sentiments. Such have never been mine. Now with these statements let me thank you very kindly one and all again tonight.

THE POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Affirmative*, First Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We come to the last session of this debate, which has been, I think, up to what was expected so far as deportment on the part of all has been concerned. I just want to say this in advance of the talk, that at the beginning, I did not want to enter into this discussion because of other duties that I felt obligatory upon me; and I hadn't had a debate in twenty-six years of this type or kind, but I can truly say that, since having gotten into it, it has been a pleasure and I think a profit. I'll do my best to revise the manuscripts and get them in shape and turn them over, but I have nothing on earth to do with the book. I did not want the responsibility; I want no remuneration from it, but if I can contribute in any way to good, I am willing to do it. We have this morning for discussion this proposition: "The Bible teaches that it is possible for a child of God to apostatize so as to be finally lost." Of course, by the Bible and its teaching, you know what I mean—that it is possible, within the realm of probability; that it can happen: that a child of God, I mean a Christian, a regenerated, saved child of God, can apostatize, or fall away, so as to be finally lost in hell. Now, if Dr. Bogard can state that any more plainly and completely, all right. The issue between us is, therefore, whether or not a child of God, one who has been regenerated by the blood of Christ, can finally do such things as will result in his damnation in hell.

The Bible gives a general warning. 1 Cor. 10: 12. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Warnings always imply danger, and, therefore, I start with that general statement unto the Corinthian Christians and to all everywhere that call upon the name of the Lord. I am beginning now with the first man and woman created upon this earth. Luke 3: 38 says that Adam was a son of God'; Gen. 1: 26, that he was made an image of God; that he transgressed God's law, Gen. 3: 3; that as a result therefore, Rom. 5: 12, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; so death passed unto all men, for in that

all have sinned. That's the statement regarding Adam, God's created man. Now then, making a parallel of that in 2 Cor. 11: 3, Paul said, "But I fear"—well, Paul, what are you afraid of?—"lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." Adam was a child of God by creation, but here were the Corinthians, children of God by regeneration. Now, Paul said that just as Adam fell by the seducing influence of the devil, I fear lest the same thing might happen to you. In Ezek. 18: 26, "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." The righteousness here mentioned is not man's of himself, because it is stated that man's righteousness is as filthy rags, and certainly there'd be no condemnation for a man to turn away from that likened unto filthy rags. Again, Ezek. 33: 18, "When the righteous turneth from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, he shall even die thereby." Then again 2 Chron. 15: 1, 2, "And the Spirit of God came upon Azariah, the son of Oded: and he went out to meet Asa, and said unto him, Hear ye me, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin; The Lord is with you, while ye be with him; and if ye seek him, he will be found of you; but if ye forsake him, he will forsake you." Well, to show that that's not just temporary, and a matter of chastisement, I read from 1 Chron. 28: 9: "And thou, Solomon my son, know thou the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart and with a willing mind: for the Lord searcheth all hearts, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts." Now get it. "If thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off for ever." Hence, it isn't a transient, ephemeral matter, but it is a *forever* casting off! On what grounds? On the ground that if you forsake God, then he will forsake you and cast you off forever. Now there's the possibility of a man's being able to forsake God or else this would be all to no profit.

I call attention now to the story of King Saul, 1 Sam. 10, in which we have this statement: "Samuel said to all the people, See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen."

First, the Lord chose him; second (1 Sam. 10: 1), the records say this: "Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, and kissed him, and said, Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee?" Well, note again in the tenth verse, "And when they came thither to the hill, behold, a band of prophets met him; and the Spirit of God came mightily upon him, and he prophesied among them." Now, Dr. Bogard's position is that nobody but a child of God can get the Spirit, and went so far as to say that old Caiaphas, who was high priest of that certain year, was one of the Old Testament prophets, therefore, God's child because the Spirit was upon him. Now then, according to that idea, here is King Saul, upon whom the Bible said the Spirit of God came—and remember the world can't receive it, his doctrine, in the sense he wants to make it, and yet here is the fellow that did receive it; therefore, according to Dr. Bogard, he would have to be considered a child of God! Not only that, but in verse nine, the Bible says that God took away from him his heart and gave him another heart, and that God was with him; and thus the story continues until, by and by, with the passing of years, Saul said unto Samuel (1 Sam. 15: 24), "I have sinned"! Well, what's the result of it? Twenty-eighth chapter, sixteenth verse, "Then said Samuel, Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy?" Now look at it. There is the man upon whom God's Spirit came. Dr. Bogard said that must be a child of God, for the world can't receive him—in the sense that he has talked about of course; but here is a man that did receive him, and then the man sinned, and what's the result? God departed from him. So, 1 Chron. 28: 9 again, "If thou forsake him, he will cast thee off for ever." But again, I am talking about how a remnant of Israel was saved, Ex. 3: 7, You are my people, whom I have delivered, or whom I have chosen. Again, Deut. 4: 20, You are the people of my inheritance; 14: 1, You are the children of Jehovah our God; fourteenth chapter further, You are a holy people; and you are a God-saved people; Rom. 9: 4, "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." Now then, God warned

them, Deut. 11: 26-28; "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day: and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known." Well, all right, now Rom. 9: 27, "Esaias also crieth concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved." Now I am calling your attention to Numbers 25, and I want to read just some things along that line, commencing with verse five. The record says here: "Slay ye every one his men that were joined unto Baalpeor. And, behold, one of the children of Israel came and brought unto his brethren a Midianitish woman in the sight of Moses, and in the sight of all the congregation of the children of Israel, who were weeping before the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And when Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, saw it, he rose up from among the congregation, and took a javelin in his hand: and he went after the man of Israel into the tent, and thrust both of them through, the man of Israel, and the woman through her belly. So the plague was stayed from the children of Israel. And those that died in the plague were twenty and four thousand." Now what do you have? One of God's servants, "my people," found in the act with a Midianitish woman, and while there caught, God slew them, and yet, the doctrine of impossibility of apostasy would have to say: "God saved them though they were slain in the very act as herein described." A doctrine, ladies and gentlemen, that is not conducive to reservations nor in deterring us in our gratification of all desires characteristic of the flesh.

But again, the Lord's people can forget him. Judges 3: 7, "The children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and forgat the Lord their God"; again, in Deut. 6: 12, "Beware lest thou forget the Lord"; Job 8: 13, "So are the paths of all that forget God"; Psalm 9: 17, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God"; Psalm 50: 22, "Now consider this, ye that forget God, lest I

tear you in pieces"; and again, Isa. 17: 10, "Because thou hast forgotten the God of thy salvation, and hast not been mindful of the rock of thy strength"; Jere. 2: 32, "Can a maid forget her ornaments?" No. "Or a bride her attire?" No. "Yet my people have forgotten me days without number." Now note what he says regarding those that have forgotten God. In Jer. 23: 39, 40, "Therefore, behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you." Now, Jeremiah, what are you saying? My people have forgotten me! Well, what are you going to do then, Lord? "Therefore, behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence: and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten." Why, ladies and gentlemen, how can a statement of truth be made plainer or more clearly put? But, you say that's back there with the Israelites. Quite true. Rom. 15: 4, Paul said, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime"—here's one of them—"were written for our learning." What can I learn from it? "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall," and God said, 1 Cor. 10: 11, "These things happened unto them by way of example." And what is the example? There are God's people, they forget God. Look at them—see the example. Now then, since they have forgotten me, I will utterly forget them and will bring upon them an everlasting reproach, and a shame! Hence, if you seek the Lord, he'll be found of you; if you forsake him, he'll forsake you, and cast you off forever! Why is all that in the Bible? They are written for the learning and the admonition of those of us yet on time's side of eternity.

Again, Jer. 13: 25, "This is thy lot, the portion of thy measures from me, saith the Lord; because thou has forgotten me." But again, "Because thou hast forgotten me, and cast me behind thy back," Ezek. 23: 35. Now then, 2 Pet. 1: 9, "But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins." Well, I am turning now to Rom. 11, right along the same line, and calling attention to verses 20 to 22. Hear it: "Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but

fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God." Look at those two things in antithesis of each other. "Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God:"—watch it!—"on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness,"—what's the next?—"if thou continue in his goodness." Now upon whom is God's goodness? Upon the man that continues in his goodness, otherwise "thou also shalt be cut off." Friends, if I were to write out a statement I believe honestly that I would not be able to frame it more direct and more positive than does the Bible with reference to matters of this kind. Behold, brethren, the goodness and the severity of God. Upon them that fell, behold God's severity; but upon you, goodness, provided you continue in his goodness. Otherwise, you also, as they, shall be cut off.

Well, in Heb. 4: 11, there is this: "Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall after the same example of disobedience" or of unbelief. Now note again, 1 Cor. 10: 11, "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." Now the conclusion, "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall. There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." Now be assured of one fact, friends, and take courage from it. There is no temptation confronting humanity, but such as is common to man. Jesus Christ was tempted in all points as are we, and in every temptation, there will be a way provided by Jehovah that we may escape. Now get it. God provides the way, but man has to accept it, and do the escaping; and God may provide thousands of things, but if man does not appropriate them he gets no benefit from them. Jehovah-Jireh the Lord has provided water, a natural element, to slake the thirst of every soul on earth. But, while Jehovah has provided water, I have to drink of it if I ever get the benefit. The Lord provides the air all around about us, and renders me able to appropriate it. But suppose I close my

nose, and if possible shut my mouth, and stop my ears, and put a coat of shellac all over my body, and refuse to breathe it—does that reflect upon Jehovah? There is the provision, but I have to accept it and appropriate it or else, the physical blessing is not mine. Even so, God will provide a way whereby all his children may escape. I don't have to go to hell; but unless I accept that way and do the escaping, then the consequences are inevitable upon me. That's a matter of faith, I am reading now 2 Tim. 2: 18, where it is said that there are those that have overthrown the faith—so faith *can* be overthrown. 1 Tim. 1: 19, "Holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck." Now what can be done with faith? It can be overthrown; it can be made shipwreck of; and in 1 Tim. 5: 12 there are those who have cast off the faith, and in 1 Tim. 4: 1, there are those that are fallen away, and the Bible said so, but the "Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith." Now what can we do with faith? Why it can be overthrown: can be made shipwreck of; it can be departed from; you can fall away from it!

Now let me just say this, because we want the truth today, and all of it to get in on the proposition possible. Dr. Ben M. Bogard does not believe any more strongly than I do that a man cannot be lost so long as he has faith in God that prompts him to do God's bidding. I believe that with all the power of my being. There is no condemnation unto the man that is a believer and a character that is walking after the counsel of God; and the issue really between us today comes down in its final analysis to this: "Can a man stop believing on the Lord?" Now, he'll argue a believer can't be lost. Well, I have no controversy with you on that point, Dr. Bogard. If you want to take the position that the believer has eternal life, and I am sure you will, in a later address, I'll give special attention to this. Question: Can a man who believes today quit believing? Can that faith be severed? Can it be overthrown? Can it be made shipwreck of? Can a man depart from it? And really, that's the issue between us and the Missionary Baptist Church. So all argument about "the faithful child of God cannot be lost" is

not relevant. I do not doubt that one particle, but here it is: Can a faithful child of God, one who believes in him, and accepts him and becomes pardoned, can that man cease to be a believer? Can he have his faith overthrown? Is there anything possible to come along by which that faith may be shipwrecked, or on account of which he may depart from it. Now that's the issue boiled down in its last analysis.

Well, again, in 1 Cor. 15: 2, you are saved, "if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain," and there is the condition, expressed in it. Note again, "We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end." Heb. 3: 14. Now what's the promise? We are made partakers of Christ. On what ground? If—if what? If we hold steadfast the confidence of our faith unto the end. Does that imply the possibility of its not being done that way? Of course it does, or else language has no sense to it. Again, Col. 1: 23, "If ye continue in the faith," be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, but become steadfast—that's the gospel preached to every creature which is under heaven, but its condition—if you continue in it. Again, 1 Pet. 1: 9, "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." Now, I know what Dr. Bogard is going to say about that, and I just want to anticipate and make these statements in advance. I know the Greek word there, "Telos," and I have here the definition of it written down from Thayer, and from Lydell and Scott. It means "termination, receiving the end, the termination." That's not all. "The limit at which a thing ceases to be." Well, when is faith going to end? Not until this earthly pilgrimage is over; when our faith will be changed into knowledge, our hopes into a glad realization. Well, what about it here? It's the termination; it's the limit at which a thing ceased to be; it's that by which a thing is finished; it's the close; it's the issue; it's the final lot; it's the faith; it's the outcome; it's the result; and those statements are taken directly from the Greek lexicon. Now, then, Peter, what about it? "Receiving the end of your faith." What does that mean? When your faith is all over, at the end of it, at the termination of it, at the limit of it, at the final issue of the matter—well, what

is the issue? It's the ultimate faith, it's the result of it, and when faith shall have been lost in sight, and we change unto the glories of the grand beyond—then what? It will not be a matter of faith. Faith will have ended. What comes with it? Salvation, eternal, in the glad by-and-by.

But note again: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." But Baptist doctrine teaches that the crown is one thing, and the life is another. But that won't stand up. Mark 15: 17 says that they put upon the brow of the Savior a crown of thorns. Did he have the thorns and then the crown? Was the crown something in addition? Or was not the crown the thing made of thorns, and thus the two thoughts? Well again, Paul says we have, in 1 Thess. 2: 19, a crown of rejoicing; 1 Pet. 5: 4, a crown of glory. Hence, what do we have here? There is the adjective phrase "of glory" descriptive of the crown. Now that's an adjective phrase, a preposition and the objective case. Change it back to the adjective—you have a glorious crown! What kind of crown is it? A glorious crown! Then reverse it, which is permissible—what is it? A crown of glory; just like a coat of mine—my coat; and there's not a bit of difference. So I just want you to see that. In expressing a thing I say, "This is a picture of me." All right, "This is my picture." It's a crown of glory; then it's a glorious crown. It's a crown of thorns; then it is a thorny crown. It's a crown of rejoicing; then it's a rejoicing crown. And I insist from the grammatical point of view that the prepositional phrase is adjective in nature and merely describes the kind of crown and is not something separate and apart, in addition to, or distinct from, if I may refer to those terms.

Now, to the next, 2 Thess. 2: 3, wherein we have this: "Let no man beguile you in any wise: for it will not be, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed." Now, I am calling attention to two words. There is a difference, friends, between falling and falling away. I could walk on this platform; I might stumble over Dr. Guthrie's small (?) feet and fall; but it is possible to get up again. But if I fall away, that disconnects me with the platform altogether, and the word *away* means "from, separated." Now

then, they shall fall away—not simply fall. “The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord: . . . though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down”; that’s quite true; but if he fall *away*, then what about it? A different story altogether. “Looking diligently,” Heb. 12: 15, “lest any man fail of the grace of God.” 2 Pet. 1: 9, 10, “He that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall.” Now note, A man is elected at the time that he becomes a Christian, but the inauguration or the coming into the fullness or possession of that election is at a later period. For instance, our president is elected in November; but he is not in office until January first. Now then, you be certain of that election of last November—see that you make that sure, and don’t violate the constitution or the laws of the land that would make void your election, so that you may on January first enter into that for which you are elected. That’s Peter’s argument. I thank you indeed.

THE POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

BEN M. BOGARD, *Negative*, First Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

To say that I am disappointed in the speech made by my good friend is to put it mildly. I had hoped that he would take up the subject and really present something that I would need to answer; but as the book will show when read, my good friend with all of his scholarship and ability has utterly failed at every step of the way, on every point that he tried to make, and has not given me enough to keep busy ten minutes in reply. I am wondering if he is aiming to throw me into the affirmative. If so, I happily take the lead, for I want the scriptures that are ordinarily used to at least be discussed in this debate.

