THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Scanned by TLC

Jno. A. Benson.

Presented by
Nello Rickard,
Feb., 23, 1936.

Scanned by TLC



W. L. OLIPHANT

Scanned by TLC



JOHN R. RICE

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

ON

1. Return of the Jews to Jerusalem
2. Personal Reign of Christ at Jerusalem
3. Baptism for Remission of Sins
4. Apostasy

* * *

Conducted at

DALLAS, TEXAS
January 15, 16, 17, 18, 1935, and
January 22, 23, 24, 25, 1935

* * *

Stenographically Reported by
Misses Maudelle Stramler
and Blanchie Burton

* * *

AUSTIN, TEXAS
FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE
1935

Scanned by TLC

COPYRIGHTED
FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE
1935

Scanned by TLC

PROPOSITIONS UNDER DISCUSSION

Page

PROPOSITION ONE: 9

"The Scriptures Teach That the Jews As a Nation Will Return to Pulestine When Christ Returns to the Earth and Then Will Be Converted to Christ."—John R. Rice affirms; W. L. Oliphant denies.

PROPOSITION TWO: 123

"The Scriptures Teach That Christ Will Establish a Literal Throne in Jerusalem and Will Reign Over the Whole Earth For a Period of One Thousand Years."—John R. Rice affirms; W. L. Oliphant denies.

PROPOSITION THREE: 271

"The Scriptures Teach That Baptism to the Penitent Believer Is Essential to His Salvation from Past or Alien Sins. —W. L. Oliphant affirms; John R. Rice denies.

PROPOSITION FOUR: 408

"The Scriptures Teach That a Child of God, One Who Has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ, Can so Sin as to be Finally Lost."—W. L. Oliphant affirms; John R. Rice denies.

Scanned by TLC

INTRODUCTION

The four propositions that constitute the subject matter of the following religious discussions involve questions pertaining to the kingdom of Christ and terms of entrance into it that are of more than passing interest. In fact, they have been studied with profound attention ever since the inauguration of the new dispensation from the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem.

This book is a stenographic report of a debate in Dallas, Texas, on four propositions. The discussions were opened on January 15, 1935, and continued for four days; then reopened the following week on January 22 and were concluded on the evening of January 25. The speakers are each representative men in their religious communions. John R. Rice is a leader in the Fundamentalist Baptist church and an outstandiing exponent of its pecular doctrines. He is also pastor of the Fundamentalist Baptist church, 201 East 10th Street, Dallas, Texas. W. L. Oliphant is a minister in the church of Christ, of ability and of long experience as a debater and preacher. He has met some of the shrewdest representatives of infidelity and modern denominationalism. During the last decade, he has served with satisfaction and distinction as minister of the Oak Cliff church of Christ, Tenth and Van Buren Streets, Dallas, Texas.

The eight sessions of two hours each afforded opportunity for a fullness of discussion on the questions involved. Both speakers had all the advantages of a keen interest among all of the other leaders and students in their respective faiths and full access to authorities that might contribute to the support of their contentions. Several thousand people were in attendance during the discussions which were held in the Fundamentalist Baptist Tabernacle, 201 East 10th Street, Dallas, Texas. Great care was taken by the stenographers accurately to record and transcribe the speeches as delivered, and much credit is due them, and our appreciation is hereby expressed for the thoroughness with which their work was accomplished. Each of the disputants had access to the transcripts of his own speeches for the purpose of correcting

Scanned by TLC

any errors, and each of these gentlemen has acquitted himself well—and in a courteous, patient and satisfactory manner in the reading and examination of these manuscripts before they went to press.

The discussions were so full and thorough on the issues involved, that we feel that the debate is a distinct contribution to the religious literature of our time on the subjects involved, and it is unlikely that a discussion so thorough on these particular lines of religious inquiry will be offered the religious public in any other form during the present generation. We, therefore, ask of the interested and patient reader a very careful perusal of the arguments and discussions unfolded in these pages.

We would not overlook the kind, polite and fair consideration that has been shown us by each of the principals in this great discussion, and we hereby express to them our sincere thanks and appreciation.

This book is sent forth without further preliminary, with the hope and prayer that those who contribute sufficient time to read it may do so carefully, sincerely, and with honesty of purpose and conscientious regard for the responsibilities resting upon us all in the discovery of truth as it is set forth in the Sacred Oracles from heaven, and that they may receive a benefit commensurate with their interest and attention, and the ardous task that has been performed in offering this book to the public.

THE PUBLISHERS.

Scanned by TLC

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	7
Index of Scriptures Cited	553
Index of Topics	567
First Session—7:30 p. m., January 15:	
John R. Rice's First Address—First Proposition	9
W. L. Oliphant's First Address—First Proposition	22
John R. Rice's Second Address—First Proposition	37
W. L. Oliphant's Second Address—First Proposition	52
Second Session—7:30 p. m., January 16:	
John R. Rice's Third Address—First Proposition	65
W. L. Oliphant's Third Address—First Proposition	80
John R. Rice's Fourth Address—First Proposition	92
W. L. Oliphant's Fourth Address—First Proposition	108
Third Session—7:30 p. m., January 17:	
John R. Rice's First Address—Second Proposition	123
W. L. Oliphant's First Address—Second Proposition	139
John R. Rice's Second Address—Second Proposition	158
W. L. Oliphant's Second Address—Second Proposition	175
Fourth Session—7:30 p. m., January 18:	
John R. Rice's Third Address—Second Proposition	192
W. L. Oliphant's Third Address—Second Proposition	209
John R. Rice's Fourth Address—Second Proposition	228
W. L. Oliphant's Fourth Address—Second Proposition	253
Fifth Session—7:30 p. m., January 22:	
W. L. Oliphant's First Address—Third Proposition	272
John R. Rice's First Address—Third Proposition	289
W. L. Oliphant's Second Address—Third Proposition	308
John R. Rice's Second Address—Third Proposition	323

Scanned by TLC

Page

Sixth Session—7:30 p. m., January 23:
W. L. Oliphant's Third Address—Third Proposition_____ 341
John R. Rice's Third Address—Third Proposition_____ 357
W. L. Oliphant's Fourth Address—Third Proposition_____ 375
John R. Rice's Fourth Address—Third Proposition_____ 390

Seventh Session—7:30 p. m., January 24:
W. L. Oliphant's First Address—Fourth Proposition_____ 409
John R. Rice's First Address—Fourth Proposition_____ 420
W. L. Oliphant's Second Address—Fourth Proposition_____ 441
John R. Rice's Second Address—Fourth Proposition_____ 456

Eighth Session—7:30 p. m., January 25:
W. L. Oliphant's Third Address—Fourth Proposition_____ 480
John R. Rice's Third Address—Fourth Proposition_____ 492
W. L. Oliphant's Fourth Address—Fourth Proposition_____ 511
John R. Rice's Fourth Address—Fourth Proposition_____ 529

Scanned by TLC

OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

First Session: 7:30 p. m. January 15, 1935.

FIRST PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ.*

John R. Rice Affirms.
W. L. Oliphant Denies.

Judge Elam, chairman, read the proposition for discussion, the rules of discussion as agreed on by the disputants and introduced John R. Rice, first speaker of the evening.

(First Affirmative Address by John R. Rice.)

Mr. Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and my brethren and friends:

I am glad of this occasion, and I think we will enjoy it. I am already enjoying it, and I am going to enjoy it a great deal more as I get along into it. I like discussions like this as much as I like riding bronchos and playing football, but I have been too busy to do either one for a great while. This is a very serious matter. Brother Oliphant, I know I speak your sentiments when I say I am profoundly moved when great crowds gather to hear you and me speak. I am glad to be here, and I want to welcome all you folks to the tabernacle. I wish we had more room. I wish we had the things that would make you feel most at home.

You are my friends, and I am yours, and I have no thought and very little anxiety but that you will behave yourselves and enjoy yourselves, although we differ about some things. I welcome you here and we want to do what we can to make your stay pleasant. Brother Elam stated

Scanned by TLC

the matter a little bit differently from what I would have stated it. These people are Christians, but they do not like to be called Christians when it refers to a denomination. These are "Church of Christ" people and prefer to be named that way, and as you want that for your name, I will call you that. I do not say the "Church of Christ" in the sense of one great denomination. I prefer to think of you as some of the churches of Christ and not one great denominational organization. I am glad you are here; you are my friends, and I trust we will get a blessing.

I will have to take exception to the way he stated the rest of the question. He said we had on the one side Christians and on the other side Baptists. He left me out of the Christians and I will not agree to that. I will say also that I do not represent Baptists as such. Particularly is that so this week, and you will find that out before we go far, and probably already know it. The subjects discussed this week do not cut along straight lines, separating the denominations, but cut across all denominational lines. I do not come to speak tonight on what Baptists believe on this subject. They will not all agree to what I say. A great many Baptists are Postmillennialists like many of you folks. The same is true of our Brother Oliphant. (I think he deserves to be called Doctor, but I would rather call him brother, and I will, if he does not object.) I think Brother Oliphant will admit he comes to speak primarily of what he thinks the Scriptures teach, not what all "Church of Christ" people think they teach. He will represent a large group, but he will not represent all the members of the "Churches of Christ."

Let us take the question as it is here: "The Scriptures teach that the Jews as a nation will return to Palestine when Christ returns to the earth and then will be converted to Christ."

It is not a discussion as to what Baptists believe or what the "Churches of Christ" teach, but what the Scriptures

Scanned by TLC

teach. Brother Oliphant is older and more experienced than I am. He has debated Atheists, Methodists, and Baptists. He is better looking than I am. I have a high regard for Brother Oliphant, and I believe we will have a higher regard for each other when the debate comes to a close. Happily good looks won't settle this question, and experience won't, and logic won't, and human argument won't. What do the *Scriptures* teach on this subject we are come to debate? What is *their* answer to this subject?

"The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ."

The Jews as a nation will return to Palestine. It does not mean that any dead Jew will have another chance to be saved. I do not know any Baptist who does believe that a sinner who dies unsaved will have another chance after death. The Baptists do not teach that. A dead Jew unsaved is a dead sinner. No, the proposition means that living Jews will go back to Palestine when Christ returns to earth. Not when Christ comes into the air to receive his saints, but at a little later phase of the Second Coming, when Christ returns *to the earth,* the Jews as a nation will be returned to Palestine. We are not to discuss whether Jews will return to Palestine in the Zionist movement. The question has no reference to the taking of Jerusalem by General Allenby in 1917, nor to the Jewish immigration which follows. It does not mean that any other group of men who die unsaved will return to Palestine, but it means that living Jews as a nation as well as the saved dead like Abraham will return to Palestine when Christ returns to the earth. And when Christ returns to the earth, after coming into the air to receive his saints, then the Jews will return to Palestine, and the statement says they will be converted to Christ. I mean that individual Jews who trust in Christ as their Savior will be saved from their sins with the same kind of salvation as Christians have today.

Scanned by TLC

I believe that. I say this return to Palestine and this conversion of the Jews as a nation will occur when Christ returns to the earth.

Now let us open our Bibles at Genesis. I hope you brought your Bibles. If you did not, do so tomorrow night. In the 13th chapter of Genesis, after God called Abraham out of the Ur of Chaldees, he told him he would give him this land for an inheritance forever. Let us look at verses 14, 15, and 16:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward:

For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever.

And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered."

Also verse 17:

"Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."

There are several things which stand out in this Scripture. I hope you will look on. I have no shadow of a doubt but that the Bible is clear on this discussion. Men may read the Bible and study it for themselves and know it if they take it at its face value. We do not have to have others to interpret the Bible for us; we do not need college men nor priests to do this for us. We can read the Bible for ourselves, and we should be honest and believe the Bible. I believe men who love God and are open minded will learn what God says. Now see what God says:

"The land that you walk on, north, south, east, and west, I will give this land to you and your seed, Abram, forever." Get it straight. The promise is of the literal land on which Abram walked—that literal land, Palestine, the Holy Land. God says, "I'll give that land to you and your seed." "I *will*

Scanned by TLC

give it." He didn't say he *had* given it. That land has not been delivered to this day. It was not delivered then. I can show you at this time it was not delivered. He said "I *will* give it to thee." Get it clear in your minds that the promise was future and is future yet. It is a literal land and will be given to Abraham for an everlasting possession.

Notice another word in there—"Forever." "For the land which thou seest, I will give thee forever." The word forever here is a translation of the Hebrew word "Olam," which according to Young's Analytical Concordance is so translated 267 times in the Old Testament. No use to say it is a mis-translation or means something else. It means "forever." "I will give to Abraham and his seed for ever the literal land of Canaan." He did not say heaven; he did not say up in the air somewhere flying around with wings. But he said, quoting verse 17 again:

"Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."

And also in verse 15 of this same chapter we find:

"For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever."

Turn to the 17th chapter of Genesis, verses 7 and 8:

"And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."

How long? *Everlasting*—"an *Everlasting* covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." Verse 8:

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all of the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God."

God is saying here, "I will make an everlasting covenant and I will be their God." The covenant of God will be a special covenant with the Jews. He always was a God to

Scanned by TLC

anybody who trusted him. But to the Jews he says, "I will make a special covenant and it is *everlasting.*"

Notice this: I charge you, you do not find it, you cannot find, my good Brother Oliphant, you will try in vain to find where this was a *conditional* promise made to Abram. Do not misunderstand me, God does have conditional promises, but I remind you that some of the promises of God are not conditional, and this is one of them. He said, "I will give." He did not say "may" nor "but." He said, "I will give this land of Canaan," and he spells it out. "This land you walk on—I will give that land to you and your seed and I will be their God."

The land of Canaan is a sacred land set aside for ever. The people of Israel are a special people and are set apart forever. Notice that this is to be in the future. Turn if you will, to Acts 7th chapter. There Stephen preaches a great sermon, and he says about Abraham, in verse 5:

"And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child."

It was future. God did not give Abram a foot of land, not a foot that he set his foot on, did he give him. He walked on it but did not possess it. God says he died and did not possess it. If you will, turn to Hebrews 11, verses 8 and 9. You will find the same thing there, and it is a great teaching.

"By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.

By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise:

For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

Scanned by TLC

While Abraham lived all his days in a tent, he was going to have a city that God would build.

"Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised."

And reading on, verse 13:

"These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth."

And if they had been mindful they might have returned. They now desire a better country. It was not good enough even in Abraham's day. At one time it flowed with milk and honey and the rose of Sharon was there. But not so any more. Now it is accursed. Once its brooks ran and flowed; now it is a dry area. But Abraham looked for a better country, and when Christ comes back, and Abraham with him, it will be a new and better land. By faith Abraham lived in a land he did not possess. He walked on it, but did not inherit it. By faith Abraham lived; he died in faith that he should dwell in the land of Canaan, for God says, "I will give it to you, the land of Canaan, the land you walk on and see, and I will give it to thee and thy seed for an everlasting possession." He did not promise just the title to it. A man may own a house and have title to it, but not possession; a renter may have possession, but not title. God says, "You do not even have title now, but you will come back and possess it." God says, "You will not only possess it and have title to it, but use it and walk on it."

Another thing: The Jews did not inherit the land immediately. The promise was not yet fulfilled. Abraham went back into Egypt. The same promises are repeated again and again. What are you interested in the Jews for?

Scanned by TLC

Because God is. God was interested in them. If God does not keep his promises to the Jews or to Abraham, he will not to anyone else, and Christians will be lost. If he does not keep his promise, everyone here may go to hell. Coming further long, let us look at the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, verse 15:

"But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee:"

And verses 24 and 25 of this same chapter:

"The Lord shall make the rain of thy land powder and dust; from heaven shall it come down upon thee, until thou be destroyed.

"The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies: thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them: and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth."

What is it? A dispersion of Israel to "all kingdoms of the earth."

Is it Abraham going down to Egypt, or the people going down to Babylon or Assyria? No. Look at verse 62:

"And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude; because thou wouldest not obey the voice of the Lord thy God."

Several verses in there show that many of the Jews will be destroyed. The Bible does not teach, and I am not teaching that any Jew or Gentile will have another chance who dies without Christ. This chapter says, "ye shall be few in number." Now go back to the Abrahamic covenant—"to thy seed." In the New Testament, 3rd chapter and 16th verse of Galatians, we read:

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

Scanned by TLC

What does that mean? He means Christ. I had a man to look it up today. It is the masculine singular noun—one seed, Christ. Coming on we find such as believe in Christ are Abraham's seed, not only outwardly but believing like Abraham. So, many of these Jews shall be scattered out and will die from their sins, but a remnant shall be left and (verse 63 of the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy):

"And it shall come to pass, that as the Lord rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it."

Verse 64:

"And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone."

This is not the Babylonian captivity, but a world wide dispersion. The Jews are now scattered among *all* people, not just in Babylon or Assyria, but in junk yards in Fort Worth and pawn shops in Dallas, and second hand clothing stores on Elm Street.

Verse 65:

"And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind."

The Babylonian captivity was not world wide, and therefore not the prophesied dispersion. The northern kingdom, Israel was carried only to Assyria, later Babylon, as 2 Kings 17:6 tells us.

"In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."

This verse names the river and three of the cities. It

Scanned by TLC

was not world wide. Likewise the captivity of Judah was not to all nations but only to Babylon. Turn to 2 Chronicles 36:20, and you will find that the Scripture says:

"And them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon; where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia."

Here you will find the Scripture says the people were not carried to all the world but to Babylon. The world wide dispersion of Jews did not take place until A. D. 70, forty years after the death of Christ. Now turn to Luke 21:20, and you will see Jesus said so. Here he pictures the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army under Titus.

"And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh."

And reading on through verse 21.

"Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto."

And verse 22 tells us that that is the long threatened day of vengeance for Israel:

"For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled."

And reading on:

"But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people.

And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

What days? Led captive into all nations in the days of vengeance!

When Titus compassed Jerusalem in A. D. 70, these were days of vengeance, for, quoting verses 22 and 23 again:

"For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.

Scanned by TLC

"But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people."

So we find that in A. D. 70, according to Jesus, the curses were fulfilled which were given in Deuteronomy, 28th chapter, verse 15:

"But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee:"

These people were punished for disobeying by being led away captives into all nations. Now we will get along a little further. I could have launched into this and given you lots of Scriptures, scattered here and there, but let us get it the way the Lord does. He says there is an everlasting promise and covenant with the people and it is imperishable and he tells when that will be fulfilled—when Christ returns. In that day it shall be fulfilled. In A. D. 70, Titus tore down the walls and desecrated the temple and Jerusalem was destroyed and the people were scattered to the ends of the earth. That was the prophesied day of vengeance, the dispersion. So there is going to be a regathering. It has not happened yet. Clearly, since the dispersion to all nations did not take place 'till A. D. 70, the regathering is afterward. It will be after A. D. 70. It has not yet occurred.

The dispersion foretold in Deuteronomy chapter 28, to all nations, therefore, was not the Babylonian captivity, but the one after the death of Christ. Jews have not yet returned as a nation to Jerusalem.

Now then, friends, it follows. Let us get this straight. Every last covenant made with the children of Israel will be fulfilled as promised. This Bible is Holy. The country of Palestine is a Holy Land. God says again, "This Holy Land, Canaan is my land. The Holy City Jerusalem is set

Scanned by TLC

apart, and Israel is set apart." The Bible says so. God has made special covenants and promises to these people which have not been fulfilled, but they will be fulfilled.

I want to give Brother Oliphant, my good friend, something to chew on. I will take the 30th chapter of Deuteronomy, the first and second verses. It tells of the children of Israel being brought back:

"And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee,

"And shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul;"

Notice verse 3:

"That then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee."

He did not say "if" or "maybe," but he said "then."

And reading on:

"If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee:

"And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers."

Notice verse 3 again:

"That then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee."

When will he regather them? When the Lord *returns*. I believe it means what it says and says what it means. I did not put it in there, and I take it at its face value. I

Scanned by TLC

believe any person here can risk his soul on any plain promise of the word of God. And here we have God's plain promise that the Lord *"will return"* and gather Israel to Palestine!