Taking up the speech in the order in which my friend delivered it, I’ll notice the things briefly that he spoke of. Adam fell, certainly, but Adam stood on his own merits, and Jesus Christ had not even been promised much less

died for Adam; hence, the merits of Christ never given to Adam, and he had no grace to fall from, for grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. Certainly he fell from his good behavior, that's all. Then my friend tells about Ezek. 33: 18, where if they sin and turn away from their righteousness, they die in their sins. I'll get to that in a minute with a thorough elaboration of the subject. Just a few things now, for I presuppose what he is going to say, and have careful answers already prepared and written out. Well, my friend Hardeman could not surprise me at anything he might say, for the simple reason that I know every argument of the Israelites forgetting God, he is speaking of them as a nation. If the nation forgets God, he forgets the nation, and casts them off. God deals with nations; God deals also with individuals. If he can find where anybody who was regenerated, born again, that forgot God, so as to be cast off, it would help him so much. Lest I forget, for I took no notes on it, my friend has proved to you from his viewpoint that nobody is ever saved in this life. For he tried to prove by the Greek word "Telos" that you would *finally quit believing* and get to heaven and be saved. There is no true salvation in this life. Incidentally no believer ever will be saved, you have got to quit believing and become an unbeliever, or else you can't get to heaven, for he says you are *saved right where you quit believing*. That's contradicting God's word. He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life. John 5: 24. Here is a man who tells you that you will never be saved and get to heaven, and you wouldn't be saved then unless you quit believing. The Greek word "Telos" sometimes does mean the termination. He said he has the lexicon—if he will look there, he will, also, find that it means "purpose" or "aim." Paul said to this "*end*" was I born. *I quit living before I was born*. Is that it? Certainly not. Born at the "*end*" of his life? Certainly not. Very well, the Greek word "Telos" is the word translated "*end*." If it means termination then Paul quit living at birth.

My friend said, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life," quoting the scripture. And what did he make of that? The *crown was the life*, he said. Then

from their own merits, and angels can fall now. I'd rather be the lowest down, meanest rake of the human race than to be the highest angel in heaven. I am well aware of the fact that this is going down in the book, and I want the world to read it. Why? Because an angel of heaven can fall from heaven into hell, because the blood of Christ was never shed for angels; he does not stand for them; he is not in any sense their substitute; but Jesus Christ does stand for me as a child of God, and if I were that low-down dirty rake, I could accept Jesus Christ and get into a position where I should never be lost, while angels are in danger of being lost every second of their existence. That popular idea that angels are good people who have died and gone to heaven is utterly contrary to the scripture for angels are to be our servants, as we read in Heb. 1: 14, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" I am taking up this now straight along from my friend, he is evidently getting nowhere, and I am determined these scriptures shall all be discussed, so you will have a clear understanding of them.

Coming to the case of King Saul—he brought up King Saul—and quoted where the Spirit of God was upon him. But I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll give him this fine Masonic ring that I have on here as a present, take it off and hand it to you right now, if you don't want to wear it you can sell it, if you will find where the Spirit was ever in King Saul. The Spirit was upon him in the same sense that the Spirit was upon Balaam's ass, that you brought up the other day—a miracle was wrought upon him. Again, he read where God gave him another heart. Well, I'll give you \$5.00 in addition to this ring if you will show where God gave him a *new heart*. Now if he didn't have the *new heart* and didn't have the *Spirit of God in him*, then how could he fall from grace? And even if my friend could prove that King Saul was a child of God, born again, saved, had eternal life in him, then I can prove that King Saul *went as crazy as a bat*. Why? Because no man in his right mind will commit suicide, and the "*evil spirit from God*" came and ran him crazy so that he did all kinds of wild things, punishment sent upon him because of his wickedness. Now, I'll prove

that to you. Hos. 13: 11, "I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath." He was put on Israel as a punishment, and so he was not God's child. Then again, my friend failed to bring up about David falling. This must be discussed. I am not going to let these scriptures go by undiscussed. I want that book we shall publish to be a standard authority, that the people can read years and years in the future, with all the scriptures discussed. If my friend won't bring them up, I will. He can do the best he can with it. David fell. Yes, David fell—he committed murder, 2 Sam. 12. The Bible says no murderer hath eternal life, 1 John 3: 15. Pretty bad case for my friend David, but David did not fall from grace, but fell from *the joy of salvation*. Why? Because when he prayed for forgiveness, Psalm 51: 11, 12, he did not say restore unto me my salvation, but "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation," and then he said, "Take not thy holy spirit from me." The Holy Spirit had not been taken from him. He was still a child of God. *Not a murderer at heart, but overcome by severe temptation*. Then again, my friend must remember that in 2 Sam. 12: 13, "And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said unto David, The Lord also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die." To those who think David fell from grace, here's a positive statement in God's word, that God put away his sins so he should not die.

What was his punishment? He was punished in the flesh for the sins of the flesh, 2 Sam. 12: 14, where God took his son away from him, and also where it said that the sword should not depart from his house while he lived. *A punishment in the flesh for the sins of the flesh*, and so it was David out of the richness of his experience who wrote Psalm 37: 23, 24, where it says, "The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord: and he delighteth in his way. Though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down." My friend says you could fall *away*, making a distinction on the "falling away," but this book says he shall never so fall as to be utterly cast down. Sweet singer in Israel, type of Christ, a man after God's own heart, who for one time sinned but did not fall from grace. Now coming to Ezekiel, eighteenth case my friend quoted, I'll state clearly that what

Ezekiel means. Ezekiel is speaking of capital punishment sent on men when they sin. Every one of the ten commandments had capital punishment, physical death, as a punishment for those physical sins, and that's brought out clearly in Ezek. 33: 1-11. Capital punishment, for instance, took a man out and killed him for picking up sticks on the Sabbath day; killed another for committing adultery; physical death always is what is referred to when you find punishment of that sort meted out here. Then again, it was a legal righteousness they stood in. Ezek. 18 says that if a man depart from his righteousness, he shall die in his sins. That says nothing about the righteousness of Christ imputed to us as we find in the New Testament. *I stand on the imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, and not on the merits of my own righteousness.*

By the way, let me bring out another thought, lest I forget, for I do not have it in my notes. According to my friend, nobody was ever born again, or become a new creature in Christ Jesus, until the day of Pentecost, for he declares the gospel was not preached until the day of Pentecost. They all lived back there by keeping the law; hence nobody could have fallen from grace in the sense of becoming unborn or ceasing to be a child of God; there was no such thing as that according to Hardeman until the New Testament came into force if Hardeman's doctrine be true. He tried to prove that very thing all day yesterday. Now he goes back there to the Old Testament and tries to prove those who were *standing in legal righteousness*—prove they fell from grace, when grace came by Jesus Christ. The man meets himself coming back, if you will pardon the expressive slang. He can't keep from contradicting himself. Now here's another that my friend failed to bring up. I am going right on with this discussion, and he can't sidetrack me by letting me fool along behind him, I am going to bring up these scriptures and he must put his construction on them, if I do have to lead; I love to lead. In fact I sometimes think I am much better in debate in the affirmative than in the negative, and if you are trying to force me into the lead, I'm taking all kinds of joy in doing so; for our purpose is not to whip one another. I didn't come here to crow over friend

you don't have any life here, for you only get it by being faithful to death, and get the life after a while at the end. Hence, nothing to fall from, he being the judge. No spiritual life now, none whatever; won't get it until you die and get to heaven, and the crown itself is the life. He illustrated it by the crown of thorns that Jesus had on his brow, that *was made of thorns*, and so the crown we will get finally will be life given to us at the end. Yet my friend has the temerity to stand up here and tell you that you could lose a thing that you haven't got, and won't get till you get to heaven. The whole thing reduces itself to this; be good, live right, maybe after a while, at the end of the faith, when you quit believing, become a non-believer, then you can get to heaven. That is ridiculous—I have never heard of it brought out in so ridiculous a manner before. Since the crown is the same thing as life, like the crown of thorns, then the crown of the king, King George's crown—the *crown is the king*, not something conferred on the king. The crown of life is something that you get as honor and glory in addition to the life. When you crown a king you don't make him king, but you *crown him because he is king*.

Then 2 Pet. 1: 10, "Make your calling and election sure." My friend said when the president was elected that he wanted to make sure of his election. That's fine. If I were elected judge or president, to the Supreme Court or anything, I'd want to make sure of it, make sure of the election that has already taken place. I don't have to wait until I make sure of it to be elected, but I make sure of it because I am elected. And I can be perfectly sure that I am elected. Why? Because he that "believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation." I am, therefore, elected and perfectly sure, if God's word is true. Now, since my friend made such a feeble effort, and it falls upon me, I will go right on and discuss this subject.

My friend forgot to say that angels fell. I want that in the book. If he's going to leave out most of these things, the way he started; and that being true, I must put them in. Angels did fall, but angels never were human beings. They were created spirits that stood on their own merits and fell

Hardeman; he didn't come here to crow over me, and gain a personal victory. That would be beneath the dignity of such men as we claim to be. But we bring out the arguments according to scripture for the enlightenment of the people. Now here is one that my friend generally quotes—I mean his people do—that the unclean spirit goes out of a man, and then returns, and the last state of that man is worse than the first, Matt. 12: 43. The unclean spirit goes out, not cast out, goes out voluntarily; he *returns to his own house*, for he called it my house; he regards it as his property all the time. He takes with him seven other spirits more wicked than himself. Then this unclean spirit was one of the demons under the devil that has possession of men, and he came back and found *his house* “empty, swept, and garnished.” Now if that man had been saved, he would have been filled with the Spirit of God and he wouldn't have come back and found the house empty, because a child of God is not empty, but filled with the Spirit; so the house belonged to the devil all the time and he temporarily left him as men who reform—like the reformed drunkard, and the reformed gambler, clean up for the time being, get out from under the power of the devil for the time being, and then go right back to their old habits again. So that scripture is disposed of in advance.

My friend and his people usually bring up Judas Iscariot as having fallen. Now, Mark 3: 19, Judas was one of the apostles, and Judas betrayed him. Judas the brother of James, Judas Iscariot, also the traitor, Luke 6: 16. He had a part in the ministry, Acts 1: 15-17. And David said of that wicked man, Psalm 109: 6-8, “Set thou a wicked man over him: and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned: and let his prayer become sin. Let his days be few; and let another take his office.” David foretold that a wicked man would be put by the side of the Lord for a purpose, and then let another one take his office. Now Jesus called Judas “the son of perdition” in John 17: 12; and Peter said, in Acts 1: 25, that “he might go to his own place.” Where is the place for a son of perdition? It's in hell. Matt. 25: “These shall go away into

everlasting punishment" "prepared for the devil and his angels." And Jesus said the "scriptures must be fulfilled." Hence, Judas, a wicked man, was chosen, John 17: 12; and he did not choose a regenerated man for that purpose, but a devil. In John 6: 64 it says Jesus "knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him." He couldn't have known a thing that wasn't so, and if Judas hadn't been an unbeliever all the way along, he couldn't have known it to be so. From the beginning he knew that Judas was a non-believer. Hence, he did not fall from grace.

Now here is one my friend did bring up—about the olive branches being broken off, the Jews, Israelites, in the wilderness, and all that. Now let me call your attention to this: "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit." John 15. Now notice. There is the vine and the branch. There are two sorts of professed Christians—the real and the nominal. The *professors*, and the *possessors*—you can't tell the difference by looking at them, for some of them camouflage so completely they seem to be in the Lord. The nominal semblance of being in the vine, nominally; but "*every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it,*" it bringeth forth more fruit. Now every child of God, at the beginning, undoubtedly brings forth fruit. Why? Because love is the fruit of the Spirit, and so when one loves, there is fruit; and so every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, and it brings forth more fruit. So, no fruit-bearing branch was cut off. By the way, let me say incidentally that if the vine and the branch being cut off because it didn't bear fruit proves falling from grace, then I am going to say that Jesus Christ was to blame for their falling from grace. Why? Because the branch beareth fruit just as the vine furnished it power to bear fruit and the branch is not in there by its own option; the branch didn't come into the vine by its own choosing; but it was forced upon it, and it bears fruit because it is forced to do so, and if it quits bearing fruit, it is simply because there comes into it some-

thing that itself is not responsible for. So that being the picture, a child of God, who is in Christ, if he quits bearing fruit, Jesus Christ himself would be to blame, and that will make Jesus Christ the author of the apostasy or falling from grace for everyone who does fall.

Now Israelites being lost in the wilderness—he brought that up—and I am coming to that now, because I want to answer it with 1 Cor. 10: 5, where they fell in the wilderness and twenty-three thousand of them fell at one time. He spoke of that man and woman committing adultery, both of them being killed, and he *seems to presume, as all his brethren do, that every Jew, every Israelite, was a regenerated child of God, and yet denies that there was such a thing back there at that time.* But on the presumption that each and everyone of them was a child of God, he presumed that if any of them fell, then they must have been children of God. Didn't Jesus stand before the Jew, Nicodemus, in the third chapter of John, and tell that Jew, one of God's chosen people, that he, Nicodemus, must be born again, and didn't John the Baptist say to those Jews that the "ax is laid unto the root of the tree: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down," and "think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Each individual Jew had to be saved just like we do; and the plan of salvation has been the same all through the ages, but the Jews as a nation were called God's people, and as a nation they were called holy; as a nation they fell away; but the *individual saved Jew in that nation did not.* I will give you a sample. When the Israelites were in bondage in the Babylonian captivity, the *nation as such had fallen away;* the nation as such had gone down; and the nation as such was in bondage; but there were Daniel and Ezekiel, individuals, who had not fallen away, personally and individually. Now let me show you who did actually fall in the wilderness. Heb. 4: 2, "For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it"; and then Heb. 3: 10, "Wherefore I was grieved with that genera-

tion, and said, They do always err in their heart; and they have not known my ways." My friend presumed that they had all known the way of the Lord, and fell away from it; but here it says that those who fell had not believed. They did in a general way believe there was a God, the nation as such, but the individuals who fell were not believers. None but wicked idolaters, who had never accepted Jesus Christ as their Savior, looking forward to him as we look back to him—none fell but them, and since they were unbelievers they had never been born again and hence could not have lost it.

Now the Jews, the broken off olive branch, Rom. 11: 20: "Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear." What does the olive branch there mean? It means favor. The Jews as a nation had the favor of God; the Jews as a nation lost the favor of God; the Gentiles got the favor of God and we have it today. The lowest down rake in creation has a special favor of God. Now the Jews as a nation are cast off, and the Jews were cut off from the favor of God—that special national favor—the Gentiles have been grafted in as a whole. And so the Gentiles now have the special favor of God, but no real child of God will be lost. So Rom. 11: 2 says no real Jew has been cast off, no one who is a Jew at heart. I read, "I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying" and so on, and Rom. 11: 11-15, "I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office: if by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them."

THE POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Affirmative*, Second Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad to review some things that have been presented for your consideration. Dr. Bogard has astonished me in his first address. It seems that he had written out his entire negative speech, not knowing precisely what the affirmative speaker would say. He could have read that just as well as if I had never made a speech at all; but his apology was that I gave him nothing. Now, of course, that needs no comment from a people who have listened. There are twenty passages of scripture read in my first speech to which no reference whatever was made. He came to talk about Adam not standing upon the merit of Christ—and nobody claimed that he did. I said he was God's child by creation; but I made the parallel, 2 Cor. 11: 3, where Paul said now as Adam physically fell, I fear for you brethren, lest ye also fall. But there wasn't anything there for him. He never mentioned 2 Cor. 11: 3. Dr. Bogard, you are slipping; you are going to prove a case of apostasy if you don't mind. You are not up to yourself. There was Adam, God's child by creation, all right. Now in the New Testament, unto Christians regenerated, Paul said, I fear that just as Adam's mind was corrupted by the seductions of the devil even so yours may be defiled and corrupted. The parallel continues from the physical to the spiritual. But with that boast of acquaintance of affairs, Dr. Bogard says, "I knew every argument that Hardeman would make and I know all his people make." I don't doubt that a bit in the world. Any man who has had the number of debates that Bogard has certainly knows them! But, brethren, did you ever think that such would work both ways? I know every argument that he'll make, but it wouldn't be debating for me just to write out what he might say about things, and never pay any attention to what he really said.

So, this is really not a debate. I made a number of arguments. Dr. Bogard sets them aside and reads from an old manuscript written, perhaps, long before. I believe that's the first time that I ever saw a respondent write out

his speech in advance. Let me say plainly that such is not my conception of debating. I can say to you truly, I came here without one single thing written other than some notes; I prepared no manuscript. I intended to examine what Dr. Bogard had to say, and not turn to things that never were introduced. Well, it's a confession of this kind: "Hardeman, I confess myself unable to meet what you presented, but what are you going to do with this?" Now the negative's part in a discussion is to notice what is presented. He made only a shadow of a show, saying that "Hardeman teaches we are not saved in this life." Well, Hardeman teaches no such thing. When a man believes and obeys the gospel of God's Son, his sins are remitted, and he stands saved, justified in God's sight; but that's salvation from sin, not in heaven, and the ultimate salvation in heaven will come at the end of the journey, when he has lived a life of faith here and comes to the end of it—that will be the eternal salvation promised throughout the entire Bible.

Well, he says that he wants to make his calling and election sure. Now according to Dr. Bogard, there isn't any effort on the part of a Christian. The very minute that he is elected, the thing's already made sure. Why on God's earth the admonition? If, at the very time you are elected, then the thing is certain and can't be disturbed in any way—what's the sense in saying then to the fellow elected, "Make your calling and election sure." Now he missed my point as usual. Roosevelt was elected in November. Does that guarantee that he is going to be president on January 1? No, sir. Is it possible for him to violate the constitution of the United States between November and January, and forfeit the possibility of becoming president actually? Of course, it is. But he is elected in November. Now, Mr. Roosevelt, you live in harmony with the laws of this government. Let your conduct be commensurate with American ideals and conceptions, and you will be inaugurated, and become *really president*. So, a Christian is elected here, but he has to live in harmony with God's law and heaven's constitution until death—and then what? That election back yonder, when he obeyed the gospel of Christ, will be made

sure when he is inaugurated into the golden glories of our father's home across which the shadows never come. Friends, that's it.

But, he got to discussing angels. I suppose he thought he could make a better job of that than he could of human beings. Hence, he turned wholly aside from anything that had been said, and brought up another thing, as much as to say, "Hardeman, I'll tell you, I've got a case here that I believe that I can handle better than I can what you said, and so I am just ignoring yours and turning to the other." Now he offered me his Masonic ring—well, God knows I don't want a Masonic ring, nor any other kind of a ring—if I would show that the Spirit of God was in Saul. Well, I do wonder about that! Dr. Bogard, I am calling your attention to Acts tenth chapter, on Cornelius. You said that Cornelius was a child of God because of the Spirit. Well, what's the point about King Saul? The Spirit came upon him, therefore, it wasn't in him. Well, let's see how it was in Cornelius' case. "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them." I wonder if you can see that, and meet yourself coming back? And then again, "But Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by *order*." Peter said, "As I *began* to speak, the Holy Ghost fell *on* them." But he said that didn't make Saul a child of God. What about the fellow that can't receive the Holy Spirit, Dr. Bogard? What about old Caiaphas? The Spirit of God was upon him! It didn't say *in him*. Well, I don't know what will happen to me when I pass threescore and ten, but I just hope and pray that I won't lose my power of discrimination, of logic and of analysis, and make such blunders as my friend has made this morning. Such may come to pass, but not now.

He is so anxious to get things in the book! I hate to say some things, but truth demands it. If Dr. Bogard had had the same anxiety about books back yonder when he wrote all these others, he wouldn't have to revise them as he has been doing. Just "look at what he has gone and went and done," as somebody put it. He wrote a book, and I have called his attention to it. He then says, "Hardeman, I am going to take that out. I see where that is wrong." Well, all right. He wrote a Waybook. I called attention to it.

"Well, he wrote another one." All right. He wrote the McPherson Debate, and last night he said, "I am going to revise that." And now, he is extremely anxious about what is going in this book. I don't blame you because (I quote from Dr. Bogard), "When a man has a debate with one fellow, he ought to be mighty careful, because when he has a debate with somebody else, he'll contradict himself." Thou art the man! And I don't blame him for being careful about books. Brethren, let me tell you, this debate has done wonderful good! You who meet Ben M. Bogard hereafter are not going to be bothered on Mark 16 about its being spurious. That's all settled. You are not going to be bothered about "at hand." He said, "If I said that, I want to take it back." Well, he said it all right, and I am perfectly willing for him to take it back. You won't be bothered with the McPherson book, he'll bring out another appendix; but it will also need an operation. And so much for talking about revising the books and of his anxiety about what goes in this one.

Now, the astonishing thing: he said, "Hardeman, all the punishment back yonder to Israel was a physical affair." Of course it was. They were God's people in Egypt, led out of that, and on their way to a physical land, Palestine or Canaan—it was theirs! But that was used in the Bible to illustrate and to demonstrate our spiritual relation—and now the point: Just as the physical with the Israelites, God's people in the flesh, so is the punishment with God's people in the spirit; and so he missed the entire application of that thing. Well, let's note again: what he said regarding John fifteenth chapter is quite unfortunate, but I can see how a man will be forced to do lots of things. "I am the true vine, ye are the branches." Every branch that is in me *really* will bear fruit, but every branch that is in me *nominally* will not bear fruit. Dr. Bogard, the Bible says something about a man's adding to God's word, and I'd be mighty careful—you haven't got many years yet to live upon this earth, at best. And now then, to offer such a criticism—hear it! Every branch in me—i-n, in; m-e, me—that wasn't a water sprout, that wasn't a sucker, that wasn't *nominally* in him, but is *in* him! Look again, verse six, "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch." Well, is the branch

really in the body? Of course. Are these really in Christ? That's what the Book said about it. Now where on God's earth did he get the idea that "every branch in me that bears fruit, that one is sure enough in, and every one that bears not fruit—that one wasn't in"? I'll tell you, friends. A doctrine that forces such suggestions is unworthy of acceptance by people who love the Book of God Almighty. So enough for that.

Now then, Rom. 11; and he tells us in that the Jews were specially favored, and that is what the branches mean. I wonder if they are just nominal, or were they really in Christ? Well, because of unbelief they were broken off. Where were they? Where were the Jews? In Christ! They were broken off! Why? Because they wouldn't believe, but thou standest by faith. "Be not highminded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches"—where were they? In the main trunk. "If God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee!" "Behold therefore . . . the goodness and severity of God!" Two things, now here they are: *goodness* and *severity*. *Severity* upon them that fell, but *goodness* on you if you continue in his goodness; otherwise, then you'll be just like these—receive severity. That's the statement of God's word, and there isn't any sense in trying to say something else about it. But right back to that eleventh chapter again, and the last argument that Dr. Bogard made respecting it. I must call attention to it. First verse: "I say then, Hath God cast away his people?" No. "I also am an Israelite." Now, Paul said they are not all cast aside—I am one of them myself. Are there not 7,000 of them reserved as a remnant? That is in verses four and five. Even so then at the present time there is a remnant!—according to the election of grace. No, God hasn't cast aside all of them; he had all those that were unfaithful. He won't cast aside everybody now. I am persuaded to think some will be faithful until the judgment. They will not be cast aside, but there are numbers and numbers to whom he will say: "Depart from me, I know you not." And there will be others to whom he'll say, "I never knew you: depart from me." And then a third class to whom he will say, "Come." Can't you see that? At the judgment,

three classes. "Come, ye blessed of my Father." Who's that? Faithful children of God. "I never knew you: depart from me." Who's that? The vile sinner that never made any pretension. Now, look at the third, "Depart from me, I know you not." I once knew you, but I know you not now! That's it. That's not nearly it, but *it*, brethren.

In Rom. 8: 13, I am reading, "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die." Now let's have that simple statement; that's talking to brethren. Well, how do I know? That can't mean physical death because you are going to die physically no matter how you live. Well, it can't refer to the sinner, because he is already dead. Then, to whom does it apply? Brethren! If you *brethren* live after the flesh. What do you mean by that? After the gratification of the flesh. If you do not bring your body under, and keep it in subjection; if you live after the flesh—what about it? You shall die! Now suppose that you say, "Physically." Why we would say, "Paul, we'll die that way whether we live after the flesh or live after the spirit." That's silly. What do you mean by it then? "I am talking about brethren in Christ Jesus, and it's up to you to know how to live. If you live after the flesh, you shall die." Therefore, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." Ezek. 18: 20. And thus we have statements along that line. Now, I am calling attention to another idea—and to the very crux of the whole affair. Dr. Bogard's doctrine, and that of the Missionary Baptist Church, is old Calvinism boiled down; and, ladies and gentlemen, it really is this: That a sinner can do nothing under heaven to save himself. Dr. Bogard has said that it takes a miracle just as it did to change the Ethiopian's skin. Nothing but a miracle! Well, the sinner can't do anything. All right then, after he becomes God's child, neither can he do anything to be lost. Now, just see the antithesis. There is the sinner—can't do anything on God's earth to be saved. There is the Christian—can't do a thing under heaven that will cause him to be lost. That's old-time Calvinism, and yet the Bible says that, at the judgment, God will "render to every man according to his deeds." Rom. 2: 6. Now just get that. If God is going to render to every man according to his deeds, don't you see that he puts the responsibility back on man? "We

must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Again, "He that soweth to his flesh"—now watch—"He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Now what is the order? First, sowing; second, reaping. Dr. Bogard's doctrine is: first, you reap eternal life, really; and then afterwards, sow. That's the reverse of the natural order; that's the reverse of God's word. It's first *sowing* and then *reaping*; and "not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not."

Now, what did Dr. Bogard say when I suggested that the final analysis of this whole matter was or is as to whether or not a child of God who believes in him can quit believing? That's the issue. It's not a question of apostasy in the general sense, but I want to bring it down. I have already suggested it to him—he does not believe more strongly than do I that a faithful child of God cannot be lost. It's impossible. But I maintain that a faithful child of God may have his faith overthrown. I have called attention to that. Not a word has he said about it—and yet he said that "Hardeman didn't give me anything to do." "I will continue to read from my old scrapbook." Faith can be made shipwreck of! You never heard a word about that. Some depart from the faith—not a word! That's the issue as we have it for discussion this morning. That takes care of his speech. 2 Cor. 11: 3, unnoticed; 1 Chron. 28: 9, "Forsake him, he will cast thee off for ever," not noticed; twenty other passages, all those about forgetting God; Jer. 23: 39, where God said, "I will forsake you"; not noticed. Heb. 4: 11, "Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief"; not noticed! But, "he gave me nothing to do, and I read something I had prepared quite a while ago." That old scrapbook from which he is reading is old enough to have graduated from high school. He ought, therefore, as a negative speaker to take up every scripture presented. I think I have done that in the preceding discussions. It has been my intention first of all to show that the passage to which reference is made does not

teach what he claims, and having answered that, then to file objections otherwise along that line. But that my good friend has not done in his speech this morning.

Now let me call attention to another matter, a presentation of the facts. I am reading this time from Psalm 106. Here are God's people, talking about their deliverance from bondage, verse twelve: "Then believed they his words,"—now watch, here are God's people and verse twelve says, "Then believed they his words"; they soon forgot his words; they forgot God, they forgot his works, which he had done for them. "Yea, they despised the pleasant land, they believed not his word: but murmured in their tents. . . . Therefore he lifted up his hand against them, to overthrow them in the wilderness." Well, what do you have there? Just a moment, verse twelve suggests—look at it—"believe they his words." I put it on the board. That's God's children—then the next statement is "they believed not his word." Now, I just want to ask what became of them? The Bible said that God overthrew them, and there is a case where they first believed God's word and later on, they did not believe it! Now then, so long as they believe his word and live accordingly, there is nothing that can damn them in hell; but when they believe not his word, then the Bible tells their destiny: "therefore he lifted up his hand against them, to overthrow them!" Brethren, take heed. These things happened unto them for our examples; they are written for our admonition; and if God spared not them, neither will he spare us. That's Paul's argument, and there's no answer possible.

I am calling attention now to the argument based upon Hebrews six and I bid you take notice of just what is said in this connection. "For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, made partakers of the Holy Spirit, tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and *then fell away*, it is impossible to renew them again to repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the son of God afresh and put him to an open shame." Now then, let's enumerate some matters. They were *once enlightened*. Now the tenth chapter of Hebrews tells this exactly, which I read; verse 32, "But call to re-

membrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated." What about you Christians, you Hebrews? You who were once illuminated by the rays of gospel life. Hence, you were once enlightened; second, you tasted of the heavenly gift—what is the word for "taste"? The same as you have in Heb. 2: 9, "Should *taste* death for every man." Now what have these done? Tasted of the heavenly gift. They were made partakers of the Holy Spirit. Well, what does the word partake mean? They were made sharers of it. To partake of a thing means to share in it; therefore, God's sons. They tasted the good word of God, and there is the word "taste" again, and power in the world to come, and *then fell away*. Now who were these folks? They were those that were one time Christians, who had experienced all the joy that comes from knowledge of salvation from sin and relationship with Jesus Christ. But after all that, they *then fell away*. I know that in King James we have the word "if," but that's not in the original text. That was added by old Theodore Beza, a student, by the way, of Calvin himself. But the "if" is not there. The Revised Version has it "and then fell away." But again, here is a Bible—a Baptist translation, gotten out and approved by the Baptist Church, and declared by them to be the best that had thus far been put out, and it says, "having fallen away." Then what?—you Baptist translators and real scholars—"it is impossible to renew them." To renew whom? Those of you that once tasted of the heavenly gift, that shared in the Holy Spirit, and that have tasted the good word of God, the powers to come, and what happened? And *then fell away!* Now then, what do you scholars say? "It's impossible to renew them." Well, there is the case made out. Now you take another translation from a prominent Baptist, Dr. Williams, to whom attention has already been called. Listen, let me read from him. "For it is impossible for those who have once for all been enlightened, and have experienced the gift from heaven, who have been made sharers of the Holy Spirit, and have experienced how God's message is, and the mighty power of the age to come, and then have fallen by the wayside, it is impossible to renew them." Brethren, that settles it.

What's the use of arguing a matter of that kind when God's word thus declares that there were those who at one time experienced all the joy, and *then fell away*?

I commented upon the difference between fall and fall away. The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord, and he may fall. Well, what about it? It's possible for him to get up again, but fall away—the word “away” severs connection. I have ridden on steamboats and have walked the decks, the promenade; then I have been out upon a ship, out of sight of land, and have walked the promenades again. You can fall, but it is possible to get up, but you fall away—that cuts you loose from the ship and you are hopeless, helpless and hapless in that unfortunate condition. What about these folks? They were one time children of God, they had all the experience, enlightenment, showers of the Holy Ghost—were partakers of it, tasted of the good word of God, the powers of the world to come, and then what? After all of that, *they fell away!* Now what about it? It's impossible to renew them again unto repentance. But let me anticipate. Suppose someone were to ask me then, “Why is it that you ask the backslider to come, and to re-dedicate himself?” Well, now let me answer. So long as a man has faith in Christ, and has not denied the same, though he err, he may confess that fault and be forgiven. But, “if a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch,” now watch, “and is withered.” Oh, you sometimes take a branch off a vine, and set it out and it will grow again, but you take it off and let it wither! There is a dead thing as sure as you live. That's what Paul means and Christ meant—it is impossible to renew him! When a man reaches that downward point where his conscience becomes seared as with a hot iron, and all sensibility has been deadened—get it!—it is impossible for the golden rays of God's eternal truth to penetrate and to make any kind of impression upon it. He has fallen away! He is withered! It is a hopeless case, and you need not preach the gospel, because it is impossible. Friends, if I ever reach the point, which I pray God I may not, that I am willing to stand out with Jesus Christ before me and nail him to a cruel cross—if I were there to drive the nails and feel toward him as did those

about him, having tasted the good word, with the influence of the Spirit, it would be impossible to renew me unto repentance! The gospel is God's power unto salvation, and, therefore, independent of that power, there is no hope of the salvation of a man. If it loses its power over me so that I could willingly crucify my Savior, I am hopelessly doomed. Thank you once again.