The Israelites were dispersed, scattered to all the nations on the earth, not at the captivity in Babylon, but Jesus said, at the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, by Titus, according to Luke 21:20-23. They will be regathered to Palestine, Deuteronomy 30:3 says, "when the Lord returns." He will then gather them, by his angels, as he promised in Matthew 24:30, from the four corners of the earth. That regathering is not the Zionist movement, nor any other human immigration. No partial return of Jews can ever fulfill this plain deliberate promise of God. He says, in Deuteronomy 30:4:

"If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee:"

Notice this: There will be a universal regathering. Not just a few of them, with some staying to run pawn shops, banks, or junk yards, or anything else. No. Here, the hearts of his people will return there and if any then be scattered, he will gather them from the Arctic Circle, the Islands of the sea, Europe, Asia, and from other nations. He will gather them on every hand and from everywhere. God will keep his promise and turn the hearts of his people and regather them and bring them to their own land, and they will possess it, every last living Jew. Those unsaved will be saved when they meet the Lord after they shall be regathered to Palestine.

Chairman: "Your time is up."

All right. God bless us as we study his word!

Scanned by TLC

OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

First Session: 7:30 p. m. January 15. 1935

First Proposition

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies.

(First Negative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Brother Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I suppose it is unnecessary for me to say that I am glad to be here. I accepted the invitation to have part in this discussion, because I wanted to do so, and because I felt that the cause of truth could be served thereby. I am very happy with the opportunity we have before us tonight. I am glad to speak to this great audience of interested men and women and to have the privilege of denying the proposition which is being affirmed by Dr. Rice. If at any time during this debate I shall seem harsh, do not get the idea that I am mad or that I do not like Dr. Rice. He and I are neighbors. I have lived here for more than ten years and expect to make this my home for many more years. Many of the members of this Baptist church are my personal friends. I have not the slightest ill will for them or for my friend who is speaking in the affirmative tonight. While I have only the kindliest feeling for my opponent and for his people, I do not believe some of his doctrines. I shall not allow friendship for him or his people to deter me from my course of opposition against what I believe to

Scanned by TLC

be false doctrine. It is my hope that this may be a discussion of issues and that personalities may have no part in it.

However, I do resent my friend's saying that I am older than he is! If he will examine the records, he will find that he was about five years old when I discovered America! Dr. Rice says this question is not to be settled by logic. Judging from the absence of logic in his first speech, he must be sincere in this statement!

I want, first, to notice the definitions Dr. Rice gives of the terms of his proposition. He says that he does not mean by "Jews as a nation" that all Jews will return to Palestine, but that he means only those who are living when Christ comes again. His proposition, if it referred to all Jews, would charge God with being a respecter of persons. Peter 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" (Acts 10: 34, 35). Peter understood that God makes no difference between Jew and Gentile, that he offers the same blessings to both. But my opponent goes further than making God a respecter of persons as between nations, and charges him with being a respecter of persons even within the Jewish nation. The promises which he read were made to Abraham and his seed. Why should the few Jews who happen to be living at Christ's second coming have such an advantage over the millions of Jews who have died before that time? Are not the Jews who have died, the seed of Abraham as much as those who are alive when Jesus comes? While my opponent is affirming that, "The Jews as a nation will return to Palestine and then be converted to Christ," he now says that he does not mean that " The Jews as a nation will be converted," but that only individual Jews who trust in Christ will be saved. He has surrendered his proposition. Jews who will accept Christ need not wait until Christ's second coming to be converted. They are

Scanned by TLC

now offered the gospel the same as the Gentiles. Dr. Rice says he will tell us in his next speech how the conversion of Israel will come about. We shall wait for this information.

In order that the issue may be clearly seen and that we may determine the meaning of the many passages in the Bible with reference to the Jews, I want to make this statement in the very beginning of the debate: Every promise in the Bible to the Jews, as a nation, comes in one of these three classes: (1). It has been literally fulfilled, or (2). It was conditional, and dependent upon the Jews' complying with certain conditions. The Jews violated these conditions and thus voided the promise, or (3). The promise has a spiritual application, and is fulfilled in Christ during the gospel dispensation. There is not a single promise to the Jews, as a nation, which has not been fulfilled or forfeited by the Jews. I, here and now, agree to show that any promise to national Israel, which my opponent may read, comes in one of these classes. If I do this, his proposition is refuted.

My friend's first argument is based on the promise to Abraham, "For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever" (Genesis 13:15). This promise was from time to time renewed to Abraham's seed. Has it been fulfilled? Let us read Joshua 21:43-45: "And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that he sware unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass."

Everything which God promised to Israel through their fathers was fulfilled. *"There failed not ought of any good thing; all came to pass."* Certainly, no Jew can hope for

Scanned by TLC

the future fulfillment of any promise made prior to the time of Joshua's statement.

But we are told that the eleventh chapter of Hebrews says that Abraham and other Old Testament worthies "received not the promise." Let us see what promise is under consideration. Notice verse 40: "God having provided some better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." The promise here referred to, is one fulfilled through the gospel. " . . . they without us should not be made perfect." Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob offered animal sacrifices. These sacrifices could not take away sin. Moses gave the law. "The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God" (Hebrews 7:19). Christians have a "perfect law of liberty," (James 1:25), a perfect sacrifice, the Lord Jesus Christ. Many Old Testament saints died before this perfect sacrifice was made and this perfect law given. "God having reserved some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." God has a better reward for Abraham and other Old Testament saints than a place in earthly Canaan. "But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city" (Hebrews 11:16). They, along with the saints of all ages, "have in heaven a better and enduring substance" (Hebrews 10:34).

My opponent confuses the three covenants made with Abraham. First, the Land Covenant, Genesis 15:18-21: "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates. The Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites." God fulfilled his part of this covenant when he brought the children of Israel into Canaan, under the

Scanned by TLC

leadership of Joshua and drove all of these enemy tribes out of the land (Joshua 21:43-45).

Second, the Seed Covenant, Genesis 12:1-3: "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." We have this covenant fulfilled in Christ. Galatians 3:6-9: "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." This covenant was spiritual and its blessings belong to the Gentile as much as to the Jew. *"They which are of faith the same are the children of Abraham."* We need not look for a special blessing to the Jews, as a nation, as a provision of this covenant.

Third, the Circumcision Covenant, Genesis 17:9-13: "And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in thy house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must

Scanned by TLC

needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."

You will notice that the circumcision covenant was an "everlasting covenant," but Paul tells us; "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision" (Galatians 5:6). Dr. Rice has a great deal to say about the land covenant being "everlasting." The circumcision covenant was also "everlasting." Does the Doctor believe that circumcision is now in force? If he does, Christ profits him nothing. (Galatians 5:2). If he believes that an "everlasting" circumcision covenant is not now in force, can he not see how an "everlasting" land covenant may not now be operative? Let him tell us about this "everlasting" circumcision covenant, and then we shall have more to say about the "everlasting" land covenant.

Our attention is invited to the 28th and 30th chapters of Deuteronomy. It should not be hard to see that Israel's remaining in the land of Canaan was conditional. The very first verses of the very chapter which my opponent so emphasizes says, "And then shall come to pass, *if* thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth: And all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, *if* thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God" (Deuteronomy 28: 1, 2). Notice the 15th verse: "But it shall come to pass, *if* thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee." Notice the 62nd and 63rd verses: "And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude; because thou wouldest not obey the voice of the Lord thy God. And it shall come to pass, that as the Lord rejoiced over you to do

Scanned by TLC

you good, and to multiply you: so the Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it."

Israel had been promised the land of Canaan as an everlasting possession, but this promise was conditional. God gave them the land and then told them that if they would obey him, they would continue to dwell in the land and be blessed by Jehovah, but that if they were disobedient they would be "destroyed," "brought to nought," "plucked from off the land," "spoiled." And how long would this condition last? Answer: "And thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind grope in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways: and thou shalt be only oppressed and spoiled *ever more*, and no man shall save thee" (Deuteronomy 28: 29).

This is in harmony with God's promise to David, as quoted by David in his speech to Israel. 1 Chronicles 28: 6-9: "And he (God) said unto me, Solomon thy son, he shall build my house and my courts: for I have chosen him to be my son, and I will be his father. Moreover, I will establish his kingdom for ever, *if* he be constant to do my commandments and my judgments, as at this day. Now therefore in the sight of all Israel the congregation of the Lord, and in the audience of our God, keep and seek for all the commandments of the Lord your God: *that ye may possess this good land, and leave it for an inheritance, for your children after you for ever.* 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: if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will *cast thee off for ever.*"

These promises to the Jewish nation were conditional, as is true of any promise made by the Lord to any nation. Notice the rule given by the Lord: "At what instant I

Scanned by TLC

shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it: If it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them" (Jeremiah 18:7-10).

But the scriptures my opponent introduces, even if they teach a regathering of Israel to Palestine, do not fit his proposition. If these scriptures are an unconditional prediction and are yet to be fulfilled, the Jews are to be converted *first* and *then* gathered back to Palestine. Deuteronomy 30: 2, 3: "And shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul; *That then* the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee." So if it could be shown that these passages teach a future restoration of Israel, they do not teach the restoration my friend's proposition calls for. He is affirming that the Jews will return to Palestine and then be converted to Christ. It will be seen that in all of these regatherings of the Jews, they were to be gathered out of nations where they were worshipping idols. In what nations are the Jews today worshipping idols?

Rice says these prophecies could not have been fulfilled before A. D. 70, because the Jews were not until then scattered in all the nations. Let us see about that. On the day of Pentecost, more than thirty years before A. D. 70, there were gathered in Jerusalem "Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven" (Acts 2:5). But my friend says the Jews were never scattered to every nation

Scanned by TLC

under heaven until A. D. 70. Let him tell us how they could have been gathered in Jerusalem from every nation under heaven if this is so.

My friends, since the time Jesus Christ died on the cross, there has been not one particle of difference between a Jew and a Gentile in God's sight. Writing to Gentiles, Paul said: "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For 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, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both (Jew and Gentile) unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off (Gentiles), and to them that were nigh (Jews). For through him we both (Jew and Gentile) have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye (Gentiles) are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God" (Ephesians 2:11-19).

The Apostle says there was once a time when the Jews were near to God, and the Gentiles were "afar off," "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel," "strangers from the covenants of promise," "having no hope and without God in the world," but that Gentiles, that is, those who accept Christ "are made nigh by the blood of Christ," because Christ, by his death, "broke down the middle wall of partition" between Jew and Gentile; that he "abolished in his flesh the enmity" between Jew and Gentile in order to

Scanned by TLC

"make in himself" of the two "one new man," and that he might "reconcile both Jew and Gentile unto God in one body," and that now both Jew and Gentile "have access by one Spirit unto the Father," and Gentiles "are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens" in the "household of God." Since that time, fleshly relationships do not affect one's standing with God.

"Wherefore," says Paul, "henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more" (2 Corinthians 5:16). "Though we have known Christ after the flesh,—that is, as a Jew,—we do not know him that way any more," Paul says. Though Christ was a Jew while in the flesh, he is not now a Jew. He, himself, abolished all fleshly relationships when he died on the cross.

After pointing out that the "middle wall of partition" between Jew and Gentile was broken down at the cross (Ephesians 2), let us see what Paul has to say in the next chapter. "For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward: How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ) which in other ages was not make known unto sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit."

Paul talks of a mystery that was not known in other ages, but that has now been revealed. What is this mystery? Continuing the quotation: "That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." The mystery not known in other ages, but revealed in the Christian age, is that there is no difference between Jews and Gentiles, that they may now be "fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." And the

Scanned by TLC

apostle says that his mission was "to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." So the apostle says, "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

God has but one family, which is his church (Galatians 6:10). That family is composed of both Jews and Gentiles. The Jews were once God's peculiar people; they were "nigh unto him" and were called by his name, but God said, "And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name" (Isaiah 65:15). The Jewish nation, as such, was slain when Christ died on the cross, "when the middle wall of partition" between them and the Gentiles was broken down, and the law was "taken out of the way" (Colossians 2:14). Since then we have such statements as these: "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Romans 10:12, 13). "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Corinthians 12:13). "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. 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" (Galatians 3:26-28). "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in

Scanned by TLC

the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God" (Romans 2:28, 29). "And put no difference between us and them, (Jews and Gentiles) purifying their hearts by faith" (Acts 15:9). "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Corinthians 5:16, 17).

But my friend may say that the condition described in the third chapter of Ephesians and in these other passages prevails only during the "church age." All right, let's see how long the "church age" will last. "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus *throughout all ages, world without end*" (Ephesians 3:21).

Why does my opponent go back to the Old Testament to find all of his proof texts concerning the Jews? Paul says a mystery prevailed then which was not revealed until the Christian dispensation. There must be something wrong with a proposition which must resort for its proof to an age in which the facts concerning it were a mystery. Doctor, why not come to the New Testament where this matter "is now revealed unto his holy prophets and apostles by the Spirit," instead of going back into "other ages" when it "was not made known unto the sons of men?" The Old Testament is to be explained and understood by the New Testament, rather than the new by the old. Some one has said: "In the Old, the new is concealed; in the New, the old is revealed." The Doctor has the cart before the horse!

Sir, there is no unfulfilled promise to the Jews as a nation. They stand on the same basis before God as do all others. You are guilty of the same sin that was committed by false prophets in ages past. You are holding before the Jews a false hope. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you: they make you vain: they speak a vision of their own

Scanned by TLC

heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord. They say still unto them that despise me, the Lord hath said, ye shall have peace; and they say unto every one that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, no evil shall come upon you" (Jeremiah 23:16, 17). These prophets promised Israel peace while in sin. Is not this the very thing my opponent is doing? Of course, he claims the authority of God for his prophecies. But so did the false prophets of ancient Israel. What did God think of them? "Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use their tongues, and say, he saith" (Jeremiah 23:31). It is nothing new for false prophets to say, "he saith," and try to palm their false prophecies and vain promises off as the word of the Lord.

Rice says the disobedient unbelieving Jews from all over the world will be gathered into Palestine and blessed. This was the kind of promise made them by the false prophets of old. But what did God say to sinful Israel? "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" (Jeremiah 23:39, 40). This is the kind of message I am bringing to rebellious Jews.

I want you to notice Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman. John 4:20-24: "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him." The woman understood that according to the Jewish law, Jerusalem was the place to worship. She tried to

Scanned by TLC

array the Samaritan position against the Jewish position, but Jesus informed her that "the hour cometh" when worship depends not on location; that the worship of God is not a matter of place or nation, but that God wants believing obedient people to worship him anywhere and everywhere "in spirit and in truth."

My opponent's position calls for the rehabilitation of Jerusalem and its reestablishment as the divinely appointed place of worship. His position calls for the reinstatement of the material regime of the old law, the very thing Jesus died to abolish (Ephesians 2:15).

My friend says he likes the words of Jesus. So do I. Let us have another statement from the Lord about the Jews. Matthew 21:33-44: "Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it. And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise. But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard and slew him." The husbandmen are the Jews. God sent servant after servant to them; they rejected, spurned, and murdered these servants. Finally, God sent his son; they crucified him. "When the Lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?" asks Jesus. Dr. Rice would answer, "Why, he will gather them back to Palestine, give them peace, and allow them to rule with him on the earth for a thousand years." But let us see the Bible answer: "They

Scanned by TLC

say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons." With this answer, Jesus agrees. Yes, sir; hear him: "Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes? Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him into powder."

The Jewish nation rejected and killed the Son of God, and Jesus says that they will be "miserably destroyed," "ground to powder." Does this look like the happy regathering into Canaan which my opponent's proposition calls for? Israel was given opportunity after opportunity for thousands of years. The climax in opportunities was reached when God sent his Son to them. Jesus said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 15:24).

In tones of mercy, love, and compassion, he pleaded with them to turn away from their rebellious and ungodly attitude and return unto God. They refused. Gazing in tenderest love upon their holy city, the Son of God cried: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate" (Matt. 23:37, 38). Israel made her choice between Jesus and Caesar, shouting: "We have no king but Caesar!" (John 19:15.)

The Jews as a nation killed Christ. Israel committed a national crime for which she has suffered a national penalty—national death. There is now in the sight of God no national Israel. "Her house is left unto her desolate."

Scanned by TLC

OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

First Session: 7:30 p. m. January 15, 1935

FIRST PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(Second Affirmative Address by John R. Rice.)

Honorable Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and Friends:

This is a happy discussion, and I will have to agree to some things Brother Oliphant has said, much as I hate to do that. Brother Oliphant says when he discovered America, I had been here about five years. I did not think him right until I heard him speak, but now I admit he is still behind five years. If he will listen another five years, he will be further along yet. I appreciate his fine courteous spirit and words, and I mean it from my heart. I am glad to have an opponent who speaks as he should, and I am sure Brother Oliphant will. Brother Oliphant is bothered about the Jews, whether they will be dead or alive, and I know he is worried about his speech or he would have heard what I said. This discussion is not whether the unsaved Jews will have another chance after they die, but the Scriptures say the promise will be fulfilled to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob who died without having received the promise. The Scriptures expressly state that saved Jews will be gathered back and living Jews will be regathered and converted. Mark the distinction which is clear. Yes,

Scanned by TLC

I agree that a Jew that died without Christ is lost and lost for good. If there is a man, whether Jew or Gentile, that hears me tonight, I warn you, as I will in nearly every speech, there is no hope of forgiveness or salvation except now. Today is the day of salvation. I don't know that you'll be alive tomorrow. I have never encouraged and I am sure Brother Oliphant did not mean to encourage anyone to go on unsaved.

I stated exactly the opposite of that, that not a single Jew who died without Christ would ever have a chance after death to be saved or to return to Palestine at the Second Coming of Christ. Brother Oliphant said there was not a single promise to Jews as a nation that has not been fulfilled. He only stated that; he did not prove it. We will come back and ask, "Has Abraham inherited the land called Canaan on which he walked and saw, and which God said, 'I'll give you as an everlasting possession'?" Just find the Scripture that tells me. Oh, you say; here is one in Joshua. He meant to, but he was so excited (but I get excited and my tongue gets twisted) that he said Genesis. The Scripture he read was from Joshua 21:43-45. This is the Scripture Brother Oliphant had in mind. Notice what it says:

"And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein.

"And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that he sware unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand.

"There failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass."

He gave to whom? To Israel, the land he swore to give to them. I admit that generation moved to Palestine, but what about Abraham, Jacob, and Isaac, to whom God promised to give the land? Yes, the Jews moved to Palestine. God fulfilled His promise to that generation of Israel, but

Scanned by TLC

that was not the same as His promise to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. But what about the Lord's promise to them? They are heirs of the same promise and they died without having received it. How about that? How about that? You say none of these things failed. That is right. Let us see Deuteronomy 18:15:

"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken;"

That was a promise of the coming Savior. Had that promise been fulfilled? Had the kingdom been established? It had been foretold in Deuteronomy 17:14, 15. Had it been fulfilled? No. It had not been. No, just promised. Then it is foolish to say that all the promises had been fulfilled. But they will be. If God did not fail back there, He will not fail Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob who have not received the promise. All that was promised IN THAT DAY was fulfilled; but that did not mean that He will rue and not fulfill the rest of it. No, he will do what He says. There is not a promise which will not be fulfilled.

But what about Abraham? Brother Oliphant says he would like for me to talk about circumcision. I am sure he would; and the Church Age; but that is not what I am debating. Let's stay on this promised regathering of Israel. He said a lot of fine things. I agree with you on the teaching there in Ephesians, that the Jews and Gentiles will be together. I thoroughly agree that the Lord has made room for me. I agree to what my friend said about there being no distinction in the plan of salvation between the Jews and the Gentiles. He said there was no difference. There is not, as far as salvation is concerned, but in a covenant of a restoration of the nation there IS a difference! Now wait a minute. The same thing is said in the Bible about male and female. Is a man still a man when he is saved? Is a woman still a woman when she is saved? Yes, the same plan of salvation, but still a man,

Scanned by TLC

still a woman! Still a black man, still a white man, still a Gentile, still a Jew; all going to heaven the same way. The Jew, remember, still has the same nose and same curly hair; still the same way of telling if a Jew, the same as before converted.