THE POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

BEN M. BOGARD, *Negative*, Second Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I now come to review the speech my good friend has just made, and take much pleasure in it; but I can hardly hold myself to express what ought to be said. He said he was glad that this part of the debate was not being broadcast. I wish it were broadcast. I want it broadcast. It is going down in the book. I am proud of the work being done here; I want the world to hear it. My friend asks, "Why did you bring up the things that I didn't speak of?" For the very same reason that you brought up things that I said thirty-six years ago, that I didn't speak of in this debate at all. My friend went back to the Borden-Bogard Debate, years ago, and dug up a statement that I made then, and tried to answer them instead of answering what I said in this debate. Now he complains because I bring up some things that he did not say in the affirmative speech. Sauce that is good for the goose is good for the gander. He goes on to say that I intended or would revise that book that I wrote thirty-six years ago. I'll do no such a thing, and never did I say any such thing. That's the Borden-Bogard Debate, taken in shorthand, and I couldn't revise it if I tried. I said nothing about revising it, neither did I say I didn't believe what is in the Borden-Bogard Debate. I refuse to discuss that debate because it should not be brought up in this debate. I haven't taken back anything I said. I don't aim to, but *I want you to meet what I say in this debate. What is commonly preached among you and your brethren, I am answering.* I am not digging up any of the statements you made long ago, but what is commonly preached now, and

it shall be done throughout this debate. He said "Why did I bring up about angels?" And in a slurring sort of way, sarcastic, he said, "I suppose you think that you could do better with them than you could with human beings." Thank you for *conceding that angels are not human beings and never were human beings*; then I hope your brethren will stop preaching that we can fall because angels fell. We have gained that much. It is commonly preached that way but my friend concedes that they are not human beings; they never had the grace of God, and; hence, could not have fallen from it. Here is the benefit of this kind of debate, especially when it goes to record. I am going to take every single prop out from under him and his people, and the doctrine they preach *whether he brings it up or not*.

Now he complains that I did not reply to twenty different passages that he used. Now listen, those twenty passages that he used were about Israel forgetting God, and he multiplied those passages. I can give you about twenty more along the same line about Israel forgetting God, and we can make it forty instead of twenty. I answered what you said by saying that all the passages referred to national Israel, and not to any individual child of God. I illustrated it by Daniel and Ezekiel—when the nation had forgotten God, they as individuals were still true to God. This is national Israel forgetting, and God's *dealing with national Israel* is one thing, and *dealing with individuals as children of God* is another thing. So why should I take up one passage behind the other when they are all saying the same thing? I can make it twenty more and have forty of them. The marvel to me is that you didn't introduce about forty and then say I didn't answer. That's a psychological trick unworthy of my friend that won't work, and the people who read the debate will see I did answer every one of them, showing what was meant by those scriptures when it speaks of the Israelites forgetting God.

Now comes my friend and acknowledges that we don't get salvation in this life. *-We only get a chance for it.* Hence, nobody can fall from salvation. He said the Greek word "Telos" means the termination, so we have got to get to be an unbeliever before we ever get to heaven. Sure,

proceeding to the end of your faith. Whenever you get to where you can quit believing. Then, you get salvation. That's what he said. My book says, "He that believeth hath everlasting life." What did he say in reply to my scriptural reply to him on that point? "How to make our calling and election sure." He said, "Couldn't Roosevelt have done something that would have kept him from becoming president even after he was elected?" He certainly could. That is purely a human matter, but when we are elected by the Almighty God and kept by his power, it doesn't depend on what we do, and right here, let me call your attention to the fact, and I am going to rub that in on him in a short time, if not in this speech, then in my next one, that this *whole thing of falling from grace depends upon the doctrine of salvation by works*, and the Bible says flatly that there is no such thing as salvation by works.

The *Spirit in Saul!* Well, well, well! I asked him if Saul received the Spirit in his heart, if he was *filled with the Spirit*, and he tried to answer that by quoting Acts 10, where the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word in the case of Cornelius. That has no earthly reference to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Why? Because Cornelius received the miraculous baptism of the Holy Ghost, and it had no earthly reference to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The apostles had the Holy Spirit, spoke by the Holy Spirit, yet in addition to that, they had the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which came upon them on the day of Pentecost. My friend and his people know absolutely nothing about the Spirit, and when you go to talking about the Spirit, they get all mixed up. Again, I offer you a reward to show where the Spirit entered the heart of Saul. The Spirit merely came upon him. Cornelius was already saved and got the baptism of the Holy Ghost to prove he was saved. Do you mean to say that King Saul got the baptism of the Holy Ghost? Well, now, if you say that, you will make yourself ridiculous in the eyes of your own brethren. They will laugh in your face. You don't dare say that Saul got the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Then, why come over there to where one did get the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and palm that off as a parallel case? Again, I ask

you to show where King Saul got a new heart. He only got "another" heart, not a heart made over, not a renewed heart by the Holy Spirit.

Now, my friend said that Bogard had to revise all of his books. If I'd do like Hardeman—never write any books, I would not have to revise them. What has he put out anyhow? I have put out something like thirty books, and if I should find an error in one, I'd certainly revise it, for I don't want any error to go out from my pen. Any man that is worth his salt would revise it when he found an error, and to say you'll never revise anything means that you think you are infallible to start with. That's funny to some of his brethren to think that a man would have to revise some statement that he made in a book that he wrote thirty-six years ago, and I never said that I was going to revise that book to start with—the one he referred to. He said Bogard said he was going to revise the debate with Aimee McPherson. I never said it awake or asleep, drunk or sober, and you won't find it in the record. Hardeman said it! I am standing by every single, solitary word said in the Aimee McPherson Debate without any revision, but in the case I should find an error, I'll be man enough to correct it. The man who is not man enough to correct his error ought not to preach, and my friend said that he is not man enough to correct an error when he makes it. He stands up here and says that he wouldn't revise anything, never, never. I am surprised at him making such a confession.

He comes on and says that Bogard said in one debate that Mark 16: 16 was spurious; in another debate he said that it wasn't; in another debate he said that it was; another debate he said that it wasn't; "in again, on again, off again, Flannigan," and they thought that was mighty funny. (Sounds from the audience, Ed.) *I have never yet said that Mark 16: 16 was a part of the word of God.* But, when I meet a fellow like you who thinks it is, then bless your soul, I will meet you on your own grounds. And I called your attention to the fact that the footnote in your Revised Version, your 148 revisers, says it is no part of the original manuscript. I didn't say it—not Bogard saying it; I am merely quoting the scholars that you used yourself, and you

say that I am wrong because I don't go by them. Then, what are you if you don't go by them? Very well, what he wanted to do was to get me into some kind of a controversy over whether this or that scripture was spurious or not spurious, and let the folks forget the issue. You have been unsuccessful in getting me into it, and you never will, for I can defeat you on any part of the ground. Your good confession (Acts 8: 37), Alexander Campbell, father of your church, said that it was no part of the original—"I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Acts 8: 37—Alexander Campbell says that; but I haven't said it, and I am just quoting it. *You pin your faith to scriptures that the best scholars in the world say are doubtful, and want to interpret all the other scriptures by those scriptures that the scholars say are doubtful. Scholars say, not Bogard, for I don't profess to be a scholar—that Mark 16: 16 is no part of the original scripture. Scholars say that your good confession, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," is no part of the original scripture, and Alexander Campbell himself said so and left it out of the version of New Testament that Campbell published. But I haven't said it—you take those scriptures that scholars say are doubtful, no part of the original, and pin your faith to them, and try to interpret all the rest of the word of God by that!*

Now, take up the next, for I want to take up everything my friend said, and go on, for I have got to lead, he won't. I have got to take the lead all the way through this debate—I see that now. (Laughs.) And you will laugh on the other side of your mouth when you see me do it, and see how far behind he is in the last speech this afternoon. "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" he uses. Listen, he makes the crown and the life the same thing, so when you crown a king the crown and the king are the same thing. What did he say in reply?—he is a wonderful fellow to reply. What did he say in reply? Nothing. He says that Bogard takes the Hardshell position—that in salvation is a miracle wrought. Bogard takes no such position. I explained that to you day before yesterday, and you failed to notice it. *That the work of regeneration, or the new birth, is the ordinary and regular work of God.*

The "beginning of miracles" was when Jesus turned the water into the wine—Jesus said so himself—I wonder if nobody was born again before Jesus turned the water into wine? That's the first miracle! I wonder if nobody is born again until then? The new birth is the ordinary work of God, like *holding the sun in the heavens as he courses through the skies*, as we say. That would be called a miracle, if you are going to say that it takes a divine power to do it, but that's the ordinary work of God. The earth wheeling around the sun once every 365 days is the mighty power of God. But no miracle, it's *the regular work that God does*. Miracles that I am talking about having been done away that you *strangely and stupidly refused to notice* is the *power to work miracles by men, the gift of miracles*. That's what I was debating in the Aimee McPherson Debate, and that was done away, and no one can do miracles now.

God renders to every man according to his deeds or his works, and my opponent claims from this that salvation comes according to works, but Tit. 3: 5 says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." He tells you that you are going to sow, then reap, and the reaping he says is salvation. Then, bless your soul, I have got to sow the seed, and I have got to cultivate the seed, and I have got to reap my own salvation! Leave God entirely out of it. First sowing and then reaping, he says. Yes, sir, in the Christian life we sow, and we reap the fruits of our efforts, not salvation, for salvation is a gift of God. In Rom. 6: 23, "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord," and yet he tells you it is reaping what you have sown.

Can't a man quit believing and then depart from the faith? To depart from the faith means to depart from that *system of doctrine* called "*the faith*." Depart from the doctrine, become heretical; and many a man has done that and still maintained his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Then he comes to those Israelites that believed. *They believed God's word*, but they didn't *believe*. They believed *what God said*, but believing what God said does not cause the salvation of the soul. You can *believe every word in the*

Bible, and die, and go to hell, and after you are in hell keep on believing every word in the Bible. But *believing the words of the Bible* or the words of God is one thing, and *believing in Jesus Christ* is quite another. The devil believes and trembles, but whenever you believe to the saving of the soul that means that you have *trusted the Lord*. The word faith is used in that sense, *trust in a person*, Jesus Christ.

I want to ask my friend a question and it won't be answered during this debate. If a man falls from grace, *will he be a lost believer or a lost unbeliever?* I will throw that out, let it go into the record. Will he be a believer lost or an unbeliever lost? He will never answer that question, mark my word. Coming now to the vine and the branches. Matthew Henry's rendering of that, great scholar that he was, a reputable commentator, says, "Every branch that *bearth fruit in me* is the correct rendering." Not every branch in me that bears fruit, but every branch that *bearth fruit in me*, he purgeth it, and bringeth forth more fruit. My friend, with sarcasm (unworthy of him), said, "Why, Bogard says some are in and some are not in." Bogard has never said it. There are two ways to be in. One in *reality* and the other *nominally*. You can be in the church in name only or in it in reality. Now, so far as the world can see, they can't tell the difference. How are you going to tell the difference? By fruit bearing. Every branch that bringeth forth fruit, he purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit—and what did he do with my statement. He can't deny it—whenever you are a child of God, *you at least have the fruit of love*. So then, every branch that loves brings forth more fruit. Now then, those that never brought any fruit will be the ones that he will cut off. There never was such a one that did not bear fruit. When he became a child of God, the very first fruit is love. That's the start-off to every branch that loves. He purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit. What did he say about my statement—if that be true that a man is cut off by unbelief like those branches cut off because they didn't bear fruit, then Jesus Christ would be responsible for their damnation, for they only bear fruit as they are forced to do so by the vine. When the

vine falls down on the job, and the branch quits bearing fruit—then who's to blame, the branch or the vine? His position makes Jesus Christ the author of apostasy for everyone who falls from grace.

Those Hebrews—what about them? It says plainly that no part of them was lost except the Hebrews who knew not his ways—"Wherefore I was grieved with that generation, and said, They do alway err in their heart; and they have not known my ways." Who? The ones who fell. My friend says that they *did* know his ways. God Almighty says they *had never known his ways*. Well, what do you mean by falling then? They simply fell physically in the wilderness. That's a physical matter, and the 23,000 who went down were among those who had never known his ways. It says so, and "they have not known my ways." My friend says they did know his ways and fell from grace. How about the olive branches? The olive branch there is the Jewish nation. We are agreed on that, as a nation. And the wild olive branch are the Gentiles. The Jews cut off as a nation, and the Gentiles grafted in as a nation. Every Jew was a part of that olive tree, and every Gentile, the lowest down wretch, the worst murderer, and thief, and liar, every one of the Gentiles is grafted in. Why? The whole Gentile race was grafted. Into what? Into the favor of God when he offered them special blessings. Jews have no special blessing now for they were cut off from that special favor. Now the Gentiles have the special blessings as they have been grafted into that special favor. He tries to make that to be apostasy. What reply does he make of that? I gave it a while ago, but he was silent on it.

Now, coming to the scripture in Heb. 6: 4-6: Impossible for those who once tasted of the grace of God, once were partakers of the grace of God, and being enlightened, and partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, if they fell away or being then fallen away—the aorist; my friend ought to know about what the aorist is—if he doesn't know any more than to say "come over to our school and we will *learn* you," while criticizing my grammar—but he knows what the aorist is. The aorist is static; it doesn't refer to the future or the past or the present—it's

static. It expresses completed action in any tense. What about it? Impossible to renew them again unto repentance. Let me read to you in the ninth verse, "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak." In other words, I have made a suppositional case, and that suppositional case is "if you fall away," he won't deny that is subjunctive mode, a mode of doubt; if they fall away, it is impossible to renew them again. Very well, if the supposition is made, he says it is possible that it might be. Then all right, let's see; 1 Cor. 15: 12-20: If Christ be not risen from the dead, then our preaching is in vain, our hope is vain. Is it possible that Christ is not risen from the dead? No. There were some who thought Christ had not risen from the dead, taking you at your word; if you fall away, it is impossible to renew you; if Christ be not risen, if you fall away, same sort of expression—there is no more doubt about one than the other. Now those who thought Christ had not risen, he took them at their word and said there's nothing in salvation for you if Christ has not risen. There are some of you who think you can fall away and then come back. Paul said if you do, you couldn't be renewed again. But beloved, lest somebody like Professor Hardeman would think that it might be, he said, "We are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak."

Coming to Heb. 10: 26 that my friend got into. "If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." What does that mean? If a child of God sins willfully, and we all do—everybody sins willfully—every child of God does. What happens? Christ is not going to die any more for you; he died once for all. He will never die again. What will happen to you then? There will be a certain fearful looking for a judgment such as comes to a child of God, the fire of indignation that should devour the adversary—not devour you—but devour the adversary. Who is the adversary? The devil. So, *instead of God sending you to hell, he'll whip hell out of you.* And that brings me to Psalm 89 where it said if my

people, if they sin, if they violate my commandment, if they keep not my statute, obey not my law, I will send them to hell? No! But I will "visit their iniquities with stripes, and their sins with the rod, but I will not let my loving kindness fail." God will whip a child of God, Heb. 12: 6, 7: Whoever God loves, he chasteneth, and no chastening seems good. There is the corrective rod of God, and that is what we have in Heb. 10: 27, where it plainly says he will devour the adversaries by this whipping that he will give us. Very well, looking for the fiery indignation that shall devour the adversaries. Take up the next now for I want my friend to know that I am going on with this thing.

Some made shipwreck of the faith. I deny it, the Bible doesn't say it, or anything akin to it; but it says some *concerning* the faith have made shipwreck. In other words, they missed it on faith and made a wreck of their lives, and if you fail to accept Jesus Christ by faith you will make a wreck of your life, too. It didn't say they made *shipwreck of the faith*. My friend quoted it that way as the record will show, and what did he say about me adding to the word of God? I'll apply it to you, but those references personally one to the other are unparliamentary, and ought never to be engaged in in honorable discussion, but all through this debate, he has been telling how little Bogard knows, how he doesn't know grammar, and how he is ignorant and all that, and frequently slurring. Professor Harde- man, that is beneath the dignity of an honorable debater. I wish you'd quit it. I have treated him as a gentleman and as a scholar all the way through, and I think I am recognized well enough to know that I know what I am talking about.

Now we will come to the next, for I want to take up each and every thing my friend said—"overthrow the faith of some." You can overthrow a thing without destroying it. Just because a man gets upset in his faith is no reason to think him lost. There sits a man right over there, Brother Carl Stephens, a car turned over with him four times only two weeks ago, and he is here at this debate now. It nearly killed the other man who was in the car with him, but didn't kill either one of them. You can overthrow a car, and not

destroy the car or the man that occupies it. "Overthrow the faith of some" doesn't mean that you are going to lose the faith or be lost and ruined in hell. Very well. Now what next? He quoted in 1 Tim. 4: 1-3, "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith." What does that mean? It means to depart from the *body of teaching*, not depart from personal faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, but become heretical in doctrine and in practice. Then we read again that there shall be a falling away first in the last days. Must first be a falling away, 2 Thess. 2: 3, 4. What does that mean? It doesn't mean they are going to fall from grace; but leaving the truth, falling away, and that's happening right now, right now the churches are being diminished. There are not as many Christian people in the world today as there were ten years ago. There are *many nominal* Christians, but they are not *real* Christians; and the Bible says as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be when the Son of man comes again. When Jesus comes back there will be a very few on this earth who are believers in the Lord Jesus Christ. He has raised the question "when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" There will only be a few waiting for Christ when he comes. A falling away from the church, not falling away from grace; a falling away from the system of doctrine and all that. That falling away referred to means going into Romanism and other heresies and departing from the truth.

Now I come to another thing. Here are the evils of the doctrine of apostasy. It is based on the doctrine of salvation by works. Tit. 3: 5 says it is not of works. This falling from grace gives the devil more power to destroy than it gives God to save, for we are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, 1 Pet. 1: 5. And that gives the devil power to overcome God's power. Again, it makes salvation depend on the grace of the devil instead of the grace of God. For we are saved by grace through faith, that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God, and if the devil can get one, and doesn't get all, it is because it doesn't want all; for we are kept by the power of God, and if we are kept by the power of God, then you have got to overcome the

power of God to get one, and if you overcome the power of God to get one, the power of God is less than the power of the devil—he could get all; and if the doctrine is true, the *only reason why you'd ever get to heaven is because the devil wouldn't have you*, that's why. Absolutely. Gives the devil more power than it gives God. Then it makes God condemn his own children. Rom. 5: 1, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." God condemns a child of God.

THE POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Affirmative*, Third Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

At this, the closing period of this debate, it is wonderfully fine to have such a magnificent audience, evidencing such a splendid interest. I gladly pass to the review of an address to which numbers listened at the forenoon session. My friend, Dr. Bogard, finds fault with me for referring to what he said some thirty-six years ago, and that was in answer to the criticism I made of his referring to other parts of the Bible than those I had mentioned or brought up. Dr. Bogard said those things, and until there is a correction of them, they are supposed to represent him, and that's why I made reference to matters of that kind. But he said, "I didn't take back one single thing that I said in the Borden Debate. I still believe it." Now I am going to excuse Dr. Bogard, if I can, on the ground of his years, as being short of memory. I know that forgetfulness is characteristic of senility, and that is the best apology that I can offer. Ladies and gentlemen, last night I read on page 95 from Dr. Bogard's book, where he wrote, "I did sign the statement that at *hand* means when John used it, has come, literally, has approached, past perfect tense." Now this audience will remember that Dr. Bogard got up and said, "If I said that I made a mistake, and I want to correct it." Now, Dr. Bogard, you said that, and then I got in behind you for putting it in the hypothetical form, "if I said it." Of course, you said it. Then again when I called attention to what he has in the little McPherson book, he said, "I am still sticking to it."

To what? "I can prove any absurdity by referring to history." He then said, "I want to expunge that and revise that statement," and he went on to talk about what he couldn't prove. Now, it's rather lamentable for a man to make statements of that kind. I regret that his memory has served him to no profit along those lines. But he said, "What books has Hardeman ever written?"

Well, I am not advertising books. I am not in the business, but Dr. Bogard, I held three meetings in the Ryman Auditorium of the city of Nashville when as many as 10,000 people assembled, and those sermons are down in three books of about 25 sermons each. I made a trip to Palestine, came back to Nashville to the Ryman Auditorium, and gave a series of lectures, also, which are in book form. I held a debate in the same city with Dr. Ira M. Boswell of Georgetown, Kentucky, on the music question. That's in a book. For your benefit, may I say there are five of them, and they are not pamphlets. They are books averaging about 185 or 200 pages. I wouldn't have said a word about them, but he asked, "What books has Hardeman written?" Well, there they are. You can get them at McQuiddy Printing Company, and I have no financial interest in them whatsoever. And that's that.

Well, another thing. He said, "I never yet said that Mark 16 was the word of God." I am truly sorry that Dr. Bogard said that. Will you pardon just a minute? I have his little "Waybook" here, and he knew that I had it, and now he says, "I never said that Mark 16: 16 was the word of God." But hear him and see how unreliable he is. Chapter 8, page 41, "The Way of Mission Work in History": "The Apostolic Baptists were Missionary Baptists. This is abundantly proved by the Master's commanding the church to go unto all the world, and preach the gospel unto every creature." Now, really, don't you think too much has been said? I will tell you, friends, and I mean no reflection, but I'd be ashamed, and I'll tell you what N. B. Hardeman would do in such a situation—in my next speech, God being my helper, I'd get up and say: "Hardeman, I missed it. I did use it and say that it was by the authority of God and it was our Lord's statement." There it is and he puts it in

quotation right in his book, and then comes and says, "I never said it was the word of God." But he did it again in this debate with I. N. Penick, held back in 1910. "The Apostolic Missionaries were guided into their movements by the word and the spirit, and not by the board," and he quoted Mark 16: 15 as authority. Now, that's on page 165 of the Penick-Bogard Debate, and yet he comes and says, "I never said it in my life." I pray God that when I get to be seventy, and that won't be any too many years yet, my memory may not become so treacherous as is that of my friend. I regret that I must expose him in this manner. Again, he used that same passage on page 166. "The Apostolic Missionaries baptized believers as Christ had commanded," and the first scripture cited is Mark 16: 15, 16. Dr. Bogard, you owe it to yourself to correct that statement, and as a man, I beg of you not to go down in this debate with that shadow resting upon you.

Well, he said, I never said that there was a miracle in conversion. Well, I have read it to him, heretofore, but his memory is failing. The truth of the business is, if that is the best his memory can serve him, Dr. Bogard ought to quit debating; and any other man, when his "forgettery" works better than his memory. Now just see what he says. This is the Warlick Debate, page 12: "Mr. Warlick thinks that the Ethiopian skin could be changed by operative law. What law? The idea is absurd. Nothing but miraculous power could change the skin of the negro. 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." And yet he comes and says, "I never said it in my life." Why, what will the man say, and what can be done under conditions of that kind? Why debate with a man who will say one thing and then when it is read to him go up and say, "I never said it in my life." Now, to be charitable, I think Dr. Bogard's memory slipped a cog and he forgot things that had been said. Just a word about the crown. He said, "If the crown is the crown of life, that made them both the same, the crown on the king is the king himself." Why, no, no, the man doesn't

change; but I want to suggest this to you: Friends, no man has ever yet been active king, until the crown was placed upon his brow, and the crown is synonymous with his reign as a king. That's true everywhere and in all cases.

Well, let me call attention again. He talked about the fruits of the laborers and suggested that Rom. 2: 6 referred to a matter of that kind. God will render to every man according to his deed. Now watch it: "To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality," God will render eternal life. Well, when does the rendition come? Unto those who seek it, and through patience continue, until life's journey is over, faithful in every step until death's knell is sounded, and the ransomed are ready to be gathered home, then—what? God will render eternal life unto them. Gal. 6, "He that soweth to his flesh"—to whom is he talking? Churches of Galatia, Christian people—and what about them, Paul? Brethren, if you sow to the flesh, you "shall of the flesh reap corruption." But he asked me, "Will a believer be lost?" He predicted that I'd never answer. Well, see if I do. Show me that man who is a believer in the Lord, active, doing God's will, rising to walk in newness of life, and walking in it—that man will not be lost. But if that believer ever ceases to be such, then what? To hell he'll go with the wrath of God Almighty resting upon him.

In John 15, he turned aside and quoted what Dr. Matthew Henry had to say about changing the prepositional phrase "in me" to after where it is in all translations of the Bible, and he said, "They can be in the church, both nominally and really." No, my friend, that's not so. No man on earth is in the church of God nominally. Every man that is in God's church is in there in reality. The Lord *adds unto* the church. The Lord doesn't add whitewash, and camouflage. A man may think that he is added, might be just nominal in his presentation, but there are no nominal members in the body of Christ. They might be in a local congregation, because we can't tell; but when a man believes the gospel, and obeys it, God Almighty is the character that does the adding. He is likewise the character that does the subtracting. All that he said about nominally and really is

nothing but Baptist excuses. It's not in God's word, and it's injurious to any man's affairs to inject it. "Every branch in me that beareth fruit, I'll purge it that it may bring forth more fruit. But every branch in me that does not bear fruit"—then, Lord, what about it? As is my Father the husbandman, "He'll take it away, and cast it aside." Friends, that's the story.

But now notice again, in Heb. 6, my friend turned to a thing that is not "apropos." He made an application that he ought not to make, and in his more sober-minded moments, he does know better. He called my attention to the third chapter of Hebrews, and said, "Now, Hardeman, that's the answer to it." Listen at it. Verse 9: "When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years. Wherefore I was grieved with that generation, and said, They do alway err in their heart; and they have not known my ways. So I swear in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest." Now that's Israel way back yonder in the flesh. Watch the application of it. Next verse, "Take heed, brethren," now just as it was back yonder with the generations gone by, so now. "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God." I want to read that from Dr. Charles Williams' modern translation, and he's a Baptist, towering above the ordinary: "See to it, my brother, that no wicked unbelieving heart is found in any of you as shown by your turning away from the ever living God, but day by day, as long as the days shall last, continue to encourage one another, so that not one of you may be hardened by sin's deceiving way, for we have become real sharers in Christ if we keep firm to the end, the faith we had at first, as yet the warning continued to be spoken." Why, that's gospel truth, and that's a Baptist, a real scholar at Union University in the city of Jackson, Tennessee, right near my home. But he came again on Heb. 6, and I just want you to see the misapplication of the point presented by Dr. Bogard. He said in verse 9, "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you." Now let's see that. Over here are a few brethren who were once enlightened, tasted of the heavenly gift, made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted of

the good word of God, and then fell away. It is impossible to renew them again to repentance; but, brethren, we are persuaded better things of you. We hope you won't do like those did. Now that's the application of that. Certainly it is. There were those who did it, here are those we hope will not do it, and of them we are persuaded better things. But he turns and says that's a hypothetical case. Paul said, if Christ be risen from the dead. Dr. Bogard, I call your attention to the fact that the word "if" is in First Corinthians, and that the word "if" is not in Heb. 6, and so you lost on that. You want to put the word "if" in it. That's but old Theodore Bezar's point in getting it into King James. It is not there; there is no hypothetical case about it. But he said the aorist tense represents the status of the affair. No, sir, the aorist tense represents the past event, and all translations recognize the fact. What about it? They fell away. Why, take Dr. Williams' translation of that, and he has the very same thing. Just let me turn and read what he has to say about it: "For it is impossible for those that have once been enlightened, have experienced the gift from heaven, who are made sharers of the Holy Spirit, and experienced how God's message is the mighty power of the age to come, and then having fallen away," a perfect participle, as already having been accomplished. Then what? "It is impossible, I say, to keep on restoring them to their first repentance since they have continued to crucify the Son of God to themselves afresh, and put him to an open shame." Now, whenever they reach that point, what about it? It is impossible to restore them, and that's the record of it.

Well, Dr. Bogard comes next and talked about Hardeman would slur matters by suggesting some errors that he made. Let me tell you, my friends, the first reference to that at all was made at his meetinghouse on the first night when he said, "Hardeman, you ought to come over here and let us teach you Greek." That's the first reference to anything of that kind. I answered back and said, "Sir, the thing you need is not Greek; you are not ready yet to enter Greek; but you need to come to Freed-Hardeman College and learn grammar." Oh, he said I said, "Then let me learn you grammar." I doubt that I said that. That's not characteristic of

my speech, may I say; but who started the business, if that be slurring? I just called attention to his errors that he had published in a book, and now to try to evade the force of it, he would try to turn the matter aside by accusing me of "slurring," but that can't be done. Well, note again: he talked of falling away from the doctrine. He said a man may become a heretic, an unbeliever in God's word, but if he believes in Christ, he can still be saved in heaven. I want you to harmonize those statements. Can I become a heretic regarding God's word, and yet believe in Jesus Christ? What would I know about Christ except what God has taught in his word? What does Dr. Bogard know about it? All the evidence that he has regarding Jesus Christ comes from the Book of God. Now hear it! He says I can become a heretic or an infidel regarding the Book, and yet accept the testimony that Jesus is the Christ. You can't do anything of the kind. "These are written!" What for? "That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ," and believing, "ye might have life through his name." So, then it's a positive contradiction of thought and of truth to talk about a man's becoming a child of God, faithful to Christ, and yet a heretic regarding God's word. To believe the Bible is to believe the Christ. He stands in the midst of the ages as the central character of all time. He runs like a silken cord through the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament and couples with them the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, thus binding both prophecy and history into one eternal truth. When a man, therefore, believes Jesus Christ to be God's Son, it's equivalent to putting one hand on Genesis, and the other on Revelation, and saying, "Lord, I believe it all." Talk about believing God's word—and not believing Christ! To talk about disbelieving the Bible, and at the same time believing in Christ is preposterous, ridiculous, absurd, and unthinkable.

But he said at last, if the devil ever gets one of God's children, mind you, then he can get all of them. Therefore, if we are saved, we are saved by the grace of the devil. Well, that would make old Aristotle and Socrates hang their heads in shame. Yet, that's Dr. Bogard! Now let me show you the fallacy of that. If God Almighty can save one of

Adam's race, then God can save all of them, and if anybody is lost, it is due to God's failure and God's wrath, and no man can help it. But those statements are illogical—one is parallel to the other, and thus that's answered. But he said that the child of God is kept by the power of God: but he didn't quote the entire passage. 1 Pet. 1: 5, "Who are kept by the power of God through faith." Well, now what is God's power? "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God," it is God's power, "unto salvation to every one that believeth." We are kept by the power of God, but the gospel is God's power. Therefore, I cannot be kept by the gospel unless I believe the gospel. Therefore, if a man is kept by the power of God, he is kept through faith, and so long as faith stands, all is well.

I must get in another argument, however. I want to get in the book some things about eternal life, and I trust that I have the time for it. There is much said, ladies and gentlemen, in the Bible about eternal life. John 3: 16, "Who-soever believeth on him should . . . have eternal life"; John 6: 47, "hath eternal life"; John 3: 36, 1 John 5, and so on. Now there are numbers of passages in the New Testament that say the believer has eternal life. Well, there are a number of them that are seemingly contradictory. Paul said in Tit. 1: 1, 2, "In hope of eternal life," and then Paul said in Rom. 8: 24, "For what a man seeth why doth he yet hope for?" Mark 10: 39, Jesus said, "In the world to come, eternal life"; and Gal. 6, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption," and when does it come? "But he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." First the sowing, second the reaping. Now, friends, there must be some harmony. One passage says we have it; the other says it is in the future or we are in hope of it, and it will be received in the other world. Now, shall I just array one of those passages against the other? No, sir. Well, what can be done? I will read to you, John 10: 27, 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, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." Now what are the statements here

made? My sheep first hear my voice; second, I know them; third, they follow me; fourth, I give to them eternal life. Now when? Matt. 25: 46, when the great last day is come, and the separation is made, these shall go away "into everlasting life." But again, you ask now what is the harmony in it? 1 John 2: 25, get it, and see just the beauty of all of God's word harmonized rather than one passage arrayed against the other. John said, "And this is the promise that he hath promised us." What is it, John? "Eternal life." So, how does a child of God have eternal life? Has it in promise; has it in prospect. Who said so? John did. Well, all right then. "He that believeth on the Son" hath everlasting life, has it in promise! I stand in hope of eternal life. There is no contradiction in it. They shall go away into everlasting life, but he that believeth on the Son hath it, hath it how? Hath it in promise! When does he go away into it? At the final judgment. Friends, that's the way to handle the Bible, and not have contradictions everywhere. The believer has eternal life; and yet Paul said, 2 Cor. 6: 10, "As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich." Now while the child of God has eternal life in promise, if he continue faithful unto the end, Paul said, notwithstanding all that, he is rich, and yet poor! And hath need of things in this world; and so in all the illustrations of God's book, eternal life is promised at the end of our earthly pilgrimage. Why, of course, I believe that the child of God has eternal life. Has it now? Has it in prospect just as John said—has it in promise; and there is no man that has left father and mother, son or daughter, wife or houses, for my sake and the gospel, but he shall receive now in this time those very things an hundredfold—now watch it—and in the world to come eternal life. When do I get in the real possession of it? At the last great day. These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. When is that? When the Son of God shall come and sit upon the throne of his glory; when all nations shall be gathered before him, and he shall separate them as the shepherd divides the sheep from the goats, and says to them on the left hand, "Depart from me, ye cursed." But to the others, "Come, ye blessed

of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." And these represent those sheep that shall go away into everlasting life. Well, what is necessary? For those sheep to be faithful; for them to follow him; and if they are following him by patient continuance in well-doing, and everlastingly seeking for glory, honor, and immortality, when life's dream is over, when life's battles are fought, when its race has been run, and the victories are all won; then the righteous who are faithful unto the end will go away into life eternal, there to receive a crown of righteousness, that fades not away. I thank you

THE POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

BEN M. BOGARD, *Negative*, Third Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend persists in trying to go back to things said in the past, and to answer those things rather than to answer what is presented in this debate. He tries to make me say, and quoted the Bogard-Warlick Debate (my friend Warlick sits here before me), that I said that the new birth was a miracle. I said no such thing. He read where I said it took miraculous power, and I said that this morning. The power that causes the sun to course through the heavens is *power equal to any miracle, but it is not a miracle in the New Testament sense, but the ordinary work of God*. It takes as much power to hold the sun in the heavens as it does to create the universe. That's true, and it takes the power of God to save the soul—miraculous power—but it doesn't come under the head of miracles, as we discussed it this morning, showing that the *beginning of miracles* was when Christ turned the water into wine. In that sense we are talking about miracles. My friend continually gets mixed up. Now if he wants to waste his time, waste space in the book by discussing things I said thirty-six years ago rather than to debate what I say now, he is perfectly welcome to continue that sort of thing.