God does not respect persons. He is the same God and has the same plan of salvation for all. Yes, but a Jew has an everlasting covenant with God about his nation, his land, his kingdom. Still a Jew, still under the covenant; surely God will keep His promises. God does not say, "There is a man I am going to send to Heaven whether he is saved or not." No, Jews must trust in Christ to be saved. And Gentiles must be saved the same way. The middle wall of partition is broken down as far as approaching God is concerned. You are right on that. That both should be together in the church is the "mystery hid in God." But that does not change a plain promise of God. What God promised the Jews is still true. Abraham was saved, but God also promised to give him and his seed the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession. Now let us talk about what God says He would do. He has said that they would possess the land forever. Brother Oliphant did not say anything about that. I would not either if it were not in the Bible. I am not holding out false hope to Israel. I have said, concerning salvation, the same thing about Jew and Gentile. The Jew that dies without Christ will have no second chance. A Jew is saved the same way as anyone else. What must I do to be saved? I want him to learn what to do to be saved. We will get to that later. Which was written first, Genesis or Ephesians? Why not begin where the Old Testament begins? The New Testament does not contradict the Old Testament.

I believe, and I trust all of us believe, the plain word of God, that Jerusalem was destroyed and the Jews scattered out into every nation, as God said it would be, and it happened after the crucifixion of Jesus as the Lord foretold it

Scanned by TLC

in Deuteronomy 28, and in Luke 21:20-22. Now why not believe also the equally plain promise of Deuteronomy 30: verses 1 to 6, which says the Lord will return and gather them back to their own land, and the promises to Abraham that he and his seed shall inherit it for an everlasting possession?

My friend referred to Matthew 21. "He let out his vineyard to others." But that parable does not mean God will not do what He said. Sure He will. The Jews did crucify Christ and got the death penalty and are dead, but Abraham died *not having received the promise.* And God will keep His promise to Abraham and the remnant of his seed, even though multitudes of Jews died in unbelief and were lost. Do you suppose the Lord says, "I will break my promise because the Jews killed Jesus; I'm going to cheat Abraham out of that," because he got mad? No. He will not do that. I grant you that the Jews are under a curse, but God says, "I will bring them out." The Jews are under a curse, and are scattered over the whole world. That is what I have been preaching, but God will bring them out sure. He says this "wicked generation" would be punished and that is what happened, they got killed and scattered to all nations. But that does not make void His plain promise to Abraham and his seed forever. Let us come back to the teaching; let us go back and read it again, and the Lord says to Abraham in Genesis 13:14, 15:

". . . . Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward:

"For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever."

Look at verse 17: *"Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."*

Yes, it's still there. Some one says it is conditional! Show me the condition! Where does it say it is conditional?

Scanned by TLC

"These all died in faith not having received the promise."

He died happy in the promise, and God will do that; God will give it to him. Let us look at some verses in the 17th Chapter of Genesis, verses 7 and 8:

"And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God."

What land? The land of Canaan for an everlasting possession. What is going to happen to Abraham? Was Abraham there when Joshua took the children of Israel into that land? Did Abraham possess it, live on it? The New Testament in Hebrews 11:8-13 says they looked for another city, not for cities then on the land, and Abraham lived in tents all his life and died in faith not having received the promise. Now was that fulfilled? God's promise to Abraham has not yet been fulfilled!

Turn back to Deuteronomy. Oh, how rich this is here. I feel like we are safe on God's word. Let us turn back to Deuteronomy 30, verses 1 and 2:

"And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee,

"And shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul;"

Were they converted? I will tell it as the Scripture tells it. I will put the order as the Lord does, verses 3 to 5:

"That then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee."

Scanned by TLC

You see they were scattered. Fine, as sure as they are scattered, they will be brought back!

"If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee:

"And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers."

I challenge my good Brother Oliphant that if there is any place in the Bible where that has happened, to please tell me. If the Lord has brought out the Jews from all the countries to which they were scattered, please give us the chapter, verse of Scripture, or the history. It is not in the Bible; it is not in history. It never did happen. It has not happened. When will it happen? When the Lord returns! Now verse 6 of Deuteronomy 30:

"And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

When? When God gets them back. In Zechariah 13:6 we are told how a Jew will be saved, after the regathering when he sees the wounds in Christ's hands.

"And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends."

After Jews are regathered, we are told in Zechariah 12:10:

"And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn."

The context shows this will happen at the Second Coming of Christ. And it says in Zechariah 13:1, "In that day," that great day, "There shall be a fountain opened to the

Scanned by TLC

house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness." Now what does it say the Lord God shall circumcise? And what does He say? See Deuteronomy 30:6 again.

"And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

Is that not fine? That is when Jews are returned to their own land and converted! Let me see, I just thought how Brother Oliphant referred to Hebrews, and I am glad he did; I wanted to use it anyway, and he read verse 40. Fine, let us read the verse preceding it. Hebrews 11:39, 40:

"And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise:

"God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."

Surely, surely they have not received the promise. What does it mean by Verse 40? It means when Abraham goes back, I am going too, and you are going too. Brother Oliphant? Yes. Fine, fine. That is what it says. Abraham and other saints died without receiving everlasting possession of their land. But God will take us with them, when He fulfills His promise, if we are children of God, by faith, like Abraham.

That is what it says. They are not going to be made perfect without us. That puts us in—it does not mean it will put them out. They are not going to be made perfect without us. God promised them possession of Canaan. They are going to receive it. They died in faith, but God is going to put us in too. Sure He is. Praise the Lord! Let us see some more about it. Let us look at 2 Samuel, Chapter 7. Let us settle it by the Bible. I am not a logician, that would not prove it, but I can read my Bible.

In 2 Samuel 7:10, we read: *"Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; nei-*

Scanned by TLC

ther shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime,"

What place, and whose place, and where is this place? It is "a place of their own." God says, "I will give it to you." "And no more shall the children of wickedness afflict them." The Lord said to David, "I will make thee a kingly house." Is David now king and does he live already in the land of promise? But they haven't gotten everlasting possession! But the Lord said, "I WILL do it and place them in a land of their own." That promise is future. They were then in the land of promise, but God still says *"I will."* God knew they would be scattered all over the world and they have been. No, we have no Scripture telling us where the Jews have been gathered back.

The Jews are scattered here and yonder with unrest everywhere. My heart goes out to the Jews—people with no Savior, no trust in him and who do not know there is a way of salvation. As Romans 11:25, 26 says they have been blinded "in part—until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." "And so all Israel shall be saved:" Then, God says, "I will appoint a place for Israel, and they will move no more." But they are still moving around. God says the land of Canaan belongs to them. They will be brought back to it. "Neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more."

Now Jews are persecuted. I know a Jew whose father was killed because he was a Jewish Rabbi. I know of a woman whose mother had her teeth kicked out in Russia, because she was a Jew. And the modern world is shocked and horrified at the cruelties to the Jews. There will come a time when they will not be afflicted, but that time has not been fulfilled. But as sure as God keeps his promise, it will be. It will. It will!

How much more time have I?

(Time keeper answers, "You have ten minutes.")

Let us turn to Isaiah, 11th Chapter, verse 1: *"And there*

Scanned by TLG

shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots:"

What is he talking about? He is talking about a tree.

Turn to Daniel the 4th Chapter, and you will see God's symbolic meaning of a tree. You remember Nebuchadnezzar had a vision and saw a watcher come down and cut down the tree? Why? Because Nebuchadnezzar had grown big and mighty and haughty. God says, "Cut it down." Daniel 4:15 says: *"Nevertheless leave the stump of his roots in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts in the grass of the earth:"*

David's kingdom was cut down, too. But out of the stump will grow a sprout. I want you to see the meaning of it. Back to Isaiah 11, again: *"And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots:"*

Jesus is the branch referred to here. Verses 2 to 5 say: *"And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord:*

"And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears:

"But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.

"And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins."

Some one says, Has that happened? No. The other verses show it has not. Read on: *"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.*

Scanned by TLC

"And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.

"And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den."

That was verses 6 to 8. Somebody says this has already happened. Show me the wolf dwelling with the lamb, the leopard lying down with the kid, the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child leading them! I read from a Holiness paper today about a woman who said that these animals all represented people. The lion means people that roar; the wolf represents the false teachers; the bear represents the nature that tries to crush the life out of people, for example, Papal Rome tried to crush the life out of Christianity; and the cow represents a nature that is always lagging behind and must be driven to church! That is the way some people explain away the Bible! But the Bible means what it says and says what it means. Honest, common Christians can understand the Bible if they believe it. God has not hidden these things. Smart folks imagine too much sometimes. It says what it means, and means what it says! Listen, again I ask you, does the wolf dwell with the lamb, the leopard lie down with the kid, the calf and the young lion feed together? Has that happened yet? No, it has not; the lions I have known do not eat straw. Read again: *"And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den.*

"They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

What mountain? The Holy Mountain Zion; the hill on which the city Jerusalem is built: *". . . . . For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."*

Scanned by TLC

Has that happened yet? No! And in that day, in that very day when God changes the nature of the lion to eat straw and the child is safe playing on the hole of the asp, shall the Jews be gathered again, for the next verses say: *"And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious.*

"And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea" (Vs. 10 and 11).

It has not happened, but it is going to happen: *"And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth."*

Yes, it is going to happen, but has not yet. Let us open our hearts; let us take what is in the Bible. If I did not know some things, I would want to learn them. Now is the time. I am glad I do not come to represent the Baptist denomination. I got a letter today from a man which stated, "You don't hold with the rest of the Baptists, and you should take down your sign." I baptize like John the Baptist; that is, immersion, and I am going to wear the name Baptist; but as far as I am concerned, I do not represent Baptists, do not represent a denomination or creed, but I do come to represent the Scriptures. I have letters, and many of them from "Churches of Christ" in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio, where your preachers have said, "I believe what you said." Read the little booklet, the statements of what Alexander Campbell and other "Church of Christ" leaders say. That means they will affirm what I am affirming and deny what Brother Oliphant teaches and would not take his position on it. You read your own book. The question is not what churches of Christ teach or

Scanned by TLC

what Baptist churches believe. I am representing what God says. It is not what man says, that does not matter.

("Four and a half minutes," the time keeper said.)

Let us get this; here it is in Isaiah 11:11: *"And it shall come to pass in that day"*—what day? When? *"In THAT day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea."*

Verse 12: *"And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth."*

God is going to regather this people. He has promised again and again and he will do what he said he would do. Isaiah 14:1 says the same thing again: *"For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land; and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob."*

That is where we will get in. Brother Oliphant, they did not understand that, but we are going to. Let me show you something; turn to Jeremiah 33:15. I have just one minute: *"In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land."*

And verse 14, just before it, says: *"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah."*

Where? In heaven. No. "In the land." Abraham and his seed—they will inherit the land of Canaan; the land Abraham walked on and saw, and others by faith in Christ will inherit that land in those days.

Now let us come on a little further. Let me read the rest of this passage, verses 16 to 22: *"In those days shall*

Scanned by TLC

Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness.

"For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel;

"Neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually.

"And the word of the Lord came unto Jeremiah, saying,

"Thus saith the Lord; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; Then may also my covenant by broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers.

"As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me."

Now, verse 23 and on through to the end of the chapter.

"Moreover the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying,

"Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, The two families which the Lord hath chosen, he hath even cast them off? thus they have despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them."

Consider the two families, Israel and Judah. What does it say about it, Brother Oliphant? *Thus saith the Lord: If my covenant be not with day and night and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth;*

"Then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them." Yes, he will.

What does God say about his covenant, Brother Oliphant? He says he will have mercy on them. Now I want

Scanned by TLC

you to come tomorrow night prayerfully. I appreciate your spirit. I stay by the literal interpretation of the Word of the Lord. I take the New Testament, but the Old is good. And that part about Israel being gathered and converted has not been fulfilled.

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

God bless you—we are just beginning to get warmed up.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

First Session: 7:30 p. m. January 15, 1935

FIRST PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(Second Negative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Just here I want to make a statement which has nothing whatever to do with the proposition under discussion. It is, however, in reply to something my opponent said. He says he is a Baptist, because John was a Baptist. Then he follows John. I am a Christian, because I follow Christ. The term Christian means a follower of Christ or one who belongs to Christ. As much as I should like to have fellowship with Dr. Rice, I still prefer to follow the Christ. I challenge my friend to read about the Baptist Church in the Bible. I challenge him to find a single member of any kind of a Baptist Church in all the word of God. John was called "the Baptist" because he baptized. That is what the term means. So, in fact, my opponent names his church after the ordinance of baptism, a thing which he says is not necessary to salvation. Before this debate is over, he will probably accuse me of thinking too much of baptism. Just remember that I do not think enough of it to wear the name of the institution, instead of the name of my Lord! All this has nothing to do with the proposition under discussion, so I won't charge you anything for it!

Scanned by TLC

My opponent has surrendered his proposition. Remember he is affirming, "The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation Will Return to Palestine When Christ Returns to the Earth and then Will Be Converted to Christ." He now comes forth and boldly declares that there is no salvation for the Jew or anyone else except in this age: "Today is the day of salvation." That's exactly what I believe, but remember that his proposition says that after Christ comes —after the close of this age—"The Jews as a nation will be converted to Christ." Now he tells us that there is no salvation for anyone except during this age. Away goes his conversion of national Israel after the coming of Christ!

Dr. Rice says that all the promises to the Jews could not have been fulfilled at the time Joshua said, "There failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass" (Joshua 21:45). Because, says he, Israel was promised a Saviour, and that promise had not been fulfilled. The promise of Christ was not to the Jews exclusively, but was a promise to the whole world. Why, the promise of the Saviour was made before there was a Jew in the world! Remember, we are talking about promises to the Jews as a nation.

He says he agrees with me and the Apostle Paul that there is no difference between the Jew and the Gentile during the Church Age. Well, I thank the gentleman for his agreeableness. Will he also agree with Paul, when he says, "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end"? (Ephesians 3:21.) Paul says the church will last throughout all ages—this and every other age—and, lest that should not be plain enough, he adds, "world without end."

(1) Paul and Dr. Rice say there is no difference between the Jew and the Gentile in the Church Age. (2) Paul says the church will last throughout all ages, world without end. (3) Therefore, there will never be any difference between Jew and Gentile in this or any other age,

Scanned by TLC

world without end! There is no need of continuing this discussion. My friend has unequivocally surrendered his proposition.

But the Doctor says he is going back to Palestine and that I am going back too. His English is getting almost as bad as his religion. How can a man "go back" where he has never been? Why, Doctor, we Gentiles were never in the land of Canaan. How can we go back? No, I am not expecting to go back to Jerusalem, but like Abel, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham, I confess that I am "a stranger and a pilgrim on the earth," and that "I desire a better country, that is, an heavenly" (Hebrews 11:13-16).

I have followed the admonition of the apostle Paul: "Seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth" (Colossians 3:1, 2). I beg my friend to give up his vain hope of a spot of ground in old earthly Canaan, believe and obey the Lord, and go with me and the rest of God's people to the heavenly Canaan.

My friend says that Abraham was looking for a city in Palestine and that God will build him a city when Christ comes back to the earth. But Paul says God has already prepared the city (Heb. 11:16). If Abraham is to receive an earthly city, it had already been built when the book of Hebrews was written.

My opponent and his people talk long and loud about salvation by faith. But his proposition does away with salvation by faith. Remember that according to his proposition, the Jews are to be converted after Christ comes. When Christ comes, "Every eye shall see him" (Revelations 1:7). Any conversion which takes place then will not be by faith, but by sight. Listen to Paul: "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (For we walk by faith, not by sight:) We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with

Scanned by TLC

the Lord" (2 Corinthians 5:6-8). To be present with the Lord is to be absent from the body. My opponent's Jews who are converted after Christ comes will be out of their bodies. Notice also that it is when we are in our bodies and absent from the Lord that we walk by faith. But my friend says he does not believe in two different plans of salvation —one for the Jew and one for the Gentiles, but that both Jew and Gentile are converted alike. He certainly has, according to his proposition, a different plan for the conversion of the Jew! Or does he believe that none of us are saved by faith?

Next, my friend introduces the 11th chapter of Isaiah. I do not care to spend a great deal of time on these various Old Testament prophecies concerning the Jews. I have shown that they are conditional, or that they have already been fulfilled; but I do want to notice Isaiah 11. Rice reads: "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox," and then exclaims: "When it says lion, it it means lion; when it says lamb, it means lamb; when it says cow, it means cow!" How does he know? He had just finished reading from the first verse of the very same chapter where it says, "a Branch shall grow out of his roots," and said the Branch was Christ. He read from the 4th chapter of Daniel about a tree, and said that a tree did not mean a tree. How does the Doctor know that a tree doesn't mean a tree and a Branch does not mean a branch, but a cow means a cow, and a lion a lion? And how does he know that the first verse of Isaiah 11 is figurative, but that the sixth verse is literal? "Oh, Consistency, where art thou?"

He insists that "wolf," "lamb," "kid," "calf," etc., must be literal, because the Bible "means what it says and says

Scanned by TLC

what it means!" I suppose he thinks that when Jesus referred to Herod as a "fox" (Luke 13:32), he meant that Herod was literally a four-footed animal! When Paul warned the Ephesian elders about "grievous wolves that would enter in among them, not sparing the flock" (Acts 20:29), he was afraid coyotes would eat up the church! And when he told the elders to protect the flock from these "wolves," he meant for them to get their guns and start wolf hunting!

When Jesus said, regarding the Lord's supper, "This is my body and This is my blood," he was teaching the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation! Are the bread and the fruit of the vine the actual, literal body and blood of Christ, Doctor? All of his talk about taking the Bible at what it says, is purely for effect. Does he not know that there are figures of speech in the Bible, and that when the Bible uses a figure of speech, it must be believed as a figure of speech?

But let's notice the 11th chapter of Isaiah a little further. The 9th verse says, "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." The passage says nothing about universal peace, but has reference to God's "holy mountain." From Isaiah 2:1-4 and Hebrews 12:22, 23, we learn that God's "holy mountain" is his church. In the latter reference "mount Sion," "city of the living God," "the heavenly Jerusalem," and the "general assembly of the church of the first born" are used interchangeably. Has the knowledge of the Lord ever gone to the whole world? Hear Paul: "If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven . . . . " (Colossians 1:23). Again, "But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth,

Scanned by TLC

and their words unto the ends of the world" (Romans 10:18).

Isaiah 11:10 says: "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious." Do the Gentiles seek Christ now? If so, the prophecy of Isaiah 11 has been fulfilled? Remember, Isaiah says that "the wolf and lion shall dwell together," "the leopard shall lie down with the kid," "the cow and the bear shall feed together," etc.—"*in that day* the Gentiles will seek Christ."

We are next asked to consider the 33rd chapter of Jeremiah. I ask the honest listeners to read the 31st, 32nd, 33rd, and 34th chapters of Jeremiah and see if they teach a future restoration of Israel.

Beginning with the 31st verse of the 31st chapter, reading through the 34th verse: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

In Hebrews 8:6-12, Paul quotes this prophecy from Jeremiah and says it is fulfilled in the Christian dispensation. We cannot look for it to be fulfilled when Christ comes for

Scanned by TLC

we are definitely told by the apostle that we are now living under the new covenant predicted in Jeremiah 31.

My friend is irritated because I want him to talk about circumcision, and says he simply won't do it! Well, don't blame him too much. Possibly I would be afraid of the question myself if I were in his position. Here is the point: He says Israel must yet dwell in Canaan, because the land was given to them in an everlasting covenant; but circumcision was also given in an everlasting covenant (Genesis 17). Now my question is this: If the circumcision of an "everlasting covenant" can cease, cannot the dwelling in the land of an "everlasting covenant" also cease? The facts are: Fleshly circumcision has been superseded by the circumcision of the heart (Rom. 2:29). Fleshly Israel has been superseded by spiritual Israel (Rom. 9:6-8). And the earthly Jerusalem has been superseded by the "heavenly Jerusalem" (Hebrews 12:22). I think I have covered, at least in a general way, all that my opponent has said; if not, I shall have plenty of time tomorrow evening.

My argument from the 4th chapter of John stands. My friend let it alone. That is a good thing for one to do in your position, Doctor.