My friend said there was no man an active king until crowned. King George was an active king, as much king as he ever was, before he was crowned. The crowning took

place several months after he became an actual king. So the crown of life is not the beginning of the life, but the glorious reward of life. Then, my friend quoted in his speech where we "seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life." Now look what he has done, and he has gone to record on it. If he were to debate with an Adventist, soul-sleeper, he'd say we *now* have immortality, and he'd debate that immortality of the soul against the materialistic idea. But he said in his last speech we *haven't immortality now at all*, and won't get immortality until we get to heaven. Exactly what the Adventists say, that we don't have an immortal soul now. Again we should seek for immortality and honor. So if my friend is seeking to have honor, he *confesses by that that he has no honor now*, and if I were to tell him he is a dishonorable man, he wouldn't like it. Have you no honor now? Well, what is meant then when "we seek glory and honour and immortality, eternal life?" We'll seek the things that *pertain to immortality*, not material things; seek the things that *pertain to honor*—not things dishonorable; seek the things that *pertain to eternal life*; seek the kingdom of God—*not seek to find it, but the things of the kingdom*. My friend says the kingdom exists now, yet we are commanded to seek the kingdom of God first, and all these things shall be added unto you. Does that mean that the kingdom is going to come into existence after a while? What is meant, then, my friend won't tell you—what is meant when we have the *promise of eternal life*, in the world to come, eternal life? Rom. 8: 23 says we "groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Our soul has immortality; our soul has eternal life now; our soul has received eternal life now; our bodies will receive it in the resurrection; I am hoping for that, and I have the promise of that. That answers him clearly on that.

Now, my friend complains, and has gone to record—I hope he will expunge it from the book when he gets to correcting his transcripts that "Bogard has added to the word of God" because he explains the word of God. Now what has he done? Over there in Romans where it says that he that soweth to the flesh shall reap corruption, he

that soweth of the spirit, etc. He turned that around and said you, if *you* sow to the flesh, and if *you* sow to the spirit. It said no such thing. I wonder if he doesn't know the difference between the *second person* and the *third person*? If *you* sow to the flesh, he quoted; but it says *he* that soweth to the flesh, and the explanation is made that the Romans were not sowing to the flesh. Why? Rom. 8: 9, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit." Oh, all that twisting and turning—it is pitiable for a college president. My good friend tells me that I am in my senility. That's very uncomplimentary, and if I were in my senility, I'd get angry, for every man who is in his dotage will get angry if you tell him so. But it tickles me down to my toes to think a poor old fellow like Bogard can just whip the socks off a young 63-year-old man like he is. Too bad, too bad, and the poor old fellow, Bogard, has no memory at all, but Bogard manages to remember enough to answer everything he puts up, and that's wonderful for one who has no memory. What if I was a real young man and at myself? It would be too bad for Professor Hardeman, wouldn't it?

Now he quotes from Professor Williams of the Union University. He has done it again and again. I had hoped he would quit quoting Williams, but he keeps on. He can't prove it by the Bible, so he proves it by Williams, and he went so far as to say that Williams had been endorsed by the Baptist Church. No such thing. He lost his place in the Southwestern Baptist Seminary for very good reasons. It wouldn't do to tell why, it wouldn't be parliamentary to tell, and here you are quoting Williams. He is endorsed by nobody except some local people. He has no national endorsement. But that's neither here nor there. Then my friend, when I told him the scripture said "some shall depart from the faith," and that meant to depart from the system of doctrine and become heretical in doctrine. He says, "You can't do that and be saved." He says you must believe, and here is his illustration. You must *believe every word in the Bible* and I will show you the Bible—illustrating like he did—put your hand over here in Genesis, and the other hand over in Revelation, and *believe every word in it in order to be saved*. Then Professor Hardeman and Ben M. Bogard

are neither one saved. We are both lost and on the road to hell, and all the rest of you are. Why? *I want to ask Professor Hardeman if he knows all about the Bible? Is there any part of it that he doesn't know? Has he a perfect knowledge of the Bible?* Well, if he says "yes," he will make himself ridiculous. If he says "no" then you can't believe what you don't know about. Absurd nonsense! The idea of having to believe every word in the Bible when he doesn't know all the words in the Bible. He couldn't quote all the Bible, and parts of it are mysterious, and you can't understand, or he hasn't been able to understand it up to this day. If he professes to know all about it, then he makes himself an egotist. That's disgusting. If he said I don't know it all, then how do you know you believe it? Very well. Now you have added to the word of God. The Bible says, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Professor Hardeman says *believe every line in the Bible from Genesis to Revelation*, and thou shalt be saved. I wonder if that's not adding to the Bible. I wonder if that boy, that girl, 10, 11, 12, 15 years old, knows all the Bible so he could believe? But he comes up here and gives the hand to the preacher, and says, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. He does believe that much, and you take him in, and baptize him. Hardeman says that boy and that girl are going to hell because they don't believe all the Bible; they haven't even read half of it. They don't know a hundredth part of it. Ridiculous adding to the word of God, as sure as you live.

Well, on the point "saved by the grace of the devil," if falling from grace is true—I maintain it is true. If the devil can get one of God's people, he must first overcome that which keeps God's child. When he gets God overcome, while he has God in his power, so as to get me, then why can't he get Professor Hardeman while he has God tied hand and foot? Our life is hid with Christ in God. You have got to get through God to get to me, and when he does that, why can't he get Hardeman; and if he *doesn't get Hardeman it is just because the devil wouldn't have him*. That is all there is about it. Very well, now that's all that my friend said in that speech. Absolutely. (Laughs from

audience.) Now I am taking up some things that must go in the book, for Professor Hardeman won't bring it up, and I want it discussed. For instance, here is what they generally bring up in their debates. If we take away (Rev. 22) the words of the book of this prophecy, God would take our names out of the book of life. Now, says my friend, that means that you will fall from grace, if you take away or add to the Book of God. Let me call your attention to the fact—if you have a Greek Testament lying around close, look at it and see that it does not say *book of life*, but *tree of life* in the Greek, and it is so written in the Revised Version, *tree of life* in the version you quote from. Hence, nobody will have his name taken out of the Book, but will forfeit his right to eat of the tree of life when we get to heaven—miss your chance for salvation. And boys, you fellows as ignorant as hogs on Greek can't grin that off—he knows it is so. (Some in audience were grinning.)

Very well, take the next, I'm determined to get it in the book. I brought this up this morning, he said nothing in reply. 2 Thess. 2: 3, 4, "That day shall not come, except there come a falling away first." That does not mean falling from grace, but the church dwindling. There is a falling off of the membership, until it gets down to little or nothing, as it will be when Jesus comes back to the world again. Jesus said, "As it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the day of the Son of man." It will dwindle down, there will be a falling away, the churches will get smaller and smaller, many of the local churches becoming extinct until there will be a very few people to meet the Lord when he comes. That's what the falling away means. Now, these two I have put in because they must be in. I want his answer, so we can get these things before the people who read the book and it'll go out to multiplied thousands. As I was closing my speech today, I was bringing up the things that would be the result of the doctrine of apostasy. I showed it was based on the system of salvation by works, and he can't deny it. I showed it gives the devil more power to destroy than it gives God to save. He made an effort to answer that, but you see how he failed. I showed it makes salvation depend on the grace of the devil instead of the grace of God, for if the devil can

get one and doesn't get all, it is because he does not want us, and we go into heaven by the grace of the devil. Again, it causes God to condemn his own children. Rom. 5: 1, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God," and he denies that the believer has everlasting life. You have just heard him deny that. He says that we don't have it and won't have it until they get to heaven. So, your doctrine denies that anybody has everlasting life. I'd like to know how you can lose it if you haven't got it? Trying to prove apostasy, and yet we haven't got eternal life to lose. Well, John 5: 24, says, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." My friend says that is a promise. Gentlemen, he that heareth my word is a promise, and believeth on him that sent me is a promise, hath everlasting life is a promise. It's all in the same sentence and if one is futile, the rest of it is. Very well. God's word says we have eternal life when we believe. It reflects on the merit of Christ's blood, and imperils the whole system of redemption and the throne of God itself. Why? Because Heb. 10: 14—get this—and my friend must answer it or it will go down in the book unanswered, and the people over the radio will hear it unanswered. "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." My friend says he has done no such thing. He is *only giving you a chance to get to heaven* when you finally quit believing, and after you quit believing, then you will be saved. No believer will be saved in heaven, for my friend says you have got to come to where you quit believing before you can get to heaven. Everybody in heaven will be unbelievers. It nullifies the work of the Spirit, John 3: 3-5, where we were born of God. It makes void the mediation of Jesus Christ, for Christ is not able to plead our cause. We have got to live a perfect life or go to hell; all that is true if the doctrine of apostasy is true.

Right here I drop this question. Please answer it in your next speech. How many sins do you have to commit in order to fall from grace? You ought to put that out so that the folks will be careful to commit just one less than enough at least. Will one sin cause you to fall from grace? or two or three or four or five or how many? I would like to have a

little certainty along this line. What is Christ mediating for if you have got to live a perfect life to get through? Our blessed Lord stands there and pleads for us, and on his merits we go in. Again it nullifies the divine promise, Heb. 6: 17, 18, where we have the oath of God, that by "two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast." Our hope is *sure and steadfast*. My friend says there is nothing sure and steadfast about it, but you may be in hell tomorrow—*have it today, lost tomorrow*. But the Book says it is sure and steadfast, and by the oath of God, we may know that he not only made the promise, but he made the oath. Again, it makes regeneration a mockery. John 3: 3. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." So what's the use of that? He must live absolutely perfect, and it leaves the world without hope for you can't hope for heaven just so long as the devil may have the power to get you.

Now having noticed all that, I am introducing a new line of argument. I want it in the record. I want my friend to wrestle with it in his next speech. Rev. 2: 7-11, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life." Verse 17, "Will give him a white stone, . . . a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it." Rev. 3: 5, the very same thing, but note, "He that overcometh," nothing shall be taken away. He will have his home in heaven. Now who overcomes? 1 John 5: 5—not he that holds out faithful to the end. "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" The overcomer has the absolute promise that nothing can keep him away from heaven's glory. Who overcomes? Those who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. My friend, if you believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, then you are an overcomer. Very well, I'll introduce some more. Will there be any empty reservations in heaven? Put that down and answer it in your next speech. You've got one chance. 1 Pet. 1: 4, "To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you." Very

well, I have a reservation, Professor Hardeman, if saved, has a reservation in heaven, and it fadeth not away. Will there be any empty seats in heaven, any reservations there that won't be occupied? I went west recently, I had a reservation in a car. I phoned down and said keep me a reservation. I want a berth, and I went down there, I had never seen the berth, never had seen the car, the reservation was in, but there it was for me, it faded not away. They could have taken it from me, but God Almighty said the one I have in heaven shall not fade away. Will there be any empty reservations in heaven?

And I want to ask, if you fall from grace, will you be a *lost believer* or a *lost unbeliever*? Will there be a believer in hell, is the point, or will he become an unbeliever in hell? You say that all the faith there is just believing the facts of the Bible. If that's true, then won't the man in hell believe the facts of the Bible? Well, if that's all the faith you have, the devil has got as good a faith as you have—the devil believes and trembles. The faith that saves the soul carries a thought with it of trust and reliance, and the trouble with my friend and his brethren is *they never have trusted Jesus Christ. They are trusting what they do*, and Professor Hardeman has been trying to prove it all day that you have got to work your way through, and that shows the scripture is wrong if he is right. It is not by works of righteousness which we have done but by his mercy he saves us. Again, 1 Cor. 3: 11-15, "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." Our imperfections are taken care of by the grace of God. I'll not burn, but my works will be burned. No sin will be carried into heaven—they will be all left on the outside and destroyed by the grace of God. Again, 1 John 2: 19; what about people who seemingly are saved, and live right for a while, then give it up as a bad job, and die that way? 1 John 2: 19, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." My friend says there is doubt, and he spent all this day trying to prove that there is considerable doubt, that they might not stay with

him, that they might not go all the way through; but God Almighty's Book says if they are of us, they would *no doubt* have continued with us. Why, did they go out then? That it might be made clear that they never were on the Lord's side. That's what it says. That's God's Book, not Bogard's word.

Again, my friend said that a great many people will fall from grace, die and go to hell. 1 John 3: 3, "Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." Every man! My friend says they won't all do it. There will be some of them who will fall from grace, and die and go to hell; and, therefore, every man won't do it, but God's Book rings back in the ears of Professor Hardeman, and says "*every man*" that has this hope in him purifies himself even as he is pure. Every man—that doesn't leave an exception to the rule. If you'll find just one man who is a child of God, yes just one man had this hope in him, and that one did not go on and purify himself, then God's Book must be written down as a false book, for the Book says every man that hath this hope in him purifies himself even as he is pure. If I say, "Everyone in this house," it means there is not one in the house not included, I'd be telling a falsehood, if I were to say, "Every man in this house has one dollar in his pocket," if we search the pockets and find just one man who did not have a dollar my statement would not be true. The Bible says that "every man that hath this hope in him purifies himself, even as he is pure,"—it must be so! and if there is just one found who doesn't do it, the Bible is false. Very well, here comes now John 10: 27-30. My friend said all that is futile. "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, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." Present tense all the way through—my sheep hear, my sheep follow, I give—and so they have it all in the present tense. Then again, in Rom. 6: 23, and I brought it up this morning, the "gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." And then again — Isa. 54: 17, "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn." Now look here, if no weapon against

me shall prosper, then the devil can't get me, and no means which he can use will get me, for if so, the devil's weapon would prosper if he should succeed in getting my soul or your soul if you are a child of God.

Then again, I'll read: Jude 24, "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory." God does the keeping. My friend said we're kept by the gospel. Bless your soul, the gospel power of God is *unto* salvation, and when you get the salvation, then you are kept by the power of God. You reach the salvation through the gospel, but Jude says he "is able to keep you from falling" after you get the salvation; and if he doesn't do it, then it is his fault and not ours. God's Book is full of wonderful things along this line. Rom. 8: 28, "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." I put this question up to Professor Harde- man. If all things work together for my good as a child of God, would it be for my good to fall from grace, and die and go to hell? If he says "yes," he makes himself absurd; if he says "no" then it can't happen. The devil himself can't do anything to me, but what God will overrule it for my good and for his glory. The work of the devil is overruled for the glory of God as it is plainly seen in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. God gave his Son to die, and used the devil to carry out the purpose of Jesus dying on the cross. So, God does use the devil, and the devil undertakes to get me, no weapon of his shall prosper, and God will overrule every- thing the devil does for my good. Then, again, I want to call your attention to the fact in 1 John 3: 9, where it says, "Who- soever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed re- maineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." What is born of God? John 3: 6 says the spirit is born of God. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Very well, what part of me is born of God? The spirit—and the Book says that which is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, for he has the seed of God in him and is kept by that because nothing can expel that seed. Now I want to ask you some questions.