I want to again call your attention to the parable of the householder and the vineyard (Matthew 21:33-44). The householder (God) planted a vineyard and let it out to husbandmen (Jews). The husbandmen (Jews) "took God's servants and beat one and killed another and stoned another." Finally God sent them his son saying, "They will reverence my son." But the Jews slew the son. Jesus asks, "When the Lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto these wicked husbandmen (Jews)? They answer: "He will miserably destroy them and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen." Jesus agrees with this and adds that "they will be ground to powder."

Scanned by TLC

My opponent says the Jews will be taken back to Palestine and given a home. Jesus says, "They will be destroyed" —"ground to powder." Just another of the differences between Doctor Rice and the Lord! Until this good moment my argument on Matthew 21 stands untouched.

Again, let us notice 1 Chronicles 28:8: "Now therefore in the sight of all Israel the congregation of the Lord, and in the audience of our God, keep and seek for all the commandments of the Lord your God; that ye may possess this good land, and leave it for an inheritance for your children after you for ever." Israel's possessing the land and their leaving it for an inheritance for their children for ever was conditioned upon their keeping and seeking for all the commandments of the Lord. This condition they did not keep. Going down to the 9th verse, we read: "If you seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever." How long will Israel be cast off? Answer: "For ever." Doctor, how long is "for ever"?

As further evidence that the promise to the Jews was conditional, I invite your attention to the 4th chapter of Deuteronomy. This is from Moses' charge which he delivered to Israel just before he went to Nebo's height to die. Verse 20 says, "But the Lord hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day." The purpose of Israel's being brought out of Egypt and into Canaan was that they might be unto God "a people of inheritance." But was their inheritance an unconditional one? Listen to Moses: "I must die in this land, I must not go over Jordan: but ye shall go over, and possess that good land. Take heed unto yourselves, lest ye forget the covenant of the Lord your God, which he made with you . . . ." (Verses 22, 23). If Israel remains true to God, they shall remain in the land forever, but if they forget him and make graven images and corrupt themselves, what will happen

Scanned by TLC

to them? "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed" (Verse 26).

My friends, could language be plainer? If Israel is faithful to God in the land of their inheritance, they shall keep it as an everlasting possession, but if they are unfaithful to God, they shall *"utterly be destroyed."* They were unfaithful, and so our Lord, in harmony with Joshua's prediction, said they would be "destroyed," "ground to powder."

I next ask you to consider with me the 19th chapter of Jeremiah. "Thus saith the Lord, Go and get a potter's earthen bottle, and take of the ancients of the people, and of the ancients of the priests; And go forth unto the valley of the son of Hinnom, which is by the entry of the east gate, and proclaim there the words that I shall tell thee, And say, Hear ye the word of the Lord, O kings of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem; Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, the which whosoever heareth, his ears shall tingle" (Verses 1-3). This is addressed to the kings of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. God told Jeremiah to say, "Behold I will bring evil upon this place," and then he tells the prophet to demonstrate to the people of Jerusalem that which is to happen to them. "Then shalt thou break the bottle in the sight of the men that go with thee, And shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be made whole again" (Verses 10, 11).

What is to be broken? *"This people and this city."* (*Jerusalem and the Jews.*) How are they to be broken? *"As one breaketh a potter's vessel that cannot be made whole again."* Could anything be plainer? I really believe my

Scanned by TLC

opponent can understand this language! God will break this people—the Jews—so that they *"cannot be made whole again."* If the Doctor gets the Jewish nation whole again, he will do something that God says cannot be done!

In the 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters of Romans, Paul discusses the present condition of the Jew. "For I could wish that myself were aloof from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh" (Verse 3). Paul could have saved himself all this heaviness and sorrow of heart if he had only known that the whole nation Israel would finally be saved! But the Apostle thought that their being fleshly descendants of Abraham would avail them nothing. "Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed" (Verses 7, 8).

The Apostle reasons that the Gentiles who have accepted Christ are saved and that the Jews as a nation have not attained "to the law of righteousness." Why? "Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumblingstone; As it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed" (Verses 30-33).

Going into the 10th chapter, Paul tells us his "heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved" (Verse 1). The Apostle did not understand that the whole nation would be gathered into Palestine and converted to Christ. How much worry my friend Rice could have saved the Apostle Paul had he been there! Throughout this chapter Paul reasons that both Jew and Gentile must be saved on the same basis, that is, through Christ. "For," says he, "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich

Scanned by TLC

unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Verses 12, 13).

In the beginning of the 11th chapter, he exclaims: "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 . . . ." (Verses 1, 2). Not all of the Israelites were lost. Why, Paul himself is an Israelite. "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace" (Verse 5). But this remnant, including the Apostle Paul, are saved through Christ and not on the basis of any promise made to national Israel. "And so all Israel shall be saved" (Verse 26). That is, through Christ. All Jews who are saved, as well as all Gentiles, are saved in the same manner. God has not cast off the Jews; that is, though they have broken his covenant with them and have brought upon themselves destruction as a nation, they are not so cast off that they cannot be saved. They have the same opportunity as the Gentiles. The promises to Abraham and his seed are fulfilled in Christ. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. 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" (Galatians 3:26-29). The promise is not to the Jewish nation, that is, to the fleshly descendants of Abraham, but every Christian, every person in Christ is of the seed of Abraham and "an heir according to the promise."

I challenge my opponent to show a single difference existing now between Jew and Gentile, or that will ever exist between them.

In regard to Galatians 3:28, Dr. Rice says that the distinction between male and female is also eliminated, and wants to know if they do not still remain male and female?

Scanned by TLC

Certainly, but there is no difference in their standing before God. The reward of both male and female is the same, just as the reward of the Jew and the Greek is the same. If my friend were affirming that God will one day gather all of the men into Palestine and convert them, leaving out the women, I should insist that this passage proves his position untrue. If the passage teaches anything at all, it teaches that there is absolutely no distinction between male and female, bond and free, Jew and Greek before God, that their standing before him and their reward is the same. God "puts no difference" between Jew and Gentile. "One Lord is over all." They are "fellow citizens of the same body," "fellow heirs, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel" (Ephesians 3:6).

But what has my friend said about my argument based on Ephesians 2nd and 3rd chapters? Doctor, why not tell us about these scriptures?

How much time have I?

Moderator: About a minute.

In that minute I want to call your attention to a few passages of scripture which I shall use as a foundation for an argument to be made tomorrow night. Salvation is in Christ (2 Timothy 2:10). "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." Paul endures all things in order that the Jews may "also"—along with the Gentiles—obtain the salvation "which is in Christ Jesus."

Redemption is in Christ (Colossians 1:13, 14). "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." All spiritual blessings are in Christ (Ephesians 1:3). "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." All of God's promises are in

Scanned by TLC

Christ (2 Corinthians 1:20). "For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him, Amen, unto the glory of God by us."

Moderator: Time is up.

Dr. Rice: Finish it up; we have plenty of time.

Dr. Oliphant: I will not run over my time. It is a pretty good idea to close on time. I might want as much as ten minutes to finish this argument. I thank you for your splendid attention. I want to urge, along with my friend, Dr. Rice, that you come back tomorrow night.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE REBATE

Second Session: 7:30 p. m., January 16, 1935

FIRST PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(First Affirmative Address by John R. Rice.)

Brother Elam, Moderator speaks:

Friends, I take it there are a good number of people here tonight that were not here last night, and for that reason it will be necessary to make announcements concerning the debate. A good number were here last night, and I am sure they enjoyed the debate. I want to say for the speakers, that they conducted themselves as gentlemen and Christians, and we got a great deal out of their speeches and will continue to do that. You probably are acquainted with the speakers. Tonight Brother John R. Rice of this congregation, will speak in the affirmative, and Brother W. L. Oliphant, Pastor of the Oak Cliff Church of Christ, will speak in the negative. The question for discussion is: *"The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ."*

Brother Rice says that will be true; Brother Oliphant says it will not be true, and each will try to convince you he is right. We, laymen, usually have to sit and listen to the preacher and have to take what he says as a fact, but these

Scanned by TLC

preachers get up here and deny what the other fellow says. We ought to get a lot out of that, and I am sure we will. Brother Rice will speak thirty minutes affirming the proposition; the next thirty minutes will be taken up by Brother Oliphant who will deny. Then Brother Rice will take the next thirty minutes, then Brother Oliphant the next thirty minutes.

Affirmative: Brother Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and this congregation: I am glad to be with you again tonight. I am still enjoying myself. Last night Dr. Oliphant was saying, "We have lots of time." I offered to give him more, but he said that would be setting a precedent. I don't blame him; I thought he needed some more. I enjoy the way you listen, but am sorry more of you did not bring your Bibles. I hope you will tomorrow night.

Bring your Bibles! You will say, "I will learn," but you will not learn as much as if you brought your Bibles. How many of you have your Bibles? All right, let's see your hands. Now the rest of you bring them tomorrow. Your interest has been keen, and on the whole you have been remarkably courteous in the way you have listened. Our interests at a time like this are aroused so high, we feel that we must discuss the matter with the ones nearest us, but they might want to listen; so I am sure you will be as quiet as you can. You are courteous and respectful, and I appreciate that. Make it so every time you are here. We are crowded. I wish we had more room. I say too, that I appreciate Dr. Oliphant's attitude; he has been very kind, and I am sure he will continue to be. Now just briefly, let me remind you of some things that I proved last night. The question for debate has been read:

"The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation Will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ."

"The Jews as a nation" does not mean dead Jews who are unconverted. It does not mean all the Jews who have

Scanned by TLC

ever lived, but it does mean a group of Jews who will be brought back and put in Palestine, and these will be converted, each individually as persons are converted today, "and so all Israel shall be saved." When Christ returns to the earth, which according to the Scriptures is future, he will stand on the mount of Olives. Last night we had a little list of Scriptures. At that time I showed from Genesis 13, verses 14, 15, 16 and 17 that the Lord said to Abraham:

". . . . Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward:

For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever.

"And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered.

"Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."

That was an unconditional promise. I challenged Brother Oliphant last night and he could not find a verse in the Bible which states a single condition for Abraham to fulfill to obtain that promise. The condition isn't there. It is an unconditional promise to Abraham and his seed. It is future. It did not say, "I have," but "I will." He said, "It shall be yours forever." It is to be an everlasting possession. In Genesis 17, verses 6-8:

"And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.

"And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.

"And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God."

Scanned by TLC

In that Scripture he specifically named the land Canaan, not heaven, but Canaan. He said, "This land I will give to thee and thy seed. It shall be given to thee for an everlasting possession. I will make a covenant with thee and thy seed." So the Lord plainly told Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in Genesis, 26th and 28th chapters, received the same promise again. And in Acts 7:5, Stephen said:

"And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child."

"Not even so much of that land as to put his foot on,"—it was promised, but not yet delivered. In Hebrews 11th chapter, the Lord particularly mentioned Abraham, with Jacob, and Isaac as joint heirs with him of the same promise. "These all died in faith, not having received the promises but having seen them afar off." That Scripture said that they looked for a city whose builder and maker is God, and they looked for another country, a better country. And in Hebrews 11:39 and 40:

"And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise:

"God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."

Again we are told they did not receive the promise, and at the time the book of Hebrews was written, they had not received the promise yet, though they died in faith. But that was God's plan. " . . . . That they without us should not be made perfect." The promise was not to be fulfilled, till our day, God said. That part was not even challenged last night, and again I dare, no, I mean challenge, my good friend to touch these covenants of Abraham. Look at it to see the words if it gives the conditions. He says it was conditional. Let us see if it was. Did Abraham break his part of it and break the covenant? He says so. If so, give me the verse which says this. Does he deny

Scanned by TLC

that God said the very land which Abraham saw and walked on would be inherited for an everlasting possession?

And another thing: Notice the possession is to be "forever," and the word "forever" is a Hebrew word "Olam," used again and again of the "everlasting mercy of God," (Psalms 100:5) and for "the everlasting God" (Gen. 21: 33, and Isa. 40:28), and such terms as that. All right, that much has not been denied.

We read Deuteronomy 28:15-68, particularly in verses 25 and 64, wherein was said:

"The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies: thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them: and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth." (vs. 25.)

"And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone." (vs. 64.)

The Lord said he would, and we have found that he did scatter the Jews to all lands of the earth, not to Babylon only; but he particularly said that a few should be left and persecuted and scattered.

Then read Luke 21:20-24:

"And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh.

"Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto.

"For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.

"But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people.

"And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

Scanned by TLC

Here the Lord Jesus said this dispersion should occur at a time when Jerusalem would be compassed with armies and that would be the day of vengeance, the day when all things written by the prophets must be fulfilled. "Ye shall be carried captive into all nations." It was fulfilled in A. D. 70, this dispersion, promised in Deuteronomy 28th chapter, of Israel to all the world. They have not yet been restored. I remind you again Brother Oliphant did not challenge that. I ask him again, does he deny that Jesus expressly said that this was the day of vengeance mentioned by the prophets? This was the day of wrath talked about by the prophets. I ask him if he denies that particular statement that the Jews should be carried to all nations?

Another thing, in Deuteronomy 30:1-5 the Lord plainly says, not "if," but "when" their hearts are turned again to the Lord, that then

". . . . It shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee,

"And shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul;

"That then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee.

"If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee:

"And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers."

All right, when? After the dispersion in A. D. 70. Jesus said the regathering is to be after that. That regathering

Scanned by TLC

has not yet taken place. In Deuteronomy 30:3, we saw that would happen when the Lord returns. "The Lord thy God shall RETURN and gather thee out of all countries."

Brother Oliphant said last night that I can't go back to Palestine, can't return because I had not been there. No, I will not return there, but Jesus will "return" and gather the Jews. This can't refer to Jesus' first coming the first time. It must be the second time when he returns and gathers them from all the countries. In the 6th verse of Deuteronomy 30, we read:

"And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

There is the conversion of the Jews after they return to Palestine. Also I called attention last night to the 11th chapter of Isaiah. I will notice some things, and then I have a confession to make. "An honest confession is good for the soul." Remember in the 11th chapter we showed a branch coming up out of the roots, and there continues a discussion of the reign of Christ Jesus, the Branch from the root of Jesse, a sprout from the stump of the tree of David. Verse 1 says:

"And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots:"

And the Scripture continues about how He would rule and reign:

"And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord;

And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord; and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears:"

Verse 4:

"But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall

Scanned by TLC

smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked."

Then I read and called attention to the passage which says: (verses 6-9)

"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.

And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.

And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den.

They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

Now here is my confession: It wasn't necessary to my argument to prove that part was literal as far as that was concerned, but I asked Brother Oliphant to go on record and state as to whether the animals were literal or not. The lion, bear, wolf, cow, leopard, serpent, and child. I said that when it says lion, it means lion; and bear, it means bear; and wolf, it means wolf; and cow, it means cow; and so on all the way through. The truth of the matter is, I wanted Brother Oliphant to express himself. Here were two reasons why:

I have here a thing which came yesterday. (I just happened to see it.) It is a Holiness woman's account of the same chapter. I knew my brother—I have dealt with these Postmillennialists so long—I was certain he would take exactly the same view. I egged him on. I plead guilty. I did it on purpose. This account is written by Mrs. W. H. Kilpatrick for the Gospel Trumpet which is the weekly journal of "The Holiness Church of God." Listen to what she said, this Holiness woman preacher:

"Therefore, since animals are used to represent the

Scanned by TLC

characters of men, what kind of character do the wolf, the lion, the cow, the bear, the ox, and the lamb represent in Isaiah 11?

"The wolf represents the false teachers. The bear represents the nature that tries to crush the life out of people; for example, Papal Rome tried to crush the life out of Christianity. The cow represents a nature that is always lagging behind, indifferent, no ambition, careless, must be driven to attend religious services, etc. The lion represents a nature that roars and threatens those who get saved, especially the weaker ones. An ox represents a minister of God."

How many cows do you have in your congregation, Brother Oliphant? Brother Oliphant, I have dealt with these Postmillennialists before. They try to explain away the prophecies. I knew he would do it; I knew he was just bound to do it, and he did! That is one of the reasons. Another reason is that, Brother Oliphant, I have been trying and trying to get you to say if you will take the Bible at its face value. I was determined he was going to do it. It *is* so or it *ain't* so! It means what it says or it doesn't! The fact of the business is, right here is the heart of this debate. I would be willing to leave the Lord to do with the Jews what he wishes, if all here would agree to take the Bible at plain face value, without explaining it away, then all would expect him to do just what he promised to do. The Bible is so, and it can be understood. It does not take a pope, or priest, or college man, to understand the Bible. You can go to God with an humble, prayerful heart and get it yourself. You can understand the Bible; it does mean what it says. I maintain you don't have to have a college education to understand it; you don't have to listen to somebody's wise-cracks.

The full depths of some of the Scriptures none of us understand, and we will not until we awake in his likeness. But it can be understood. You may be sure it was written

Scanned by TLC

to be understood. You bring your cup and you can get it full if you come with a prayerful, unbiased mind willing to do the will of God. So I fully confess I wanted to get him to say (the fact of the business is, this did not particularly make any difference to this debate) whether this is to be fulfilled literally or not, Brother Oliphant. Whether this bear was a bear or some kind of a guy trying to squeeze or crush the life out of others, or whether the cow is somebody you have to drive along to get to come to religious services, or whether the ox is a preacher—it hasn't happened yet. This Scripture has not been fulfilled! Jesus has not returned to Palestine as God plainly promised.

Some folks say that these animals represent different classes or races, or somebody else says the bear represents Russia, and the lion is England. Somebody else says that the lion is capital and the lamb represents labor. I don't care what you say; it has not happened yet. Labor and capital do not lie down together; but if the lion is England, England does not eat straw like an ox; if the wolf is a false teacher, nevertheless a lamb is not safe with it. It has not happened yet! Now I challenge Brother Oliphant to get off some wise-cracks to explain this:

" . . . *For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.*"

Let us see if it is true. It does not take wise-cracks to explain the Bible. Is that so today? I maintain that no matter what it means, whether the wolf means false teachers, Russia, England, capital and labor, it hasn't happened yet. I confess to the trick all right. I want people to come out and say exactly what they believe, Brother Oliphant. I want Brother Oliphant to say whether he will believe it. He won't own it. I've tried to get him on the Abrahamic Covenant. He had lots of time to make wise-cracks about the Baptists; that is all right, I have been on them also. But did God break his word to Abraham, who "died in faith, not having received the promises"?

He asked me some questions about circumcision and the

Scanned by TLC

church age, but he did not say whether it was a literal land of Canaan and whether God would keep his promise. He said it was conditional but did not say whether Abraham broke it or not. God said, "Abraham died in faith, not having received the promises . . ." He said Abraham could see it afar off, but Brother Oliphant did not say whether he would get it or not. Come, be really square and face these Scriptures. It is best to see what the Lord said, and did he mean what he said? Let's be quiet. I appreciate your interest.

Last night when "Herod that fox" was mentioned, Brother Oliphant said, "Dr. Rice is going to take that literally." He said in the case of Daniel the fourth chapter, "How did he know it was a tree?" "How did he know it was a fox?" About wolves as false teachers, he said, "How are you going to know whether it means that or not? We will have to ask Dr. Rice."

Now, Brother Oliphant, you asked me whether it meant a four-legged fox or not? I can tell you. In the same verse Jesus told us that he meant King Herod. No mystery about it. That is not so hard to do. If you find in the Scriptures where a bear means Russia and the cow is someone you have to drive to church, I will take it. The fact of the business is—don't let anybody fool you—this business of taking the Bible at its face value—it is not so hard to take. There is no doubt about that. I know that the tree represented something, and that tree, the reason I know it represents something, is because Daniel said so. Where the Bible uses symbols it explains them. Otherwise we are to take the Bible at face value as an honest Book. So if there is any reproach for taking the Bible at face value, heap it on me. It says what it means and means what it says. You asked about the lion; the Bible tells us what it means. "That old serpent" in Revelation; how do you know that was the devil? Because it says so. The Lord interprets symbols. If the Lord does not interpret, don't

Scanned by TLC

put your hands on it, Brother, no sir. I'm anxious about it. Why if I don't look out, my five girls will land in college one of these days and some one will advise them in the wrong way.

In Baylor University they teach that God created the earth by evolution and deny that God made man in his own image, like Genesis said he did, out of the dust of the earth. They say the Genesis account of creation is "allegorical and figurative," that is the way people explain away the Bible. I am a graduate of Baylor, and I have a right to say it. I do not act much like I am a university graduate and a college teacher in English. The Lord has forgiven me for that. That was a long time ago. I have the faith my mother had. She believed God made the earth in six days, and I do too. If the Bible says lions and you explain that away—unless the Bible does say so, I do not care for your explanation. This will come up again and again.

Someone will talk about Jonah and the whale. A preacher right here in Oak Cliff (he is not a Baptist) taught in a church that the story of Jonah and the whale is just a parable. He said, "Why a whale could not swallow a man," but Jesus Christ made both Jonah and the whale, and I could easily believe him if he said Jonah swallowed the whale! I say take the Bible at what it says. People will scoff at you. But that is the kind of religion I have; the kind my mother had. Now take the Bible. You are for it or you are not. Brother Oliphant, I have been in it so long, I know the tricks of the Postmillennialists. I feel kindly toward Brother Oliphant. I have the highest respect for him as a Christian gentleman. He is in a tight, and he will be in a harder tight before this is over. I feel sorry for him. This is not anything personal. It will be so all during this debate.

I have dealt with the Postmillennialists so long. I know you fellows are drifting away so far from this Bible you soon won't have a Bible left. Methodists, Baptists, and

Scanned by TLC

Christians have gone this same way too. Let us get this in mind. I say take what the Bible says. It says a plenty and it can be understood, for God hath revealed these things. All right, let us come on down a little further. The first thing you know our Postmillennialist friends will soon see modernism creeping in. You never find a Premillennialist becoming a modernist.

God promised Abraham the land of Canaan, and I know he will keep his promise. The time will come when, " . . . the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." There is no doubt. God said to Abraham, "I will give this land for an everlasting possession." I have no doubt about it; we will take it at its face value.

Brother Oliphant said there were conditions, and every time the conditions were broken. But the Scripture does not mention any condition here. I take the 19th chapter of Jeremiah. The Lord says, "Take a potter's earthen bottle and go down and lecture them; tell them I will make void the counsel of Judah":

"And I will make void the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place; and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hands of them that seek their lives: and their carcases will I give to be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth."

That was verse 7 and here are verses 10 and 11:

"Then shalt thou break the bottle in the sight of the men that go with thee,

"And shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be made whole again: and they shall bury them in Tophet, till there be no place to bury."

God says, "As this bottle is broken, even will I break this people and this city." Now let's get it. Did he kill every living Jew? You go tomorrow to Linz Brothers, to the banks and pawn shops and find out. He did not kill them all.

Scanned by TLC

Is he going to? Would he kill every one of them? Would he make it so Jerusalem would not be inhabited? I have never been there, but I am dead sure it is there, and inhabited. Did it mean when Abraham was buried, God would forget his promise? What did he mean? Some of the Jews rejected their God and were taken into captivity, and some were slain with the sword, but God is still going to do what he said he would do for Isaac, Abraham, and Jacob, and Christ. More than that, he said the church will give glory to God in all ages too. God will not make them perfect without us.

Brother Oliphant says he may not get there. I am going, I believe he is going; I believe the Lord will get us both there. Brother, I am saved. My good friend, Brother Oliphant, thinks he will get there all right. I believe the Lord is merciful enough to let us both into heaven. But he said, "Where?" In the land of Canaan, a heavenly country. The Bible names this country the land of Canaan. "Walk through it. To thee will I give it," God says again and again. What country? A heavenly country where God will build a city. My mother is there. I am going to praise him wherever we are. There comes a time when we will go there to live. But that heavenly city will come down to the earth, to be the capital city of Palestine, and the earth. And we read in Revelation 21:1:

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away: and there was no more sea."

And the second verse:

"And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."

The heavenly city will come down to earth. God will keep his promises to Abraham. Abraham will live in the city he looked for, in the land of Canaan, the land he walked on, which God promised to him, to Isaac, to Jacob, and to

Scanned by TLC

Jesus, the Seed of Abraham. So in Revelation 21:3, the next verse, we are told:

"And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God."

The Scripture says there will be the tabernacle of God with men on this earth! Now my friends, there are riches here for you, riches of God, take them for their face value. It means what it says and says what it means. Have I another minute? All right, I'll read from Acts third chapter, notice this: (19th-21st verses)

"Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord;

"And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you:

"Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."

Restore what? Restore Israel to Palestine, at the second coming of Christ!

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Second Session: 7:30 p. m., January 16, 1935

First Proposition

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(First Negative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In replying to the speech just made by my opponent and friend, I think I shall begin where he quit.

The last passage he introduced was Acts 3:19-21. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."

I congratulate my friend on not having learned how to defend a false proposition. He reads too far. Notice the 21st verse: "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." That is, Jesus must stay in heaven until the restitution of all things spoken by the prophets, but my friend's proposition says the Jews will be gathered to Palestine and converted after Christ returns to the earth. If the Jews are

Scanned by TLC

ever taken back to Palestine and converted, it must be before Jesus' second coming, according to Rice's own proof text. His own scriptures refute his proposition.

I liked the Doctor's lecture on evolution. He speaks the truth on that subject. He can do better on it than on the false proposition he is supposed to be trying to prove. However, I can see no reason for his speech about evolution, unless he thinks that he can create prejudice against me by such talk. He knows that I am not an evolutionist. In 1929, I engaged in public debate with Charles Smith of New York, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism. This debate was published in book form, and my opponent has a copy of it. One of the propositions I denied during that debate was that organic evolution is true. So Dr. Rice is not in the dark as to where I stand on that question. Then, why does he try to cloud the issue by injecting into the debate questions which are not under dispute?

I heartily agree that we can understand the Bible, but I wonder if he does not know that there are such things as figures of speech in the Bible. Again, I ask: Are there any figures of speech in the Bible? When Jesus said, (Matthew 16:18), "Upon this rock I will build my church," did he mean a literal rock? When Jesus said in regard to the Lord's supper: "This is my body," and "This is my blood," did he mean for his language to be taken literally? Was he trying to make cannibals of his disciples? Will my friend turn Roman Catholic on this question? And again, I ask him if the apostle Paul intended to warn the Ephesian elders against literal wolves? But my friend says that every statement is to be taken literally unless the author in the same passage interprets his language as figurative. Did Paul, in Acts 20, explain that "wolves" did not mean literal wolves? Did Jesus explain that bread and wine are not literally his body and blood? Did he explain that "rock" in Matthew 16:18 should not be under-

Scanned by TLC

stood as a literal rock? Certainly, he did not. He expected sensible readers of his word to understand that these are figures of speech.

Is it not strange that my opponent can find a figure of speech in the first verse of Isaiah 11, but the sixth verse must be taken literally? I am not interested in the speculations of a woman Holiness preacher any more than I am interested in Rice's speculations. He finds it easier to discuss some woman preacher than to debate this question. He says he pulled a trick on me in respect to this matter. He is worried because his trick did not work. He wants me to speculate about Isaiah 11, like he and his Holiness preacher. But I won't do it, Doctor; I am not going to guess about the matter!

He insists that Isaiah 11 can not have been fulfilled, because the knowledge of the Lord has never covered the earth. Oh, yes, it has. I introduced, in a former speech, scriptures which positively say so. Colossians 1:23 says the gospel had been preached to every creature under heaven. Romans 10:18 says the words of God's ministers had gone "into all the earth" and "unto the ends of the world." Will my friend take these passages at what they say? He again reads, "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain . . ." In reply, I again ask him to read Isaiah 2 and Hebrews 12 and learn that God's "holy mountain" is his church. In God's church—"his holy mountain"—peace has been made. "For he is our peace, who hath made both (Jew and Gentile) one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of 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: And came and *preached peace* to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh" (Ephesians 2:14-17).

Scanned by TLC

My opponent still insists that the Jews were not scattered into every nation until A. D. 70, in spite of the fact that I showed from Acts 2:5, that the scattering had been done before Pentecost. It seems to do no good to read the Bible to him.

He likes to talk about Abraham so well, let's just talk about him a little more. He still insists that the promise which Paul says Abraham died without receiving, was the promise of the land of Canaan. Then how about Abel, Enoch, and Noah? They were included in the "these all" who "received not the promise" (Hebrews 11:39). Doctor, don't you know that these men died long before the land promise was ever given? The 16th verse explains the whole matter. "But now they (Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and other Old Testament saints) desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." The apostle had just explained in the preceding chapter to believing Jews that they "have in heaven a better and an enduring substance" (Hebrews 10:34).

Again, I beg you: "Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth" (Colossians 3:2). I should like to see my friend go to heaven instead of Jerusalem. He tries to prove that the Jews will go to a literal Jerusalem on this literal earth and never move again. Well, Peter says the earth will be burned up (2 Peter 3:10). If the Jews are put in Jerusalem and are to never move, what will happen to them when the earth burns up? Let my opponent explain this matter.

But Dr. Rice is not the man to talk about the promise to Abraham. He said, in defining the terms of his proposition, that he does not mean any dead Jew will be taken back to Palestine—that his proposition means only those who are living when Christ comes. Your proposition does not get Abraham into Canaan then, Doctor.

My friend gave up his proposition last evening when he

Scanned by TLC

said that the Jews must be converted individually, and that the only hope of salvation is in this age. Don't forget that he is supposed to be affirming a national conversion of Israel in a future age. Why continue this debate? The Doctor and I are agreed that the only hope the Jew has, is in being converted to Christ now; that is, if my friend "means what he says and says what he means!"

It seems that I cannot get him to notice the distinction between the three covenants made with Abraham. I have called his attention to the matter twice. The covenant of Genesis 12 was fulfilled in Christ. Read Galatians 3:6-9. The covenant of Genesis 15—the land covenant—has been fulfilled. Joshua 21: "There failed not ought of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass" (Verse 45). The land was delivered. How long were they to keep it? Forever. Were there any conditions in connection therewith? "But the Lord hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day. Futhermore the Lord was angry with me for your sakes, and sware that I should not go over Jordan, and that I should not go in unto that good land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance: But I must die in this land, I must not go over Jordan, but ye shall go over, and possess that good land. Take heed unto yourselves, lest ye forget the covenant of the Lord your God, which he made with you, and make you a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, which the Lord thy God hath forbidden thee" (Deuteronomy 4:20-23).

What will happen to them if they disobey God? Listen to the 26th verse. "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed." The land is given to Abraham's seed in accordance with the promise; their enemies are driven out of the

Scanned by TLC

land. They are warned that they will not continue to be "a people of inheritance" and remain in the land unless they are faithful to God. Listen again to Joshua: "Know for a certainty that the Lord your God will no more drive out of any of these nations from before you; but they shall be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you" (Joshua 23:13). Israel has been given the land. They are to dwell in it forever, conditioned upon their being faithful to God; but if they depart from him, they are to "perish from off this good land" and to "know for a certainty that the Lord will no more drive out their enemies."

If you want further proof that God fufilled his land promise to Abraham and his seed, consider Nehemiah 9: 7, 8. After the Jews' return to Canaan under Nehemiah, and after the walls of Jerusalem had been rebuilt, the people assembled in the streets of the city for an all-day service. In a speech of praise to Jehovah, it was declared: "Thou art the Lord the God, who didst choose Abram, and broughtest him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, and gavest him the name of Abraham; And foundest his heart faithful before thee, and madest a covenant with him to give the land of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites and the Girgashites, to give it, I say, to his seed, and hast performed thy words; for thou art righteous." First, God promised the land to Abraham and his seed. Second, he *"hast performed"* that which he promised. Dr. Rice, why continue to try to make people believe God is yet to fulfill a promise which he, centuries ago, *"hast performed?"*

Now, Doctor, will you believe these passages which say that all that God promised Israel was fulfilled, that he "hast performed" that which he promised, that they were unfaithful to God, and that God will "no more" drive out their enemies? Yes, I believe a man without a college

Scanned by TLC

education can understand these plain statements of Holy Writ. Perhaps that is the trouble with my friend. He is educated. Doctor, did you learn at Baylor how to keep from understanding these plain passages of scripture? If so, I understand why you asked the Lord to forgive you for going there—and this is not a "wise-crack;" I am serious about the matter!

The circumcision covenant of Genesis 17 was introduced in my first speech. It too, was an "everlasting covenant." I have again and again asked my opponent to tell us whether circumcision is still in vogue, and if not, how that which belonged to an everlasting covenant can cease. I challenge him to explain this matter.

The sabbath was given to Israel "for a perpetual covenant." It was to be a sign between God and the children of Israel forever (Exodus 31:16, 17).

I have a little pamphlet which Dr. Rice wrote on the sabbath question in which he says the sabbath has been abolished. And, by the way, there are many good lessons in this little booklet. Doctor, isn't it just as easy to understand how an everlasting land covenant could be abolished as to understand how a perpetual sabbath covenant could cease to exist? Since we cannot get our friend to explain how everlasting covenants may cease, I shall let the word of God explain it to you.

A covenant is an agreement between two parties. When one party to a covenant breaks the covenant, the innocent party is thereby released. The Jews broke God's covenant with them. "They have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinances, broken the everlasting covenant" (Isaiah 24:5). What was the promise of this covenant? The land of Canaan (Genesis 17:7-9). It was an "everlasting covenant," yet it was broken.

Now let us examine Zechariah 11:10-12: "And I took my staff, even beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people. And

Scanned by TLC

it was broken in that day." Broken in what day? Let us read on. "And so the poor of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the word of the Lord. And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver." Then the day they weighed for his price thirty pieces of silver, God broke the covenant which he made with all the people. The price was weighed or given to Judas (Matt. 26:15). Therefore God then and there broke that covenant. It was the covenant that God made with all the people. What covenant was that? Let us read Deuteronomy 29: 10-13:

"Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water: That thou shouldest enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day: That he may establish thee today for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob."

Now turn to Psalms 105:8-11: "He hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations. Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant: Saying, unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance."

The land of Canaan covenant then was the covenant he made with all the people, and it was the covenant that he made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But in Zechariah 11:10-13, God said he would break it when they weighed the thirty pieces of silver. This, they did (Matthew 26: 15). Hence, the covenant which the Jews had broken be-

Scanned by TLC

fore, God broke then and there. What became of it? Christ took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross (Colossians 2:14).

At what instant was it taken away? Turn to the 8th chapter of Amos: "And he said, Amos, what seest thou? And I said, a basket of summer fruit. Then said the Lord unto me, The end is come upon my people of Israel; I will not again pass by them any more" (Verse 2). When is "the end" come upon Israel? Read verse 9: "And it shall come to pass *in that day,* saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." This was fulfilled when Jesus died on the cross (Matthew 27:45). When Jesus died, the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile was broken down (Ephesians 2:14); The Jewish law was abolished (Colossians 2:14); The everlasting covenant, the land of Canaan covenant, the covenant God made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was broken, and "the end" came upon Israel. God is no longer under any obligation to Israel as a nation. They have no covenant whatever with him. They forfeited every right and all title to the land of Canaan when they rejected and crucified the Son of God. Christ, after his triumphal entry, said, "Your house is left unto you desolate."

God broke his "everlasting covenant" with the Jews, because they refused to keep it. He pulled them up out of the land, foreclosing, as it were, by the Romans, and from that day to this, the Jew has been no more to Jehovah than a Gentile.

These scriptures I have just given you forever and eternally abolish the contention of my friend's proposition, and if my friend is sincere in his oft-repeated assertion that the Bible "means what it says and says what it means," the matter is settled. I hope he doesn't ignore these plain scriptures and come back with a mere repetition

Scanned by TLC

of the fact that God made an everlasting covenant with Abraham.

Because I have a little time left, and not because there is need for any further argument, I invite your attention to a continuation of the argument started at the close of my last speech yesterday evening. From 2 Timothy 2:10, we learn that salvation is in Christ. Redemption is in Christ (Colossians 1:14). All spiritual blessings are in Christ (Ephesians 1:3). All the promises of God are in Christ (2 Corinthians 1:20). Please keep these thoughts in mind: There is no salvation outside of Christ. There is no redemption outside of Christ. There are no spiritual blessings outside of Christ. There are no promises of God outside of Christ. Now what is the relation between Jew and Gentile in 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" (Galatians 3:28). In Christ there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile. Salvation is in Christ. Therefore there is no distinction between the salvation of the Jew and the salvation of the Gentile. In Christ there is no distinction between the Jew and the Gentile. Redemption is in Christ. Therefore there is no distinction between the redemption of the Jew and the redemption of the Gentile. In Christ there is no distinction between the Jew and the Gentile. All spiritual blessings are in Christ. Therefore there is no distinction between the spiritual blessings received by the Jew and those received by the Gentile. In Christ there is no distinction between the Jew and the Gentile. All of God's promises are in Christ. Therefore there is no distinction between the promises made to the Jews and the promises made to the Gentiles.

Are the blessings called for by my friend's proposition to be given in Christ? If not, they are not spiritual blessings, for these are all in Christ. They have nothing to do with

Scanned by TLC

salvation, because salvation is in Christ. They do not belong to redemption, because redemption is in Christ, and they are not the promises of God, because the promises of God are all in Christ. If the regathering and conversion, for which my opponent contends, are in Christ, then they do not belong to "the Jews as a nation," because there is no distinction between Jews and Gentiles in Christ. "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek" (Romans 10:12).

Let us next examine Isaiah 5:1-6: "Now will I sing to my well beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill: And he fenced it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also made a winepress therein: and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes? And now go to; I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard: I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down: And I will lay it waste: it shall not be pruned, nor digged; but there shall come up briers and thorns: I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it."

God planted a vineyard and did everything for that vineyard that even God could do. He expected the vineyard to produce good fruit, but it "brought forth wild grapes." "The vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant." The good fruit for which the Lord looked was justice and righteousness; the wild grapes which Israel produced were oppression and injustice (Verse 7). And God says he will destroy his

Scanned by TLC

vineyard. "It shall be eaten up," "trodden down." Does this look like a national conversion in the land of Canaan?

My opponent charges me with persecuting the Jews. Sir, I plead not guilty. You are the man who is doing the Jews an injustice. Like the false prophets of Jeremiah 23, you are holding out to them a false hope. I am begging them to accept Christ, insisting that God "put no difference" between them and the Gentiles; that all have a right to the privileges of the gospel. I am offering them the hope of the gospel which is better than the covenant which they broke. It offers them "a better country," "an habitation in heaven."

Dr. Rice, I love you, and I beg you and all others to turn from earthly things and "set your affections on things above." This earth with all that belongs to it will one day be burned up. The elements shall melt with fervent heat. If you are depending on a habitation in Jerusalem, or any other place on this old sin-cursed earth, you are doomed to disappointment. I plead that you set your hopes on something more secure; that you obey the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ and walk by faith in him, that you may one day lay claim "to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you" (1 Peter 1:4).

May God help us all to get as far away from materialism as possible.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Second Session: 7:30 p. m., January 16, 1935

FIRST PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(Second Affirmative Address by John R. Rice.)

Brother Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and this great congregation: I told you he would come out after that, didn't I? But Brother Oliphant, you did not come out far enough. I have been trying, in two speeches, last night and one tonight, to convince him on the Abrahamic covenant. He helped me get the Jews out of Jerusalem, but he did not help to get them back. But they are coming back! He will not touch Deuteronomy 30:1-6. No he will not touch that. He has never denied the proposition that the Lord promised Abraham literal possession of Canaan, and God called it by name, Canaan, and that Abraham died without having received that promise. No, he just keeps on talking about individual Jews breaking it! But he won't come back to God's promise to Abraham!