Can Satan get me? No, for the Bible says, 1 John 5: 18, "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." The devil can't touch my soul, and if the devil can't touch my soul, according to the word of God, then undoubtedly he cannot get me. And whosoever is born of God overcometh the word. 1 John 5: 4, 5, "Whosoever is born of God overcometh the world." It didn't say he might overcome the world, or ought to overcome the world or could overcome the world, but he that is born of God *overcometh* the world. We are sealed by the Holy Spirit, 2 Cor. 1: 22, "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." We have the first down payment on heaven, that's what an earnest is, and we have got the Holy Spirit as positive proof or seal of first payment, and we are sealed and that is *unto the day of redemption*. What is the day of redemption? Why it's the resurrection day. So, Eph. 1: 13, 14, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." And then in the wonderful text over there in the eighty-ninth Psalm, what if we sin? I read it this morning and he made no reply. He has got a chance to do it yet, that if my people sin, I'll visit their iniquity with stripes and their sins with the rod, but I'll never let my loving-kindness fail toward them. Instead of God sending us to hell when we sin, he'll whip hell out of us by these terrible punishments that he puts on us, as I brought out clearly in my speech this morning. He'll devour the adversary—just as well use the term as to use the meaning of it. If we sin willfully, God will not have Christ to die over again, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation *will* devour the adversary, the devil, so the devil will be whipped in the punishments and afflictions God puts on his children as he punishes them in the flesh for the sins of the flesh. So, I have proved, both positively and negatively, that we are secure, and my friend, Professor Hardeman, will have to reconcile all these scriptures for

Rom. 8: 1 says, "There is therefore now no condemnation" or judgment "to them which are in Christ Jesus," the latter part, which reads, "Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," is left out of the Revised Version that you have been quoting from, is not in the original Greek, so our safety does not depend on our walking. There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. Why? Because our souls have been saved, our souls do not sin, our souls are as perfect as God. His seed remains in them—they cannot sin! Our bodies are imperfect, and are waiting for the eternal life of the body, Rom. 8: 23, and that will come in the resurrection of the dead. Thank you.

THE POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

N. B. HARDEMAN, *Affirmative*, Fourth Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

For the last time of this series, I appear before you, and I want to say again that it has been a pleasure unmixed with any sorrow whatsoever. I understand that the radio officials object to references that might be made in answer to the first part of Dr. Bogard's speech. Hence I refer not to such. He misses the entire point about my reflecting upon his number of years. God knows to the contrary. Those things come in spite of all that we can do, and with them there *are* extremities, both body and mind. My sympathy goes out to all such because I am beating a rapid march on down to the same period.

In the passage where it is said to seek for honor, glory, and immortality, Dr. Bogard faces Paul's declaration. He said, "Why, if we have to seek for it, that's evidence direct that we don't have eternal life." Well, I wonder what he would say to the peerless apostle of the Gentile world? I simply quoted what Paul said about it, and he finds fault with that idea and says, "Why, Paul, you're beside yourself. You say seek for it, and don't you know that you have it already? So, Paul, you don't have immortality, and therefore, your declaration is wholly beside the mark." Well, that answers the matter. He said with reference to sowing to the flesh, that, brethren, you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit. Of course, they are in the flesh physically.

Now, he brought brand-new stuff to my mind when he said Chas. B. Williams of Jackson was not endorsed. Why, Dr. Bogard, I think that statement is ridiculous. Union University is one of the best schools that the Baptist Church has. Old Dr. Savage with hoary hairs of honored life was one among the early teachers and continued until recently. It's a splendid university, to which my own children have gone. Dr. John Jeter Hurt is its president; Dr. I. N. Penick is the head of the theological department, and Dr. C. B. Williams, who wrote a translation of the New Testament, has been there for a number of years, and yet, with all the board of trustees, who are scattered all over the land (I think some twelve or fifteen representative brethren of the Baptist Church are members of the board), endorsing him, Dr. Bogard said "that man is not endorsed." He should not say a thing of that kind, knowing that it is not so at the time he said it. But, ladies and gentlemen, to cap the climax of affairs—he astonishes me! Why, he said, "Hardeman, you can't say that you believe all the Bible unless you know all of it." Doesn't my friend know the difference between faith and knowledge? Does he not believe anything that he does not understand and does not know? Jesus said the kingdom of heaven is as a man planting seed in the ground. He plants and the seed springs and grows up, he knows not how. I wonder how many of you farmers believe that when you plant seed this spring they will come up? Christ said they would. Well, I believe it, but Christ said *you know not how*; You never have found out yet. But thank God, I am believing. That's a ridiculous statement. Faith rests upon evidence; knowledge rests upon direct contact. Thank God I can say it—I believe every word of God's Book from cover to cover. It is a matter of faith, not a matter of knowledge. God's ways are not like mine, nor his thoughts mine, but I can believe what he says. I do not understand all about the wonderful sacrifice God made in the gift of his Son, nor all the details; but I believe every word of the record. And that's sufficient for that.

Now it was quite elegant, when he said: "You fellows that are as ignorant as hogs." Won't that look elegant and graceful to adorn Dr. Ben M. Bogard? Well, of course,

that's a slip; and then he misrepresented directly what I said. He said, "Hardeman says we don't have eternal life here." I said exactly the reverse of it, based upon 1 John 2: 25. "This is the promise which he has promised us, even eternal life." We have it, but how do we have it? Just like the Bible said, in prospect, in promise. Now, he turns to Revelation, and talks about overcoming, and then with that couples 1 John 5: 4, and he says *even our faith*. Well, that's correct. What is it that overcomes the world in me (not the physical world, but my worldly nature)? It's my faith that overcomes my physical disposition and appetites and holds them in subjection; but what has he said regarding 1 Tim. 4: 1, "Some shall depart from the faith"? I presume that he'll wait until the next time. No answer direct. He did make a shadow of a show on your faith's being shipwrecked, but there are those that departed from the faith, and some are already turned aside from it! My faith will overcome the world in me if I maintain that faith, but whenever I allow that faith to depart or for myself to depart from it, then, there can no longer be the overcoming. He asks: "Will there be any believer in hell?" Yes, sir. John 8: 30. There were the Jews that believed on him, believed "eis" him, and yet verse 44, Jesus said, "Ye are the children of the devil." As your father did, so will you. Next John 12: 42, "Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him." That's the same word, believed "eis" him. But "they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Of course there will be believers in hell, but they are not active believers; they are not believers who are made perfect by work, by obedience to the gospel of Christ, and are therefore lost in hell.

In 1 Cor. 3: All of his works burned up, but he, himself, saved as by fire—the works, ladies and gentlemen, referred to in that, are the converts made by the preaching of the peerless apostle—while some of them may be lost and land in hell, yet he himself no doubt will be saved. And again, 1 John 2: 19, and note just what is said regarding it—one of the main passages. "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt

have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not *all* of us." Dr. Bogard left out the "all." Dr. Bogard, that implies that some of them were, and if just one, that settles the matter, and that scripture is gone from you. Don't you ever quote it again with any semblance of getting by. They went out, why? As manifestation of the fact they were not *all* of us—well, some of them were, and so they went, by the way. And there's a clear case of apostasy proved by the gentleman himself. Well, he said, "Everyone that hath this hope in him purifieth himself," and he had just gone before that and said, "You are kept by God's power. Man doesn't have anything to do with it!" And yet everyone that has this hope—who's the responsible character? That man purifies himself everyone that hath the hope. But bear in mind, ladies and gentlemen, hope rests upon faith. Without faith there is no hope. Some can depart from the faith—therefore, all hope abandoned, and all hope forever gone.

Well, again, in Isaiah, fifty-fourth chapter, just let me turn for a moment as rapidly as I may be able, regarding these matters. "No weapon that is formed 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." What is the heritage? They have the weapons of God in that he will provide a way by which they may escape. God provides the weapon with which men can escape. It's their heritage, but he provides the way that *you* may escape. I made that clear in my first speech, and not one word has been said in reply to it as yet.

Well, note again. This time he said, "All things work together for good to them that love God." Now he said, "Hardeman, if I were to apostatize and go to hell, would that work for my good?" Well, I hardly think so. Now what's the trouble with the man? He has no limitation on the expression "all things," and I just want to show him now the consequence of such a manner of handling the Bible. Paul said, "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient." Now, Dr. Bogard would be forced to say, "Paul, go out and kill, steal, murder, and do all manner

of evil. All things are lawful." But again, Paul said, 1 Cor. 3: 21, 23, "All things are your's, . . . and ye are Christ's." He thinks that's the Baptists. Well, all right. Now what about all things, unlimited? It covers everything. All things are yours. "All things" then, if unlimited, would imply both hell and the devil. All things—they are a part of them; unlimited! that's his contention. Therefore, all things are yours, according to that method of handling God's word. When Dr. Bogard gets to the end of life, he'll have both hell and the devil because they are included in "all things." But, friends, that's the consequence of a false process of reasoning, and giving a universality unto that which is limited by the context of the same. But note again: "Who shall separate us from the love of . . . God, which is in Christ Jesus?" I answer, ladies and gentlemen, not one thing under heaven. There is nothing that can separate us from the love of God. While we were dead in sin, lost, ruined, and recreant, God loved us. Now, that's not the question. Look at it! Who shall separate us from the love of God? I'll put the word "love" on the board. What's the answer? Nothing at all. Now let us raise the real question: Who shall separate us from God—not his love, but from God? Answer: Isa. 59: 1, 2, "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear: but your iniquities," talking to his people, "your iniquities have separated between you and your God." Rom. 8: 37 doesn't talk about God, but talks about love, and the answer is "nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God." Friends, that's not the issue. A boy is separated from his mother. Lester Brocklehurst, executed at Tuckerman Prison in this state a short while ago, was separated from his mother, but not from her love! It was there and continues yet, but he is separated from her by disobedience of the law of the land. That's the idea.

Why, he says that the one that is born of God cannot sin. Well, I just ask: Does Dr. Bogard ever sin? If, therefore, he commits a sin, then according to his doctrine, he is not born of God. Now, he ought to know that the word "cannot" means consistent with his life, and a better rendition would

be "he that is born of God doth not practice sin." I was asked several times, "Brother Hardeman, can't you come here and do this or that or the other?" I say: "No, my dear brother, I cannot." Does that mean impossible? No, but consistent with my program, and in harmony with my plans, I can't do it. You ask me, can't you remain over here tomorrow? No, sir, I cannot. I am due in Birmingham, Alabama, and have to leave tomorrow. Is it impossible? Oh, no, I could wire them that I will not be there, and I could stay; but according to plans, and consistent with my program, I cannot! That's the answer. Well, he said you are sealed with the Spirit of God. I just want to ask Dr. Bogard this: Are we sealed conditionally, or unconditionally? Now, if we are sealed conditionally, then we remain sealed conditionally, and what are the conditions? If you continue in well-doing, and seek for glory, honor, and immortality, then what? God will render life eternal unto that class.

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." He says, "Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" is left out of verse one. That's correct, but you just watch Paul a little bit. I'll quote all the four verses. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." It's in verse four, and you knew that, but you thought you could get by with a statement to the contrary. But we are not in the "getting by" business. In Psalm 89, he missed the entire point. "My loving-kindness will I not utterly take from" the seed of David. Who is that? Jesus Christ, and not the Christian character. But again, Hebrews, sixth chapter. This is one of the most beautiful presentations in the Bible, and I want you to hear it. "Which hope we have," "that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a

strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us." Hear it! "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast." Friends, do you see the splendid picture as there presented? Look at it. Up yonder is the anchor, hope cast into the heavenly dock. Down here upon life's ocean is the individual. All right. Here is the cable, faith, that holds the individual or ship to the anchor. Now then, so long as the cable—which is faith, the foundation of hope—so long as the cable holds, the tempests may rage, the storms may sweep over the billowy deep, but that ship will not be driven, because it is fastened unto the anchor, which is hope over yonder. But you break the cable, depart from the faith—let your faith be overthrown—and then the vessel goes to wreck and to ruin upon the reefs and rocks wherever chance and circumstances may drive it.

I come now, friends, having answered all, to review some things. I showed this morning in the very first address that Adam was God's son by creation; and then I turned to 2 Cor. 11: 3 and showed that Paul said: "I fear, . . . as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtility, so your minds should be corrupted." Do you know what's happened? Three speeches have gone by, and Dr. Bogard has not touched, he has never quoted—not one time—2 Cor. 11: 3, and it would be wholly out of order to do so now. But I am waiving that, and giving Dr. Bogard the right to make whatever reply he wants in the last speech, because I would love to hear what he has to say about it. So far that's never been touched. In 1 Chron. 28: 9, no reference made to it this live-long day. What is that? "If thou seek him, he will be found of thee"; if you be faithful unto him, he will unto you. "But if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off for ever." That's never been noted. Not one single reference made thereto. Well again, Psalms, one hundred sixth chapter. There were those of God's people that believed his word, and then after a while, the record says, they believed not his word. Now, what's been said about it, although it was put on the board? Not a sign nor a reference whatsoever. Now friends, that's very significant. Had I not put it on the board, he might have said, well, due to my

years, I forgot it; but there it is right up there before his eyes, and what about it? No reference made at all unto the statement of God's word respecting this matter. All the Israelites—cast down—large numbers of them. Why? Because of their unbelief. I want to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, when Moses, after forty years of leadership, had come to the plains of Moab and from Nebo's height looked across into the land to which he longed to go; he saw a million graves of those of Israel that had fallen by the wayside with God's wrath visited upon them. They were not allowed to enter into the rest of Palestine. Now, Paul said, "I fear," lest the same thing be characteristic of you folks, and you will fail to enter into that rest, the life beyond. But the Doctor made no reference to all this.

But again. Since I made the last argument regarding Heb. 6, he has let it severely alone. I suppose he will bring some further statement regarding it now. They were once enlightened; they tasted of the good word of God; they were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and of the power of the world to come; and after all of that, then what? And then *fell away*, past tense, as others rendered; "and having fallen away," the perfect participle, which suggests completed action in time gone by, up to the present. What about it? They then fell away—what about it, Lord? It's impossible to renew them. Friends, the argument is before you with all matters presented.

Let me say this as a final word to you friends and brethren. If you have named the name of the Lord; if you have tasted the good word of God; if you stand today a child of high heaven with all sins forgiven—to God be all the praise and glory, and to us the encouragement. I want to suggest to you, many of whom I know that I will never again see. I take you to record this day that, as much as time and opportunity have afforded, I am pure from the blood of men who have been listening. Why? I have not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God. Brethren, I beg of you in heaven's name, let us buckle on God's armor afresh; let us raise aloft the banner, let us unsheathe the sword of the Spirit, and so long as God lets us live, let us fight under the leadership of him who has never yet lost a conflict. And then by and by,

when life's race has been run, its battles fought and its victories won, the Captain of our salvation shall bid us stack arms on the glad plains of a never-ending eternity. There he will have us to lay aside our battle-scarred armor, and hang our swords upon the jasper walls of that eternal city. Then with palms of victory and crowns of glory we will sweep through the gates into the grandeur of our Father's home, across which no shadows have ever come, wherein we can see beautiful sentences of life, punctuated by the stars of eternal glory, enabling us to read our titles clear to mansions over there. May God bless you is my prayer.

THE POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

BEN M. BOGARD, *Negative*, Fourth Speech

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I come to you to close this discussion and to reply to my good friend. On seeking eternal life, I showed him very clearly that we are also told there to seek immortality, and I called his attention to the fact that if he were debating with an Adventist, a soul-sleeper, he would contend that we do now have immortality of the soul. So, then, what do you mean when you seek immortality? You are seeking the things that belong to immortality, and not immortality itself. Then, we have eternal life now. Then why seek it? Seeking things that belong to eternal life rather than earthly things. Then, "eternal life is a promise." I showed him what that meant. He made no reply. I gave him Rom. 8: 23; he made no reply. "We ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Our bodies do not have eternal life now; our souls do! Then when I said my soul had been saved, my spirit regenerated, and, 1 John 3: 9: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin" and "he cannot sin," showing the part born of God cannot sin. What reply to that? It went like this: "You ask me to stay over; I say I cannot." Why he meant he *would not*, "cannot consistently." But the reason given why they cannot sin is not because they can't do it consistently—*his seed remaineth in you*—therefore you cannot sin! Jesus Christ remains in us! That prevents sin. My soul sin? No. "Has Brother Bogard ever sinned?" In my

soul, I do not. I am as perfect as God himself as far as my soul is concerned. Then what about my body? It does sin. So we have two natures—the one fighting against the other, the flesh against the spirit, and spirit against the flesh. The man who never had that conflict is not a Christian, for all children of God have that inward conflict. The soul fighting against the flesh, the flesh against the spirit; one born of God, the other waiting for the adoption, the redemption of the body. My friend made no reply. Then he forgot. I'll make no personal reflection on him as the radio manager just notified him that he had to stop making reflections on me. I am glad they did, because I don't like it a bit. That's so unpleasant for one speaker to reflect on the other. (Harper: The radio station did not notify him regarding that, Brother Bogard.) All right, no matter who did it, the thing was done, and it was objected to by the radio. So I pass that up.