In the first speech I made last night, I showed that most of the Jews rejected Christ, and when they were scattered to Babylon most of them did not come back. Since being scattered in A. D. 70, multitudes of Jews have died unsaved. Every last one of them broke the covenant, but Abraham didn't, Isaac didn't, and Christ, the promised

Scanned by TLC

Seed, didn't. And God is going to make His Word good to all those He has promised. He will not forget because some one else was not saved. When I preach the gospel and one sinner turns it down, cannot every other sinner accept it? Brother Oliphant, you are doing fine. They are coming back; you helped me get them out of the land. Now help me get them back. Come on to Deuteronomy 30:1-6! The Lord said they were coming back. The Lord said it, Brother Oliphant! Let me call your attention to two or three interesting things in the 23rd chapter of Joshua. Verse 14 tells how God had given *that generation,* (Not Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, nor Christ), the land of Canaan. Verses 15 and 16 then warn that generation that "If you don't look out, God will drive you away." This is what I am debating, that is what I have been arguing about all this time. And he has done it too, just as he said in Deuteronomy, that he would scatter the remnant of the Jews to all nations under heaven. He has done it. Now just as surely he will keep his promise in Deuteronomy 30:1-6, to bring the Jews back at Christ's return! And in Jeremiah 32:42, the Lord said, " . . . Like as I have brought all this great evil upon this people, so will I bring upon them all the good that I have promised them."

We are not at outs about the fact that the Jews are dispersed and those that died unsaved are unsaved for good. We are agreed about that. But that does not break God's promise to the rest of the Jews who will be alive and to those who died in faith. You are in a tight, Brother Oliphant. I did not say the saved, dead Jews would not come back. They will, and living Jews will also. In Deuteronomy 30, same chapter, it said they would return. Yes, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and others are going to be brought back. The Lord said so. Jesus is going to return too. Say what you want to about the Jews returning to Palestine with Christ! He will return and gather them, he says. That is fine.

Scanned by TLC

Let us take the rest of Joshua 23:16. "Ye shall perish quickly from off the good land . . . . " I ask, "Have they perished from the land forever?" Not individual Jews, but did the race perish forever? When they perished, did God say to Abraham, "I will take back what I promised you on solemn oath," because some Jews died unsaved? No, God did not say it. You say they are going to perish. Was Abraham there and did he perish? Was Isaac there and did he perish? Was Jacob there and did he perish? No! Individual Jews have perished without Christ and lost their part in the promises to Abraham and his seed, but God's promises are still true and he will do what he said.

Brother Oliphant has been reading some of my books. I have a book coming off the press containing about 160 pages to cost around 50c, *The Coming Kingdom of Christ.* I hope you will get it. He says I am a good writer. And he is right. I am a good writer, because I take the Bible at what it says. When it says "forever," I believe it means "forever." It says circumcision—you are right, Brother Oliphant—It says circumcision was promised as an everlasting covenant. Now, Brother Oliphant, I have been trying to get you to express yourself plainly, I am going to ask you, do you deny it? God promised it for ever. You say that is all right. Now, do you deny it? God promised it; you don't deny that some Jews are circumcised now, do you? But you say that does not save anybody. Being circumcised never did save anybody, Brother Oliphant! Abraham was not saved by circumcision; Abraham was circumcised for the faith he already had.

Does Paul say in First Corinthians, that if a man is uncircumcised that he does not need to be circumcised? Yes, that is so. But he did *not* say it was wrong for the Jews to be circumcised. He circumcised Timothy. You say the Bible says the Sabbath is a sign forever. So it is. Why not believe it? You say you read my book on the Sabbath.

Scanned by TLC

You will still say it is fine. Read it again. He said last night he was five years behind me. I believe he is. You are a good man. You will find I never did claim to be a Jew. I never was circumcised. I never did keep the Sabbath on Saturday. What I said was that New Testament Christians are not judged by the Mosaic law, but I did not say God had broken his word, and the Jews did not still keep it. I challenge you to say that God broke it. Circumcision does not save anybody now, and never did. That was never a Gentile commandment. It was never for the Gentiles. Never was, never was. It was an everlasting covenant with Jews, God says, and I believe it.

He mentioned Isaiah 24:5—that here was broken the everlasting covenant. Was Abraham there? Did Jacob, Isaac, Jesus, or the remnant of Jews, to be alive when Jesus comes, break it? No. Those individual Jews broke it! Every Gentile or Jew who broke it and died unsaved—does that make it of no effect for the rest of us? God never did say every Jew would be saved, only the children according to the promise, only those by faith. How about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? Many of the Jews in Christ's time broke it—you are right. They died unsaved. They missed the promise and were scattered out to all the world. That is why Jesus said in Luke 21:20-22:

"And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh."

I'm glad you brought that up. Probaby you did not think about it. When he says, " . . . When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies," that is a warning—

"Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto.

"For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled."

Jesus said when Jerusalem is compassed with armies that is the day of vengeance—nevertheless there is a dif-

Scanned by TLC

ference. A remnant will be spared. He spoke a word of warning to believing Jews at that time. A remnant was spared at that time. Ever since then God has spared a remnant of Jews, and eventually "all Israel" left shall be saved. As sure as this dispersion happened in A. D. 70, the regathering will take place "when the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Verses 23 and 24 say:

"But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people.

"And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

Jesus says, "In that day of vengeance when all things written shall be fulfilled, they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and they shall be led away captive into all nations." Jesus said that. Jesus said so. Jesus said this was the promised dispersion. That is one fact, indisputable! Here is another. Israel, as a nation, is coming back. He said, "I dare you, no, I challenge you, to show that circumcision is still in vogue." I did not have time to argue about it, but wanted him to get on into Acts 3rd chapter, verse 19:

"Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord;"

Now, Brother Oliphant thinks the individual is saved in the water or when he comes out. My sins are blotted out I know. For the nation of Jews, when will they, as a nation, have their sins blotted out? Now they are blind, but there is coming a time when national Israel will have their sins blotted out,— " . . . When the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord;" this time is when Jesus returns; there is a second coming, when Jesus returns, " . . . whom the heavens must receive," until then. He said Brother Rice read too far and did not know to read

Scanned by TLC

down to a certain verse and leave it off. Brother Oliphant knows just how to do it; he left out the heart of the verse. I thought you would, because I know the book you got the argument out of. I have a copy of it!

Listen to this: Brother Oliphant said, "Whom the heaven must receive until the restitution of all things," he said, "That has taken place." But this is what he left out: ". . . until the times of . . . " Jesus must be received in the heavens until the times of restitution of all things spoken by the prophets, and then Israel as a nation will have their sins blotted out, and the nation restored! It was easier to make a wise-crack than to answer it, and then easier to make another than to answer it! Peter preaches in the third chapter of Acts to Jews that "nationally your sins will be blotted out." Peter says, "You Jews as a nation, there is a chance for you." When? "When the 'times of refreshing' come, there is a chance for you. The heavens must receive Jesus, but God will not send him back until the time of the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of his holy prophets. Your sins nationally will be blotted out then." Jews who repent now will be included in that national restoration of living Jews at that time. That is what Peter says in Acts 3:19-21.

Restitution and restoration—that is the only time that word in the Greek is used in the New Testament. What is that? Putting back something! Going to heaven? No, they had not been to heaven, and so could not be restored to heaven. What did Peter mean? Restoring to them as a nation—the land of Canaan, the throne of David, the mountains of Israel, the city of Jerusalem, the favor of God! The divorced wife, Israel, is restored to her husband, God. All that when Jesus returns. That is the term God used and that is after the day of Pentecost and after the cross. Peter says and the Bible says, "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things . . . " "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: Whom the heaven must receive until

Scanned by TLC

the time of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." This is according to the prophecies I have been reading to you. I am going to read more about the time when the Jews are to be brought back and restored.

Here is some more. This is interesting. I read in Romans the 11th chapter. Last night Brother Oliphant hit a snag there too. I felt sorry for Brother Oliphant. I feel great sympathy for him. I don't wonder that he sweats when he talks. He is going to sweat more than this! Have you your Bibles? Here is something most important. I asked, "Has God cast away his people?" No. You say converted Gentiles are now spiritual Israel. But is that what God means? Read it and see. Wait a minute. Had God cast away his people? "I am an Israelite," Paul said, "of the seed of Abraham of the tribe of Benjamin." Brother Oliphant, what tribe are you a member of? If God just meant saved people, what tribe are you of? What kind of Israelites are the tribes descended from Abraham? It is literal Israel Romans 11 is talking about. Verses 2 and 3 say:

"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,

Lord, they have killed thy prophets . . ."

(Who, saved Gentiles?)

" . . . and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life."

Is that who killed their prophets? Saved Gentiles? No! Literal Israel!

"But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.

"Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace."

Scanned by TLC

A remnant of believing Jews, literal Jews, like in Elijah's time. Romans 11:1-7:

"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,

"Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life.

"But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.

"Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.

"And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.

"What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded."

Reading on down to verse 13:

"(According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day.

"And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them:

"Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway.

"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?"

Scanned by TLC

Verse 13:

"For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office:"

"I speak to you Gentiles." He is talking to the saved Gentiles about the literal Israelites. Paul says, "I am still an Israelite, I speak of Israelites, not Gentiles, but Israelites, *which are my flesh.*" What kind? Not saved Gentiles, but Jews, and God has not cast them away! Those "according to my flesh" are literally of the seed of Benjamin. Dr. Oliphant read the same verse in the same chapter and said that did not mean Jews. Dr. Oliphant is a fine gentleman and he will correct that; he slipped a little bit. And he will admit it expressly says "Israelites according to the flesh." I am sure Brother Oliphant will take that back, because it is not so. What people? Israelites. God has not cast away Israel, literal Israel. Reading on in this chapter, verse 15:

"For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?"

Read on a little further, verses 18 to 20:

"Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

"Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in.

"Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear:"

What root is it? There Brother Oliphant says the branch is broken off, . . . that I might be graffed in. Well verse 23 says:

"And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be graffed in: for God is able to graff them in again."

And verse 21 says:

"For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee."

If the Jews who are Jews by nature did not all get in,

Scanned by TLC

then the Gentiles will not get in either unless they believe. Reading on, verse 22:

"Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off."

Who? Literal Israel! But God is able to graff them in again. Verse 23:

"And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be graffed in: for God is able to graff them in again."

The Jews are going to come back. The Lord said so. Read on:

"For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature," (Gentiles wild by nature) "and wert graffed contrary to nature into a good olive tree:" (Israelitish root) "How much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be graffed into their own olive tree?" The Jews are going to come back; they are going to be grafted in again. Verse 25 says:

"For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in."

Happened to some saved Gentiles? No. Paul said about these: "God has not cast away his people." He didn't say saved Gentiles either when he said it. He said these Jews of the tribe of Benjamin. And God has broken them off, temporarily, but they will be graffed in. "Until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Brother Oliphant, what is that? The Jews are still going to be graffed in when "the times of the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." Why? And all Israel shall be saved—not all the dead unsaved thousands, but the remnant that will be alive. They will trust in him. They will hail him.

"And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There

Scanned by TLC

shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob" (vs. 26).

Jacob and Israel are two names for the same man: one, a fleshly name given at birth, and the other, a spiritual name given when he (Israel) wrestled with the angel. This is Jacob, literal Jacob, literal Jews. The Jews are still the enemies of the gospel. And Brother Oliphant says it just refers to saved Gentiles, God's people!

"For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.

"As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes" (vss. 27, 28).

Jews today are beloved for Abraham's sake. God promised Abraham, and he will keep his word. God said, "I will keep my word. I will keep a remnant of Jews, Abraham's seed, and in them fulfill my promise." God will too. God loves the nation Israel. That is the reason I keep bringing them in. God is going to bring them in. Mentioning Abraham, they are beloved for Abraham's, Isaac's, and Jacob's and David's sake. They died without having received the promise, but they knew that it was the truth. God does not take back what he promised Abraham. He will do what he said. "So then all Israel shall be saved," verse 26 says, when that blindness is removed from the remnant at the return of Christ.

"For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.

"For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief:" (vss. 29, 30.)

It is talking about the fathers right here. You say he broke it with those who would not take it. It is talking about the fathers here, and the wondrous mercy of God; when so many Jews turned him down, yet they are beloved for the Father's sake. But God remembers his covenant even though now they are enemies of Christ, they are beloved for the fathers' sake and God will keep his promise for the sake of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and for the

Scanned by TLC

sake of Jesus to whom the promise was particularly made. He will do what he said regarding the land of promise and all. "Even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy."

Turn quickly if you will to Jeremiah 23. Just a little bit here at the beginning, verses 3 and 4:

"And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and increase.

"And I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord."

Brother Oliphant, I would start studying on that. You will surely need it about tomorrow night and the next night. Brother Oliphant, you need it. Now, verses 5, 6, and 8.

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth.

"In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

"But, the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land."

Now turn to the 30th chapter of Jeremiah. I have lots of Scriptures. I have scores of them, and I wish I had time to give them all. I want to bring in a few in detail. I don't believe you can get away from verse 3:

"For, lo, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel and Judah, saith the Lord: and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it."

What people? Spiritual Jews? Converted Gentiles?

Scanned by TLC

No, Israel and Judah. "I will cause them to return to the land I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it." And these are the words in the 31st chapter beginning with the 31st verse:

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house Judah:"

He is talking about Abraham's covenant. He will make it different from the Mosaic covenant.

"Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord·

"But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.

"And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

Now that is the same Israel he made the covenant with on Mt. Sinai, literal Jews, and "I will make a new one," he says, and every last Jew shall know the Lord. Has that happened yet? Was it saved Gentiles on Mt. Sinai? With the same Jews he will make a new covenant, and "I will write my law in their hearts, for everyone will know the Lord." This will be the same group that he made the other covenant with. Praise God, the word of God is true; let God's word be true and every man a liar. Brother Oliphant says God has cast those Jews away and that Israelites just meant saved people. He needs to read it again.

"Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for

Scanned by TLC

a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; The Lord of hosts is his name:

"If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever.

"Thus saith the Lord; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord" (vss. 35-37).

Chairman: "You have four minutes."

Here is another, the 33rd chapter of Jeremiah; that's a glorious chapter. There is plenty of it here; you can read on every page. I want you to get that covenant in your mind and heart, and don't forget it. Verse 14 and following:

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah.

"In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land" (vss. 14, 15).

In the land! Where? *In the land, not in Heaven.* What land? This land he is talking about, this land of the covenant. "In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely:" God didn't do that at Pentecost. The Jews were not all converted. "And this is the name whereof he shall be called, the Lord our righteousness." He did not reign on earth, "execute judgment and righteousness in the land" at Pentecost. That has not happened yet. It will happen at the Second Coming of Christ. Jerusalem did not dwell safely after Pentecost, and Israel was scattered to the ends of the earth, but there will come a time "they will be brought to the land given them of our fathers; they shall possess it and dwell forever and they will move no more." "For thus saith the Lord: David

Scanned by TLC

shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel;" Let us turn to Ezekiel 20:33-38:

"As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you:

"And I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out.

"And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face.

"Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord God.

"And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenants:

"And I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am the Lord."

Let us turn to Ezekiel 36. I wish I could get them all. There are lots more of them, but my time is short; we will use them tomorrow night. First, let us see verse 22 and following:

"Therefore say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God; I do not this for your sakes, O house of Israel, but for mine holy name's sake, which ye have profaned among the heathen, whither ye went.

"And I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes.

"For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather

Scanned by TLC

you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land.

"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you.

"A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.

"And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.

"And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God" (vss. 22-28).

And in this same chapter, verse 35:

"And they shall say, This land that was desolate is become like the garden of Eden; and the waste and desolate and ruined cities are become fenced, and are inhabited."

"A garden of Eden," that is not true about Palestine today, never has been since, but it will be, bless God! God keeps his covenants. "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

Just a word here, the time will soon be up.

"And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel" (Ezekiel 37). Where? "The mountains of Israel." " . . . And one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all: Neither shall they defile themselves . . . "

Chairman: "Your time is up."

They will come back. Praise God!

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Second Session: 7:30 p. m., January 16, 1935.

First Proposition

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that the Jews as a Nation will Return to Palestine when Christ Returns to the Earth and then will be Converted to Christ.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(Second Negative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Brother Moderators, Dr. Rice, and my Friends:

Again, I am beginning where my opponent left off. His last reference was to Ezekiel. He reads from the 33rd through the 36th verses of the 20th chapter: "As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you: And I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out. And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face. Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord God."

This prophecy clearly has reference to the Babylonian captivity and Israel's return to Canaan under the leadership of Nehemiah, Ezra, and others. Its fulfillment will be found in the books of Nehemiah and Ezra. The context shows that the prophecy refers to the return from Babylonian captivity. It was given during the days of

Scanned by TLC

this captivity. God said to Ezekiel, "And go, get thee to them of the captivity, unto the children of thy people, and speak unto them, and tell them, Thus saith the Lord God; whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear" (Ezekiel 3:11). The 13th verse of the 12th chapter and the 9th verse of the 19th chapter show that this prophecy concerns the Babylonian captivity. Throughout the book there are predictions concerning other nations which were contemporaries of Israel during the exile—nations which have long since perished from the earth. Read the 20th the 28th verses of the 21st chapter. "Thus saith the Lord God concerning the Ammonites . . . " This prophecy must have had its fulfillment during the days of the Ammonites. In the 23rd chapter we read about the Assyrians, the Chaldeans, Sabeans and Samaritans; which all goes to show that the prophecy of Ezekiel had an ancient fulfillment and is not to be fulfilled in the future, as my opponent contends.

Dr. Rice emphasizes the 36th and 37th chapters of Ezekiel. This prophecy was to be fulfilled while the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic law were still in force. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you" (Ezekiel 36:25). This referred to the waters of purification described in Numbers 19. "The solemn feasts" of Israel were still observed (Ezekiel 36:38). The law containing these things was abolished when Christ died (Colossians 2:14). Therefore these prophecies had to find their fulfillment before Christ. "And David my servant shall be king over them . . . " (Ezekiel 37:24). "And my servant David shall be their prince . . . " (Ezekiel 37:25). My opponent contends for a literal interpretation of the Bible; then this prophecy cannot refer to his imagined "thousand years' reign" after Christ comes. My opponent himself being witness, Christ will be king then.

He again refers to Jeremiah's prophecy. I think I have shown conclusively that the 31st, 32nd, and 33rd chapters

Scanned by TLC

of Jeremiah were fulfilled when Christ gave the new covenant. We need not guess about this matter at all. In Hebrews 8:8-13, Paul quotes from the 31st chapter of Jeremiah and tells us that it has been fulfilled. The old covenant was fleshly, requiring fleshly circumcision and offering a literal land, but God promises through Jeremiah that he will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah "not according to" the old fleshly covenant. In the new covenant God says, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity and I will remember their sin no more" (Jeremiah 31).

Before Jesus left the earth, he promised to send the Holy Spirit, who will "guide you into all truth;" that is, write his law in their hearts. On the day of Pentecost this promise was fulfilled. Neither Jew nor Gentile is now under the old covenant which was "written and engraven in stones," but are under the new covenant which was written "in fleshly tables of the heart" (2 Corinthians 3:3). The old covenant offered no actual forgiveness for sin. It was impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to atone for sin. Christ died on the cross; his blood atones for sin, and so the prophet could say under the new covenant containing the blood of Christ, "Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." If the prophecy of Jeremiah has not been fulfilled, there is no such thing as remission of sin. In his vain and futile effort to prove that fleshly Israel will be gathered back to Palestine, my opponent denies the existence of that covenant which contains the blood of Christ, and without which there can be no salvation—and that in the face of a plain declaration by the Holy Spirit that this covenant is in force and that the prophecy containing its promise has been fulfilled. Oh the lengths to which a man

Scanned by TLC

will go when he tries to establish a false doctrine! He wants me to study the 23rd chapter of Jeremiah. My opponent is the man who needs to study that chapter and learn to quit speaking "a vision of his own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord" (Verse 16).

Again we are referred to the 9th chapter of Romans. I have shown that the 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters of Romans simply teach that there is now no difference between Jew and Gentile; that the covenant with the Jews has been broken, but that they need not be lost; they have the same opportunity of being saved that the Gentiles have. They were broken off because of unbelief. They may be graft in through faith, just as Gentiles may be saved through faith. "And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith" (Acts 15:9). Paul urges that since a "remnant" of the Jews—including himself—now stand in God's favor, Israel is not "cast off" in such a way that individuals of the race cannot be saved. There is nothing in the entire book of Romans about Israel as a nation being saved or gathered into Palestine.

Mr. Rice again refers to Acts 3:19-21. This time, instead of answering my argument on the passage, he accuses me of leaving out the word "times." I can see no difference between "the restitution of all things" and the "times" of such restitution. I take it that the "restitution" will take place at the "times" of restitution. I certainly had no intention of leaving a word out of the quotation. If I did so inadvertently, I ask your pardon.

But let's examine the passage. Peter was urging the Jews to "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." But my opponent's position makes their repentance and conversion entirely unnecessary. According to his proposition, the nation of Israel will be gathered into Palestine when Christ comes, regardless of whether they have repented and been con-

Scanned by TLC

verted. In fact, his proposition says they will be converted after they are gathered into their own land. Peter urges the Jews to repent and be converted now. My opponent holds out for them the false hope of a national conversion in the age to come. Peter offers the Jews no special blessing on the basis of a covenant made exclusively with them, but on the contrary, urges them to take advantage of the provisions of the gospel. Read verses 25 and 26: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." It is now (during the gospel dispensation —while the promise embodying "all the kindreds of the earth" is in effect), that the Jews may be blessed "in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

I ask my opponent to join with me and follow the apostle Peter in urging the Jews to cease depending upon a covenant long since made null and void, and seek the blessing now offered them through the Lord Jesus Christ.

The blessings offered in Acts 3 are based upon Christ's being "raised up," not upon his being "brought down." "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you" (Acts 3:22). Christ does not have to be "brought down" to earth again to save either Jews and Gentiles. He was crucified, buried, raised, and seated at the right hand of God in heaven in order to save lost men and women—both Jews and Gentiles. Listen to Paul: "But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is to bring Christ down from above:) Or, who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead). But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy

Scanned by TLC

mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him" (Romans 10:6-12).

Doctor, do you preach "the word of faith?" Paul says it does not depend on "bringing Christ down from above" or "bringing up Christ again from the dead." The apostle says, we now have this "word of faith—nigh thee even in thy mouth and in thy heart." This "word of faith" applies to both Jew and Gentile, "for there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek." Dr. Rice doesn't deny that Jesus rose from the dead; but his position logically defeats the purpose of Christ's resurrection and if true, would make it necessary "to bring Christ down from above," or "to bring up Christ again from the dead."

Rice says I make God lie to Abraham. Instead of making such charges, why doesn't my friend answer the argument I made from Isaiah 24:5, Zechariah 11:10-12, Matthew 26:15, Deuteronomy 29:10-13, and Amos 8:1-9 in which I showed plainly that the Jews failed to keep God's covenant which he had made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and with "all the people," and that God finally broke this covenant.

I showed that it was broken when Jesus died, and that this was the "end" of Israel as a nation. These scriptures irrevocably refute my friend's proposition. I beg him to give them at least a decent consideration. The debate on this proposition closes without his having even noticed them. No, my friends, God has not lied to Abraham. On the contrary, he has given him " a better country, that is,

Scanned by TLC

an heavenly . . . "(Hebrews 11:16). Abraham has "in heaven a better and an enduring substance" (Hebrews 10:34).

My opponent insists that all the curses which were predicted to come upon Israel apply only to those who were disobedient at that time. I read from Joshua 23:13 that God will "no more" drive out Israel's enemies from Canaan. "No more." Let him tell us how long "no more" means! Joshua 23:13 stands squarely in the way of my friend's proposition, and he has made no effort to remove it.

Dr. Rice now tells us that the crowd gathered back to Palestine will be composed of saved Jews who have died, living Jews—both saved and unsaved, and saved Gentiles. I told you he had agreed to affirm the wrong proposition! He is supposed to be trying to prove that "The Jews as a nation will return to Palestine." Which of these positions does he expect this audience to believe? They can't believe both. Why should an unbelieving Jew who dies before Christ comes, have any less right to Canaan than the unbelieving Jew who lives to see the second coming? Was not the promise upon which my opponent so much relies made to Abraham and his seed? Is not the dead Jew as much the seed of Abraham as the living Jew? Why should God so discriminate against the unbelieving Jew who dies before Christ comes? Let's compare two Jews on the basis of Rice's contention. The first one lived early in the Christian age. He never heard the gospel and died out of Christ. When Christ comes, this Jew will be left in his grave and will have no part in God's promise to Abraham and his seed. The second Jew was born late in the Christian age. The gospel is preached on every hand. He hears the gospel, learns that Christ died for him, hears the plea of the Lord that "now is the accepted time and today is the day of salvation." He hardens his heart and refuses to accept Christ. But Christ comes before this Jew dies and he, along with the living Jews and Gentiles who have accepted Christ and

Scanned by TLC

with faithful Abraham and other Old Testament saints, is given a glorious welcome into a rejuvenated Canaan, allowed to see Christ in person and be converted to him (not by faith, but by sight), and dwells happily forever more. What unfairness my opponent lays at the door of our God! Certainly our Father is not such a "respecter of persons!"

At last, I have succeeded in getting our friend to say something about circumcision. In my opening speech, I insisted that if an "everlasting" circumcision covenant can cease, an "everlasting" land covenant may likewise end. I have pressed the matter upon my opponent in every speech. Driven to desperation, he now says that the circumcision covenant is still in force. He says it applies only to the Jews now. Well my opponent, himself, has said that it never did apply to the Gentiles. If the Jews are still under the circumcision covenant, there has been no change in the law. What does Paul say about the matter? "Behold, I, Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Galatians 5:2-4).

Paul wrote to Jewish Christians who had been redeemed from the curse of the law (Galatians 3:13). Judaizing teachers had appeared among them and had caused some of them to turn back to the old fleshly circumcision covenant. The outstanding purpose of the Galatian letter was to show these Jewish Christians that the law containing circumcision had been abolished, and that they now live under a spiritual law, in which circumcision of the heart takes the place of fleshly circumcision. My opponent lines himself up with the false teachers who sought to Judaize the church of the first century. Let it be remembered that Dr. Rice has gone on record as saying that Jews are still to be circumcised, while Paul says: "If ye be circumcised,

Scanned by TLC

Christ shall profit you nothing." "Christ is become of no effect unto you." "Ye are fallen from grace." This is his testimony to "every man that is circumcised"—whether he be Jew or Gentile. Incidentally, my friend proves my proposition on apostacy even before we get to it. He even goes me one better. I shall attempt to prove on the last nights of this debate, that a child of God "can" fall from grace. My opponent, by his position on circumcision, says that Jewish Christians *must* fall from grace! "Jews are still under the circumcision covenant."—Rice. The uncircumcised Jew under the circumcision covenant "shall be cut off from his people" (Genesis 17:14). Therefore, the Jew who isn't circumcised will be lost. But the Jew who is circumcised, has fallen from grace—according to Paul. If we are to believe Moses, Paul, and Rice, the Jew is lost —circumcision or no circumcision. Somebody is wrong, and I don't mind telling you that I believe it is my friend, Rice!

I complimented his tract on the "Sabbath," but now he goes back on himself! In order to maintain his fleshly, earthly, materialistic proposition, he says the Jews are still to keep the Sabbath. Thus my friend has been driven away from the "body of Christ" back into the "shadow of things to come" (Colossians 2:16, 17). Doctor, come out of the "shadows." The truth is, God now has no fleshly covenant with Jew or Gentile. "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more" (2 Corinthians 5:16). Christ was a Jew while in the flesh, but even he is not a Jew any more. If God now knows "no man after the flesh," on what basis will he pick the Jew out to take him back to Palestine? It has always been difficult to get man away from material, fleshly concepts. This is the burden of Christianity.

My friends, I beg you to turn away from the fleshly idea. It was forever annihilated when the Son of God came to

Scanned by TLC

earth and lived in human flesh, and through the crucifixion of his flesh, broke down all fleshly differences; having "through the veil, that is to say, his flesh" (Hebrews 10:20), abolished the enmity between races (Ephesians 2:14, 15). He could then send his disciples into all the world to preach the gospel to every creature (Mark 16:15). Both Jew and Gentile now live under a world-wide commission based on a "better covenant," which offers "better promises"—not a home in earthly Jerusalem for a thousand years, but an eternal home in heaven. My friend advises that I read his books on "The Reign of Christ." Before we finish discussing that question, he will decide that I have read his books. I shall have occasion to quote him tomorrow night.

I think I have answered everything in the affirmative speeches of both last night and tonight. It would be unfair for me to introduce any new argument now, since he would not have opportunity to reply. I shall spend the rest of my time in reviewing some of the arguments I have offered. It is not the obligation of the negative to prove anything. He has only to refute the arguments brought forward by the affirmative. The burden rests upon him who affirms. I have gone further than my obligation. I have answered his arguments and, in addition, have offered many rebuttal arguments; most of which have not even been noticed by my opponent.

Now to the review. I have shown that God made three covenants with Abraham. (1). The seed covenant (Genesis 12:1-3). This covenant was fulfilled in Christ (Galatians 3:6-9).

(2). The circumcision covenant (Genesis 17:9-13). This covenant has been abolished, and fleshly circumcision has been superseded by circumcision of the heart. "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the

Scanned by TLC

heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God" (Romans 2:28, 29). "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love" (Galatians 5:6).

(3). The land covenant (Genesis 15:18-21). This covenant was with Abraham and his seed. God gave the land to the seed of Abraham (Joshua 21:43-45; Nehemiah 9:7, 8). They were to have it for an everlasting inheritance, provided they were faithful to God and did not "forget the covenant of the Lord" (Deut. 4:23). They forgot the covenant. God drove them out of the land. He continued to give them opportunity after opportunity. He brought them out of Babylonian captivity under the leadership of Nehemiah, Ezra, and others; but finally, because they continued to break his "everlasting" covenant, (Isaiah 24:5) God broke the covenant. I showed from Zechariah 11:10-12, that God broke this covenant when they "weighed the thirty pieces of silver."

From Amos 8:2-9, I showed that the end of Israel as a nation came when Christ died. I consider the arguments made on these passages of scripture unanswerable. My opponent evidently agrees with me. He has said not one word about them. From Hebrews 10:34, I showed that God has in store for the faithful, both Jew and Gentile, a better and more enduring reward.

My opponent argued that God will, after Christ comes, build Abraham a city in earthly Canaan. I showed from Hebrews 11:16 that God has already built the city. My opponent does no more than to make fun of the idea. He asked, "Who ever heard of a city without a country?" He wants to know in what country that city is located. Why, in the "better country, that is a heavenly" (Hebrews 11:16).

We learned from Jeremiah 19 that the Jewish nation was to be broken as a potter's vessel "that cannot be made whole again."

Scanned by TLC

Jesus said, "Your house is left unto you desolate." He taught in Matthew 21:43-45, that the Jewish nation would be destroyed, ground to powder.

I showed that the promises to Israel, as a nation, were all conditional, that they violated the conditions, and therefore, forfeited their right to the promises.

I showed from 2 Corinthians 5:5, 6, that a national conversion of Israel, such as my friend's proposition calls for, could not be by faith. We walk by faith while we are in the body and absent from the Lord. At Christ's coming, we are to receive the reward of our faith. "That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ: Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls" (1 Peter 1:7-9). If the Jews are to be converted after Jesus comes, it must be without faith. It comes to pass that one who has contended so stoutly for salvation by faith, even by faith alone, is going to have a whole nation converted by sight! To this objection to his theory, my opponent has offered not one word of reply.

We learned from John 4:20-24, that Jerusalem was no longer to have any preference as a place of worship. The Premillennial theory calls for the rehabilitation of Jerusalem, the rebuilding of the temple, and the restoration of all of the feasts and ceremonies of the Jewish law. This is contrary to the spirit and tenor of the entire New Testament. My arguments along this line have not been noticed.

From Matthew 12:43-45, we learned that the last state of the Jewish nation will be worse than the first. This argument, although introduced early in the debate, has never been mentioned.

With a host of scriptures, I have shown that all distinction between Jews and Gentiles has been obliterated.

Scanned by TLC

Some of these passages are: Galatians 3:26-28; 1 Corinthians 12:13; Romans 10:12, 13; Romans 2:28, 29; Romans 9:6-8; 1 Corinthians 15:50; 2 Corinthians 5:16, 17; 1 Corinthians 1:27-29; Romans 3:21-23; 2 Corinthians 2:20, 21; and 2 Timothy 2:10.

I showed that the elements of Jewish nationality have been destroyed. The chief things which made the Jewish nation a peculiar people were circumcision, the law, genealogy, and the covenant of the Messianic hope (Romans 9:4, 5). If these things are fulfilled or removed, the peculiar features of their nationality have been taken away. Circumcision of the flesh has been superseded by circumcision of the heart (Romans 2:29; Colossians 2:11). The Jewish law was nailed to the cross (Colossians 2:14). Genealogy (the means of identifying one with fleshly Israel) has been abandoned by divine authority (1 Timothy 1:4; Titus 3:9). The Messianic hope was fulfilled when Christ came. The difference between Jew and Gentile was completely abolished in the death of Christ (Ephesians 2:14-16). Thereafter we "know no man after the flesh"—not even Christ (2 Corinthians 5:16).

I showed from the 2nd and 3rd chapters of Ephesians, that though Gentiles were one time "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world;" they are now "made nigh by the blood of Christ;" that Christ is "our peace who hath made both one and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;" that he reconciles both Jew and Gentile in one body (the church); that Jews and Gentiles are "fellow saints," "fellowheirs," "of the same body," and "partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel;" that this fellowship between Jew and Gentile in the church of the living God was a mystery, which was not revealed in Old Testament times, but "is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit."

Scanned by TLC

I begged my opponent to try to prove his proposition by the New Testament scriptures which were written after the mystery was revealed, but he has persisted in depending on those scriptures written before "the eternal purpose which God purposed in Christ Jesus" was revealed. The fact is, his proposition has never been revealed by Holy Writ! He admitted that there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile during the church age. I proved that the church is to last forever, "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end" (Ephesians 3:21). Therefore,—according to Paul and Rice,—there is never to be any distinction between Jew and Gentile. The outstanding difference between us is that my friend is contending for a fleshly covenant, with an earthly reward; while I agree with Paul that Christians "are not in the flesh, but in the spirit" (Romans 8:9). The Doctor keeps insisting that I am five years behind him, because he is five years older than I am. That is merely in the flesh, friend Rice! And the Holy Spirit "knows no man after the flesh."

My friends, I hold in my heart no enmity toward the Jew, and no special defence for the Gentile. "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23). God makes no fleshly distinctions. Salvation is by grace, for both Jew and Gentile. His proffered mercy contemplates the whole of mankind, without regard to race or previous national standing. In the universal program of our God, spirit takes precedence over flesh; circumcision of the heart, instead of fleshly circumcision, is demanded; the whole earth, instead of a single nation, is the field of operation; faith and obedience to God, instead of racial characteristics, determines our standing before God; our bodies, as "living sacrifices," are offered to Jehovah, instead of the dead animal sacrifices of Moses' time; the law of love, instead of the law of works, is in force; the church of the living God replaces Jerusalem's temple, as the place

Scanned by TLC

of worship; and our hope is not for a home in earthly Canaan, but for an eternal, glorious home, "reserved for us" in the land of perpetual delight—the Heavenly Canaan. "Forgetting those things which are behind"—including the supposed benefits of race or tribe—let us "reach forth unto those things which are before;" that we may eternally dwell with God, our maker, Christ our Savior, and faithful souls of all ages and all races.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Third Session: 7:30 p. m., January 17, 1935

SECOND PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach that Christ Will Establish a Literal Throne in Jerusalem and Will Rule over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years.—*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(First Affirmative Address by John R. Rice.)

Brother Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and this great congregation: It is a great joy again to speak to you. I am enjoying this discussion, and I think you will excuse me if I show a little boyish enthusiasm. This is the first debate of this kind I have ever had, and I am enjoying it, I suppose, more than if I were accustomed to it. I really am heartily enjoying myself. I enjoy the fellowship of other people, and I have preached the gospel long enough and have spoken so definitely and have attacked sin with all my being long enough, that I have become accustomed to people not always agreeing to what I say. I mean by that people have the right to an honest opinion, and people that do not always agree are not always so far apart on other things. I count you my friends, and I would like for you to be happy and comfortable while you are here. Someone told me I lowered my voice occasionally when I talk to Brother Oliphant or someone behind me. I am sorry; I will try to think of that. I am not accustomed to whatever formal ethics there may be about public discussions like this. If I make errors or seem discourteous, maybe I don't know any better. I want to do right and I say that

Scanned by TLC

from my heart, and I am sure you believe it. I would like to meet things in such a way as to show a kindly spirit. I want this discussion really to be helpful.

We come tonight happy to get a little further in the very heart of the question of premillennial truth. With that in mind, of course, you will be prayerful and thoughtful. I suppose you will listen carefully. How many of you brought your Bibles? The Bible is a mighty good book to bring. You might look on. I am not afraid of an open Bible. The question is:

"The Scriptures Teach that Christ Will Establish A Literal Throne in Jerusalem and will Rule Over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years."

Now from previous discussions, you have learned that I insist we take just what the Scriptures teach. Again I say we are debating on what the Bible says, not debating on what the Bible might mean, aside from what it teaches. We are not debating what the Lord meant, if he did not say what he meant. I believe he meant what he said. I believe honest humble hearts can understand the Bible and take it for what it teaches on its face, and this argument tonight will be on the proposition that the Scriptures teach certain things. I have no time or disposition to argue now (and I am sure Brother Oliphant has not) as to whether or not the Bible is true. With me that is past argument. I would argue it if they were others, as Brother Oliphant has done, who don't believe it. This congregation does not need a discussion as to whether or not the Bible is true. And for my part, we do not have to discuss whether or not the Bible means what it says. Therefore the Scriptures teach Christ will establish a literal throne at Jerusalem. I think this is a good proposition; it is true. Christ will establish a literal throne. Christ will establish—what does that mean? I mean it will not be built by men, not be brought in by preaching the gospel. Schools, hospitals, civilization, lawmaking bodies, and peace

Scanned by TLC

treaties will not build that kingdom. Christ will establish the throne. God in heaven, through Christ his Son, will establish a kingdom. Christ will establish a literal throne. What does it mean by throne? I mean exactly that, just that—a "throne," just what the Bible meant. I take it at face value when it says "throne of David," and when it says that God in heaven would set up a kingdom. I will get to that a little further.

When I say literal, I rather invite, I am not afraid of, I rather invite, in fact I went out of my way to invite, a discussion of the question that the Bible can be taken literally at face value. In this discussion let us see, let us get it clear. My position is simply this: When God said he made man in his own image, he meant just that literally. He did just that. He made man out of the dust of the earth; he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. I believe that literally. Somebody said to a member of my church, "Brother Rice is so uncultured; he is so ignorant. He believes in a literal hell."

I plead guilty, I do. I go further than that. I believe in a literal fire in it, flames of fire. "For I am tormented in this flame" (Luke 16:24). On this we should agree. The Bible says so.

Christ will establish a literal throne at Jerusalem, there the proposition says, and will reign over the whole earth for a period of a thousand years. I do not say the reign will only be in Palestine, I say over the whole earth—a Jewish nation, yes, and a Jewish kingdom, yes but extending also over all the earth. The Jews, yes, and saved Gentiles, yes, as well as saved Jews. I will discuss that, and I believe in that. "At Jerusalem" means Jerusalem, and, now on the rest of it—"Over the Whole World for a Period of One Thousand Years," and I believe really one thousand years. I mean what the Bible means, I think, a literal thousand years. Speaking in the words of one of your great men—there have been many great men among the

Scanned by TLC

"churches of Christ."—In the words of Moses E. Lard: (He needs no introduction to members of the "Church of Christ"): "The Millennium will commence in the precise instant in which Satan is bound and locked up in prison—at the moment when he falls, the moment when his great bad power is wrested from him, at that moment the Millennium will be inaugurated. From that time it will stretch forward and include, in my opinion, *A Period of a Thousand Years Precisely*. It will not consist of an *Indefinite* number of years, or be *Merely a Long Time; But of a Thousand Years, Neither More Nor Less*. Of the events which are further to characterize its commencement we shall now speak more particularly."