He said I made no reply to "depart from the faith" when he himself in his other speech said I said the man became a heretic. If I made no reply, how did I say that? And then he came back and said that a man couldn't be a heretic and be saved. The book will show I did reply. When he said that you had to believe every word in the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, in order to be saved, I said what about that child down there who comes up and offers himself for membership in the church? About all he knows is that he is a sinner. He doesn't know much about the Bible, not one hundredth part of it. According to that, the child will be lost in hell because he doesn't have a perfect knowledge of the Bible. Well, my friend says "there is a difference between faith and knowledge." No, sir, faith is based on knowledge, and you can't have faith without knowledge. That's nonsense. Here is a bank: I know the bank exists but I may believe in a bank, or I might not. I know about Jesus Christ, and then I might believe in him, and I might not. I know about God, I might believe in him, or not. I know parts of the Bible. I don't claim all knowledge, like Professor Hardeman does. I can believe it or not believe it. Certainly! If you don't know all there is in the Bible, you can't believe all there is in the Bible. Well, he said, the

farmer doesn't understand how the seed grows; just knows it grows. Yes, sir, and his faith is based on his knowledge, having seen the seed grow. If he had planted the seed and it hadn't grown and never had seen any grow, he couldn't believe it would grow. It is based on knowledge every time.

He says, "believers in hell." For the Pharisees believed "eis" Christ, and yet children of the devil. We had the "eis" discussion one day on baptism, and I showed that Thayer said the word "eis," if used of place, means *into* of relation, *with reference to*. So these Pharisees believed with reference to Christ, but did not put their trust in him. The devil believed, and when he finally gets to hell, he will still believe the Bible; but he never has believed in Jesus 'Christ. He believes Christ exists. Do you mean that you just believe Jesus Christ exists; and that is the faith you have in Christ? You believe the devil exists, don't you? If you believe the devil exists you have just as much faith in the devil as you have in Jesus Christ. That's nonsense. Faith means believe in God's existence, in Christ's existence, and in addition *put your trust* in Christ! There is a bank in town. You believe the bank is there, don't you? But you might have no faith in it. I know a man that knew a bank existed in a few miles of hm, but had no faith in it. He hid his money about the place. He had faith in the hole where he put it away! The thing you trust in, that is what you have faith in, and the man who does not trust in Jesus Christ has no faith in Jesus Christ, and I am afraid that a great many of you, my good friends—I am your friend—you never have trusted Jesus. You are doing like Professor Hardeman, trying to work your way through, and having faith in what you do. You are depending on that and not depending on Jesus Christ for salvation.

My friend commented on 1 Cor. 3, where it says, "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." He said that means the converts made by the preacher — they will be burned up, and the preacher himself saved. That's the first time I ever heard that a convert was the preacher's work. I thought the *Lord's work saved*. No man can save another man, and unless I save another man his salvation

would not be my work. It just means our imperfection, the wrongs and evils we have done, will be destroyed by the Lord, yet we are saved! 1 John 2: 19, "They went out from us, but they were not of us." My friend said that teaches some of them did go out. Shows exactly the opposite. Here is a house full of people, I'll say for accommodation, Brother Harper is a minister. Suppose he has a thousand members. Now some of them might be hypocrites, pretenders, and so far as Harper and others can see, "you can't tell the difference." By and by they turn up in a bad way. They go out from this congregation. Why? Because they were not of them! If they had been, they would have continued with them; but they went out that it might be manifest they were untrue. To begin with, some were hypocrites, and as they went out, it was manifest that they were not children of God. Certainly that is what it means.

On Rom. 8: 28, "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God"—my friend says that doesn't mean what it says. It means something like "all things are lawful," "but not expedient." Now, I am forced to make a comment that will be new, for he brought it on. Paul was not under law at all, and so far as the law is concerned, it was lawful for him to do anything. But with the love of God in his heart, it was not expedient. We are not saved by keeping law. We are not saved by obedience to law. All things are lawful to me. Why? Because I am out from under it! But it is not expedient. I am now governed by love, and love prompts me to obey God. Very well, now he said, "All things are yours." He says that means hell and all. Yes, sir, it means absolutely everything. The saints shall reign with Christ on earth and the devil shall be put under our feet completely. Everything good and bad belongs to God's people! The devil himself subjected! Why sure, and all things on the earth! So, if that's true, and "all things work together for good to them that love God," then it follows, positively, unless falling from grace would be for my good, that it can't happen. It follows undoubtedly that even the devil can't do anything that would cause me to lose my salvation because the devil himself can't do anything except that which God will overrule for our good. I illustrated how

that was when Christ was crucified. If there ever was a time when the devil was used by the Almighty God to bring about his promise, that was the time. The devil undertook to conquer Christ, tempted him, tried to get him to surrender, followed him, hounded him, all through his life: finally got Judas to betray him; he was crucified, and the devil chuckled. Why? Because he thought, "I've got him now." He came here to do a work and I killed his purpose. I've got rid of him. When he was sealed in the tomb, if there ever was joy among the demons of hell, there was joy then. They were working to destroy the Lord, and thought they had him, but when Jesus burst the bounds of that tomb, and came forth gloriously and triumphant, then the joy went the other way. All things worked for good—even the work of the devil, and so our salvation is due to the work of the devil, for if Jesus Christ had not been crucified we couldn't have been saved, and he wouldn't have been crucified but for the works of the devil, and God overruled the work of the devil for his glory and the salvation of men. "All things work together for good." "Then let the infernal lion roar, how vain his threats appear. When he can match Jehovah's power, then I'll begin to fear." I am not afraid until then.

Now the questions I introduced, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ." My friend says nothing "can separate us from the love of God." Well, in Prov. 1: 24-28 it says that God will cease to love those who have gone beyond his power. I'll not quote it for that would be new matter. I will just let you read it. When you call, I will not hear you. Why? Because when I called you refused! In hell God turned his back on them and said, "I also will laugh at your calamity," and that's when your fear cometh. My friend says God still loves them though he laughed at their calamity. No, sir, when you get to hell, you cut loose from God loving you as well as your love for God. And so who shall separate us from the love of God? Nothing in heaven, earth, or hell can do so.

Well, here is one thing I want you young preachers, and all the rest of you to note down: Rom. 8: 1, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

You put in there: "It all depends on your walking." There are half a dozen men on this floor, that I have debated with, and they all do it. They said your not being condemned depends on your continued walking, "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." It is published in some of the debates like the Borden-Bogard Debate, and the Bogard-Warlick Debate, down in black and white. You *walk* not after the flesh, but after the spirit, and it depends on your walking; and when I gave that to my friend here, and said it is not in the Greek, and he got up and said, "*You are right; it is not in the Greek, and it was left out of the Revised Version.*" Now, you fellows quit preaching it! Don't palm off something that is not scripture anymore. And, by the way, let me say, if Professor Hardeman can say that the latter part of Rom. 8: 1 is not in the Bible, *is there any crime if Bogard said Mark 16: 16 is no part of the original scripture?* I wonder if sauce that is good for the goose is not good for the gander? And I wonder if we can't let that go to record now? I am an awful heretic because I say the passage that has been quoted again and again, Mark 16: 16, is not in the original Greek. The Revised Version says plainly at the foot of the page that "from verse nine down to the end of the chapter is missing from the two oldest manuscripts." That note was put there by his 148 scholars. Now comes Professor Hardeman and says, well, the latter part of Rom. 8: 1 is no part of the original. So then, I'd like to shake hands with Professor Hardeman, and then go down to record that we agree that some of the things found in the translation of the Bible are not in the scripture. By the way, Brother Hardeman, would you shake with me on that? (Hardeman—"If you read verse four, I will.") All right, will you shake on that, then I will read verse four? (Hardeman—"Read verse four first.") Oh, he won't shake! All right then. (Laughs from audience.) Everybody happy and getting along nicely.

Psalm 89. I am sorry that he slipped on that, because I had rather he had met it. He said that he will not let his loving-kindness fail toward you, but he will visit your iniquities with stripes—applies to the Lord Jesus Christ, the promised seed! Let me read now: "His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven."

Now that does refer to Jesus Christ. No mistake. Now what about the rest of it? "If his children," God's children, not his seed, not Jesus Christ, "forsake my law"—certainly Jesus Christ wouldn't forsake his law;—"and walk not in my judgments"—Christ would not fail to walk in his judgment. "If they break my statutes," that's plural, that is not Jesus Christ, "and keep not my commandment: then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes." How is God going to punish a man who does wrong as a child of God? Not by sending him to hell; but by visiting stripes and rods upon him, and nevertheless my loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. The covenant there is with Jesus Christ that keeps his people, and if they sin, they'll have the rod laid on them, punished in the flesh for the sins of the flesh.

I shall take up everything my friend said. I cannot get him to come up to Heb. 6: 4. He hasn't done it and the record will show it. "If they fall away" it is impossible "to renew them again unto repentance" does not apply to any of the children of God. Verse nine says, "We are persuaded better things of you." So then, don't understand, I am referring to the possibility of your falling away, says Paul! I am using an illustration that *if you should* fall away, it is impossible to renew you again. My friend says that "if" isn't in the Greek, but it *happens to be subjunctive mode*, he won't deny that, and the subjunctive always carries doubt. So it is the same thing, subjunctive mode, in 1 Cor. 15 where it said, "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." Now in the few minutes that remain, I want to run over some things my friend has not touched on. I called his attention to the fact that Satan could not get us. 1 John 5: 18. "He that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." If the wicked one can't touch me, how in the world is the devil going to get me? Rom. 6: 14 has been quoted twice, "Sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace." Paul said, "Nay, in all these things

we are more than conquerors through him that loved us." Rom. 8: 37. 2 Cor. 4: 17, "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Can the world? I have quoted that to him and he has said nothing in reply. 1 John 5: 4, "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world," and so I want to ask you what he did with the scriptures that I have brought up here about the overcomer? He will overcome who has a white stone and a new name. He will overcome and have access to the tree of life. He will overcome who sits on thrones. Who overcomes? 1 John 5: 5, "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" Not one breath did he use in reply to that! The record will show that he did not use one particle of his time to try to reply.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I am gloriously satisfied, and I am glad that this debate is going to record so that people can buy it, and read it and study it, and in that way know more about the word of God.

Now, I am talking to the radio audience especially—the debate is over except what I want to say. It has been demonstrated that we can hold debates in Little Rock and everybody stay in a good humor. The two debaters are the best of friends, and those who say they don't believe in debates because of bad feelings stirred up can know from this debate that none have been stirred up. Oh, you say, you had a debate across the river with Aimee McPherson when there was howling and yelling; but the debaters didn't do any of it. A gang gathered over there and did that in spite of all I could do. I thank God for that debate, because it broke the backbone of that church, and it has dwindled from a thousand members to so small a number they can get in the annex of my church right now. And our church, the Antioch Missionary Baptist Church, has grown and flourished from that day on. I am not uneasy about debates, and if the other fellow wants to act bad, he can do it; but I will behave myself as a gentleman. As I told Brother Harper here a while ago, privately, that even though he were crushed, and down

and out in this debate, yet he gained, he won! Why? By his gentlemanly conduct. He had won in that sense, and I always win in that sense. God knows I don't want anything rough in any debate that I hold. I want it all to be for the glory of God and for the good of the community in which we are holding the discussion. I want to thank all for their kindness and I appreciate the courtesies of E. R. Harper, Professor Hardeman, and all the folk who have listened in or who have sat here in this great audience and have heard it.

CONCLUSION

E. R. HARPER

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This brings us to the close of a most interesting discussion, and I trust that everyone has enjoyed the fine order that has prevailed throughout these four days. I have never seen vital material presented in a more forceful way and the response on your part is commendable. Debates of this character will build up the church and bring back the respect once manifested for discussions of a religious nature. May I compliment both men for their genial deportment—they have acted like gentlemen, and, by so doing, have kept the audience, gathered each day, in a fine feeling of friendship. May we continue to have this splendid attitude and friendship on the part of Baptist people. We have done everything in our power to treat them as we would be treated, and I hope they continue to listen to our daily broadcasts and that some day they may see the truth that makes men free and that we may all be one and live together in that beautiful home of the soul.

It has been a pleasure to have had all our visitors from the various states, and the church here is delighted that it could be host to you and to so many preachers of the gospel. To one and all we wish happiness here and in the world to come. It is our prayer that we may enjoy this same sweet association, through the sacred will of God, in another world, where we may live, love, and worship our blessed Redeemer forever and ever. That will, indeed, be a wonderful meeting.

In our debate today, there was a misunderstanding on the part of some regarding Brother Hardeman having been called down by the radio company. It was not Brother Hardeman. Here is what happened: Mr. Bogard said that instead of God sending his child to hell the Lord would "whip hell out of him." That statement is what the radio world calls obscene language, as I understand it. As moderator for Brother Hardeman, and with interest both in the audience and radio officials, I asked Brother Hardeman not to make reply to that statement—especially if he had to

repeat it. I did not wish to have the radio commission bring criticism on our station and against our church program over it.

The objection, therefore, was my own offering, and it was against the statement made by Dr. Bogard. I called the attention of Mr. Bogard to the fact that the radio did not offer the objection, and for him to make the accusation was unfair to Brother Hardeman. However, he either did not understand or, if so, failed to correct his statement concerning Brother Hardeman, and that is why I am forced to make this explanation to you who are here and to the vast radio audience as well. It would not have been fair to Brother Hardeman to let the statement stand that he had been criticized by the radio station for objectionable language when, as a matter of fact, it was the language of Dr. Bogard that was the object of the criticism.

It seemed that we were going to get together here in this last moment of the discussion when Dr. Bogard offered to shake hands with Brother Hardeman on Rom. 8: 1, but when Brother Hardeman asked him to read on through verse 4, where the expression is the climax of the first four verses and stands equally related to each as a climax to each verse, showing that you cannot "walk after the flesh" but must "walk after the Spirit," if one expects not to be condemned, and then Dr. Bogard refused to shake.

All in all we have had a great time and a great debate, and we are leaving here really feeling that it was good to have been here—no hard feelings toward anyone. As we, one by one, pass from this earth into the great beyond, may the impressions of truth become deeper and clearer. May those who read the debate know that it was one discussion where good feelings prevailed and truth triumphed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Apostasy, The Possibility of	241-317
Baptism, The Necessity of	82-157
Church, The Establishment of	158-240
Holy Spirit, The Work of	7-81

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH

Bogard's First Speech	158
Hardeman's Reply	168
Bogard's Second Speech	178
Hardeman's Reply	189
Bogard's Third Speech	199
Hardeman's Reply	209
Bogard's Fourth Speech	219
Hardeman's Reply	230

NECESSITY OF BAPTISM

Hardeman's First Speech	82
Bogard's Reply	89
Hardeman's Second Speech	99
Bogard's Reply	109
Hardeman's Third Speech	119
Bogard's Reply	128
Hardeman's Fourth Speech	139
Bogard's Reply	149

POSSIBILITY OF APOSTASY

Hardeman's First Speech	241
Bogard's Reply	250
Hardeman's Second Speech	260
Bogard's Reply	270
Hardeman's Third Speech	281
Bogard's Reply	290
Hardeman's Fourth Speech	301
Bogard's Reply	309

WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Bogard's First Speech	7
Hardeman's Reply	16
Bogard's Second Speech	28
Hardeman's Reply	37
Bogard's Third Speech	46
Hardeman's Reply	55
Bogard's Fourth Speech	65
Hardeman's Reply	73