About that a little further find the quotation in the booklet, *"A Brief History of Premillennialism,"* by Edward V. Wood, who is a present minister of the "Church of Christ," and many other quotations by great men, not only of his own faith, but of others. I hope you will look up and see in Lard's *"Quarterly."* He says: "A period of a thousand years precisely." Do I mean that reign or kingdom will extend only a thousand years? No, I mean one thousand years will be a separate period set off by some certain events described in the Bible, and after that the kingdom will continue for ever after the earth is purged by fire in the time of the last great judgment of the unsaved dead as described in the 20th chapter of Revelation. I say the thousand years will be exactly that, evidently. The Bible does not call it anything else, so I call it that and it will continue into the "forever and forever," mentioned again and again in the Bible.

Now, my friend, it is a happy thing if we come in the spirit of Christ. I covet the prayers of all those here tonight. I want the truth to be known. I am sure my friend Brother Oliphant does. Yes, I wish to pay him a just tribute. I appreciate his kindly spirit. He does not agree with me. He thinks some things I teach are not true; I am sure some he teaches are not. But I respect him; I appreciate his

Scanned by TLC

congenial, happy friendship. I hope he will be my friend through the years. We are neighbors; we are both pastors in Oak Cliff. I respect him; I respect his opinion. I gladly give him the liberty to speak his mind. I take no offense if he does not agree with me. When he learns more about it, I think he will agree with me, but I respect him. Now into the argument. I turn to the word of God. You will please me a good deal better if you will bring your Bibles.

Let us turn to 2 Samuel, chapter 7, verses 10-17:

"Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel (That is Nathan the prophet speaking to David with a message from God) *and will plant them that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more: neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime,*

"And as since the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel, and have caused thee to rest from all thine enemies. Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee an house."

(David now is to have a kingly house, a dynasty.)

"And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom.

"He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever.

"I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men:

"But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee.

"And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever.

"According to all these words, and according to all this vision, so did Nathan speak unto David."

Scanned by TLC

God didn't say, "I will establish David's kingdom," in the sense that David would reign forever, nor Solomon reign for ever, but "I will establish the *throne* of his kingdom for ever." Notice another thing. The Scripture expressly says, not, "I have," but "I *will*." God didn't say, "David, I have already given it to you," but said, "I will." God knew that one day that throne would be vacant for a time before it is established forever. God will not make any covenant now that needed to be broken later, as Brother Oliphant feels like the Lord did Abraham. The Lord didn't say, "I've already established it," but said, "I give you this covenant that I *will establish it.*"

" . . . I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever."

"He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever" (vs. 13).

Notice carefully what God says. God says this is an unconditional covenant. He says, "Never mind what your son does. I will not break my covenant, and I will not take away the kingdom in the same sense I took it away from Saul."

"I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men:

"But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee" (vss. 14, 15).

Mark you, God did not take away the covenant from Saul in person while he lived, but God took it away from his kingly dynasty. So here is another covenant. The covenant with Abraham was about a land for the people, the covenant with David was about a throne for a king. Both covenants have the identical purpose and will be fulfilled at the same time and fulfilled in the return of Christ and the events connected therewith. Notice this: God said, "Abraham, I will give this land to thee and to thy seed for an everlasting possession." Genesis 13th and 17th

Scanned by TLC

chapters remind you of this. He particularly said many Jews would not come into that covenant. Every Jew who died unsaved would miss it. There is a bottle broken for many a Jew. Not only these few places, but in many places, the Jew had his bottle broken; but Abraham did not, and Isaac did not, and Jacob did not, and Christ did not, and they died, and many of those who died back yonder died in faith. Of David the same thing is true.

"If some of your children go wrong, I will chastise them; I have a right to do so, but I won't break the dynasty," God says. Any individul king might sit on David's throne and lose his part of the covenant. Surely many kings lost forever their part. I will go further and say that God was not under any obligation to maintain a line all the way through. In fact the Lord chose another kingly line through another son, not through Solomon, but through Nathan. This you will see when you read the actual genealogy in Luke 3:23-38. The genealogy through Joseph, given in Matthew 1:1-17, is not the actual genealogy of Christ, but simply the official, kingly line. Unsaved individuals lost out. God was not under obligation to fulfill national promises to all individuals of the nation. So not all individuals of the dynasty inherited the promise to David and his dynasty. To Christ, the seed of David, the promise will be fulfilled.

"I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will not break it, I will not take away my mercy." This is the same kind of covenant and exactly as unconditional as the Abrahamic covenant. Read further—,

"And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever" (vs. 16).

A literal dynasty and a literal throne in the same verse! What kind of seed, what kind of dynasty, what kind of house did it mean? It said according to the flesh, a dynasty

Scanned by TLC

according to the flesh—it meant throne the same way, a literal throne. Come a little further. The 89th Psalm, verses 3 and 4:

"I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant,

"Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations. Selah."

Also verses 27-37.

"Also I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth.

"My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him.

"His seed also will I make to endure for ever and his throne as the days of heaven.

"If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments:

"If they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments;

"Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes.

"Nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail.

"My covenant will I not break, (and that is so of the rest of his covenants) *nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips.*

"Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David.

"His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me.

"It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven. Selah."

" . . . and as a faithful witness," the marginal reading in the revised version will make clear that, "He is a faithful witness in heaven and will not break his promise."

Here again is a hard problem. What do you believe is the heart of the doctrine or teaching of the Fundamentalist

Scanned by TLC

position or Premillennialist position? Here it is. The Bible says what it means and means what it says. I repeat again: Modernists are all Postmillennialists. Not all Postmillennialists are modernists. They are just headed that way. Modernists are all Postmillennialists. Show me one or call the name of one that is a Premillennialist and does not believe in the Genesis account of creation! Show me one who does not believe in the miraculous, bodily resurrection! You can't do it. Premillennialists believe the Bible. I don't think my friend, Brother Oliphant, meant what he said about the difference in the plan of interpreting the Scriptures. He is just in a tight. Get it clear now. Brother Oliphant said, "To be present with the Lord is to be absent from the body." 2 Corinthians 5:8:

"We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord."

He said therefore that no Jew could be present with the Lord in the body! If that were true, then no person could have been saved in the personal ministry of Christ here. Nobody could be present with Jesus and in the body! And there could then be no resurrection of the body of the saved! That is what he said about that position and I want you to understand it. I don't think he meant it. Then Brother Oliphant does not believe in the bodily resurrection that the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians tells about, nor in Philippians 3:21 where the Scripture says:

"Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

What I want to get you to see is this: My friend, this Premillennialist position at heart is this: "I believe the word." May I say in kindness, say frankly and plainly, (I challenge anybody to deny it) I say frankly about this business: The Bible means what it says or it does not, one or the other. The trouble about Brother Oliphant is he reaches over here and twists here, there, and the other

Scanned by TLC

place. I believe he does believe in the bodily resurrection, believes the Bible. Either he is in a tight, or is an honest modernist that does not believe in the bodily resurrection. I, for my part, take the passage for what it says. The Bible says the throne is going to be established for ever. God says, "I will not break it." For my part, when the Bible says "bear," I am going to take "bear" unless in the same Scripture it is plainly indicated that it means something else, and is figurative. Take what the Lord says, don't take from it. All right; here is some more Scripture. Jeremiah 23rd chapter. That will be familiar to you I hope. The two covenants are connected. Beginning with the 3rd verse:

"And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and increase.

"And I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord.

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth."

How would you know that the Branch was a King? The same verse says so. Now notice this: A King shall reign. Where? A King shall prosper. Where? A King shall execute judgment and justice. Where? The same verse tells *"in the earth!"* If you don't like the literal, then you don't like this verse, do you? Read it again. Look at the Bible. That's the reason I wish you had your Bibles here. Nobody can fool you when you look at your Bible:

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth" (vs. 5).

Where does that take place? In the earth! That will fulfill the prayer we were taught to pray.

Scanned by TLC

" . . . Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven."

His will isn't done now on earth like it is in heaven. Men do not obey Christ like angels do in heaven, but the time will come on earth, the Scriptures say so. A literal interpretation of the Bible takes what it says to mean what it says.

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth."

The Scripture is clear about that. Jeremiah 33rd chapter, 14th verse:

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah."

Also the 15th verse:

"In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land."

Where? In the land! What land? The one I am talking to you about. Israel and Judah in the land of Palestine!

"In those days Judah shall be saved," and then it says:

"For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel;" (vs. 17.)

But here is another, Ezekiel 37, verse 21: I wish I had time to read the entire chapter. There is so much of it.

"And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land:"

How do you know the sticks mean so and so? Verse 16 says in the same chapter,

"Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon

Scanned by TLC

it. For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions:

And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand."

How do we know what the sticks mean? The same Scripture tells us, and I take it at face value. If the Lord didn't tell me, I wouldn't say. Thus saith the Lord God! Now verse 22 says:

"And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all:"

Where is that? In heaven? No. Where is that? In heaven? No. Floating around somewhere, playing a harp? No, no. Where is it going to be? *"In the land,"* the land of the mountains of Israel!

" . . . I will make them one nation, in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all . . . "

When? On the day of Pentecost? No. " . . . And they shall be no more two nations . . . " And verses 23 and 24 say:

"Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwelling places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God.

"And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them."

"And David my servant shall be king over them." The greater David, God's Son, the Seed of David, the one promised to David, of the dynasty of David, will be king over them, executing judgment in the land—in the land on the mountains of Israel! Did that happen at Pentecost? Does it need any explanation? It means what it says. If you

Scanned by TLC

are just willing to throw away your own false ideas, and take what the Bible says. Reading on, verse 25:

"And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever."

Not in heaven, not on another planet—our brother talked about a heavenly country. Where? On Mars? Where? "A country." Will you give me one Scripture that talks about people inhabiting a country except on this earth? There is a city, and, "In my father's house are many mansions:" It is coming down from God out of heaven. Then the tabernacle of God will be with men, after the reign of 1000 years. In Revelation 21:2, John says, "I saw it." It is a new Jerusalem. Why call it "New Jerusalem?" Because it is a new Jerusalem. It will come down to earth. Listen what the Lord says: "They shall dwell in the land that I have given unto them." Now remember this was written when David was in his grave. Pray tell me, has that transpired? Was that on the day of Pentecost? Verses 27 and 28 of Ezekiel 37 say:

"My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

"And the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore."

"And the heathen shall know . . ."Are there heathen in heaven? Where does it say heaven? Any heathen in heaven? Actually "heathen" is often translated Gentiles, and some saved Gentile people will be there as well as Jews—in the land upon the mountains of Israel, when the Jewish King, the Seed of David, the greater David, shall reign over them. Turn to Micah the 4th chapter, and verse 1 says:

"But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the

Scanned by TLC

mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it."

And listen to verse 2:

"And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

What does that mean? It means a house. He will 'teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: and the word of the Lord shall go forth from *heaven?* From where? Heaven? From where? Heaven? No, no! From Jerusalem! Notice this, Zion and Jerusalem are used synonymously, and the Lord said, "The law shall go forth" from there. "Many nations shall come." It is on earth, this literal kingdom of Christ. Now verse 3:

"And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Now did that happen at Pentecost? Is that true on the earth now? Have wars all stopped? Have there been any wars since Pentecost? Was that fulfilled at Pentecost? "Among the nations," he said. Even the churches have plenty of war now! Read on, in verses 4 and 5:

"But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it.

"For all people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever."

In the revised version, "They do *walk* every one in the name of his god; and we *will walk* . . . " That is clearer.

Verse 6 says:

Scanned by TLC

"In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted:"

"In that day . . . will I assemble her . . . " In what day? Not at Pentecost. Now verses 7 and 8:

"And I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation: and the Lord shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever."

Where? In Mount Zion!

"And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem."

In Zechariah 14, here is another quotation, beginning with verses 2 and 3:

"For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city.

"Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle."

Who? The Lord! And, "The Lord shall go forth and fight against those nations." Somebody says the Lord is not coming back. Yes, he is—in "the day of the Lord" and "upon the Mount of Olives." Did that happen on the day of Pentecost?

Read verse 4:

"And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley: and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south."

Did that happen at Pentecost? Did the mount of Olives

Scanned by TLC

on the east divide in two parts and half move toward north and half to south? Did that happen at Pentecost? Now listen to verse 5:

"And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee."

Who is he talking to? Israel, because Zechariah is addressed to them. The saints are coming. All the saints are coming with him and the church will give him glory forever. Brother Oliphant will be in that, because he is one of the saints. A saint means a saved person. Next time we will bring some more of the Scriptures showing that Christ will have a literal reign on David's throne at Jerusalem.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Third Session: 7:30 p. m., January 17, 1935

SECOND PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that Christ will Establish a Literal Throne in Jerusalem and will Reign Over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(First Negative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

A number of things have been said here which I think have no place in this discussion. They pertain to Dr. Wood, his son, Vernon, and a few other brethren who have espoused the cause of premillennialism. They do not, in any sense, represent the great body of undenominational Christians with whom I am associated; their position on these matters is not the position of the churches of Christ. Dr. Eugene Wood and the few other members of the church of Christ who have been so much mentioned in this debate, are personal friends of mine. I do not believe what they teach on this question; and I say, without hesitation, that I believe they are apostates from the faith of the gospel. It is not anything new for them to advocate these hurtful and speculative theories about the millennium. They have done so for years. I discussed this question with Dr. Wood some six or seven years ago. He and I were friends then, and I trust that we are still friends. Vernon was at one time a member of the congregation for which I preached. I knew then that he held some peculiar and untenable positions with reference to certain prophecies,

Scanned by TLC

but he did not then disturb the harmony of the congregation by agitating these questions. Since then he has found an opportunity to get some publicity by lining up with Dr. Norris and Dr. Rice—attention and publicity which he would never have otherwise received.

During this debate these few speculators in the church of Christ have shown their sympathies to be entirely with Rice. I am wondering if they will stay with him when we discuss the baptism and apostacy questions. It seems that when a man becomes obsessed with a hobby, he is willing to sacrifice all of the fundamental truths for which he has contended through the years, for the sake of this hobby. These brethren have always been agreed on the great fundamental truths concerning the church, the plan of salvation, and the Christian life; but they have become enamored with the speculative theories of premillennialism and are willing now to oppose me and the thousands of brethren with whom they have stood for years, in order to advance these wild, speculative ideas. I cannot keep from wondering how they will feel when they sit in this auditorium next week and hear their champion, Dr. Rice, deny the teaching of the Bible concerning the plan of salvation. Will they be willing to sacrifice the truth on that question in the interest of their pet millennium hobby? We shall see.

I regret to have to engage in these discussions of persons. We are debating a Bible proposition and I am perfectly willing for it to be determined solely on the basis of what the Bible teaches, but my opponent has said so much about these men—not only in his regular speeches, but also in his preliminary remarks—that it became absolutely imperative that I say what I have said. Vernon Wood's tract has been circulated here since the beginning of the debate and has been referred to time and again by my opponent. That tract misrepresents Alexander Campbell and other pioneers of the Restoration Movement. Be-

Scanned by TLC

fore this debate is over, I shall have to take up this matter and show how Vernon has misrepresented the dead.

My opponent seems to realize that he cannot prove his proposition by the Scriptures. He makes a desperate effort to prove it by Alexander Campbell. Allow me to again say that I am not interested, primarily, in what Campbell taught. I am not a follower of Campbell, and his teachings mean no more to me than those of any other good man. I do, however, believe that Campbell was a great man, and that he taught the truth, insofar as he knew the truth. He has been dead for many years, and I do not want to allow my opponent to misrepresent him.

I have here several volumes of Campbell's paper, the Millennial Harbinger. I shall read you a few things Campbell had to say on this question. From Millennial Harbinger, Volume 6, (1849) Page 289, we read:

"An opinion has been occasionally propagated at different periods of the Christian Church, that the conversion of the Jews would be effected at once in a national way, and that by a personal literal return of the Messiah to the literal and earthly Jerusalem in Judaea, where our Lord was crucified. This opinion has again been revived in connection with other kindred notions, propagated also at different periods of the Christian Church concerning the state of the dead, of which I cannot now speak particularly. But the recent attempts to revive the oft alleged, and *as often refuted,* notions of the personal and literal return to Jerusalem of the Messiah to sit upon the literal throne of David, and thus to convert the Jews by sight rather than by faith, demands a passing notice at our hands, and more especially as it has now been presented to our consideration by our much esteemed Brother Anderson of Kentucky."

Thus it will be seen that Campbell's work in refuting the very position now advocated by my opponent was not new. He said this position had oft been alleged, "and as often

Scanned by TLC

refuted." So my work in this debate is just another refutation of a false position, which Campbell refuted, and which had at that time been "often refuted." The article from which I read is under the title: "THE THRONE OF DAVID." There follows this quotation, references to all the Scriptures dealing with the throne of David. Campbell then says:

"With this induction of all the passages that speak of the throne of David, and all that is said of the anointing or coronation of the Lord Jesus, can any one find a vestige of authority for the assumption that Jesus Christ will descend from the throne of God in the heavens, to sit upon any thing called a throne of David, in the literal Jerusalem; and thus, in the form of a man, reign as a prince and priest over one nation and people, for any national, temporal, or spiritual purpose!" (Page 292.)

Campbell then makes a number of arguments against the very position advocated by my opponent, and closes his article with these words: "God reigned on earth in the persons of Judah's kings on David's throne. But after the Jews said,—'This is the heir, come let us kill him and seize the inheritance,' he translated the throne of David to heaven and placed his son upon it, and there it will continue as the seat of the Lord Jesus Christ till all his enemies fall before him."

Does that look like Campbell believed Rice's premillennial theory? Remember, Campbell is Rice's witness; not mine. Is it not tragic for a man to get himself in a position where he has to resort to the introduction of a witness who taught exactly the opposite of what he introduced him to teach?

Not only is my position in accord with Campbell on the "THRONE OF DAVID," but he is also on my side of the proposition discussed last night. In an article on Page 257 of the same book under the title, "NOTICES OF THE JEWS, THEIR LAND AND DESTINY," Mr. Campbell wrote: "And that which lies at the foundation of all, is the fact, that, since the great sacrifice and atonement,

Scanned by TLC

once for all made by the Lord Jesus Christ, the relation to the spiritual blessings of the Abrahamic covenant is no longer a relation of Blood, but of faith, and is common and equal to believing Jews and Gentiles. Never again, in the spiritual kingdom of God, will there be such a thing known as circumcision or uncircumcision, Greek or Jew, Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free. Never again will there be a need of temples, sacrifices, bloody rites, a mediating priesthood, and a showy ritual. Never again will there be a theocracy, with a sensuous external economy, limited to a single nation. The kingdom of God, under the Christian dispensation, has assumed a purely spiritual form—a form to embrace the whole of mankind; so that all, of every nation, may have equal opportunity to become fellow-citizens of the saints and household of God, built upon the foundation laid by apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone. Never again, in the church of God, shall he be accounted a Jew, in the evangelical sense, who is one outwardly; neither shall that be regarded as circumcision, which is outward in the flesh. 'But he is a Jew—and of course an heir to all the spiritual promises made in the Old Testament to the Jews, whatever his birth and origin,—who is one inwardly; and circumcision is of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God'" (Romans 2:28, 29).

I could read many other statements of the same import from Campbell, but after all, the proposition my friend is affirming says: "The Scriptures Teach . . ." Sir, while I know that you cannot prove your proposition by the Scriptures, I am sure you have not benefited yourself by leaving them for Alexander Campbell. You cannot prove it by him either.

I am sure this audience would be glad for Dr. Rice to devote his attention to the proposition under discussion, instead of spending so much time boasting of how strongly he believes the Bible. Why not demonstrate some of that belief in the Bible, Doctor, instead of talking so much

Scanned by TLC

about it? That is not an issue between us. This audience knows that I accept the Bible as the word of God and believe every word of it. I have met in public discussions the outstanding leaders of those who do not believe the Bible.

Dr. Rice, do you believe there are any symbols in the Bible? Do you believe the Bible contains any figures of speech? If so, is it not believing the Bible to believe its figures of speech as such? Rice says he takes every statement literally, unless the same passage says that it is not to be taken literally. When Jesus said concerning the bread and the fruit of the vine, "This is my body; this is my blood," he did not explain that his language was not to be taken literally. Does my opponent join the Roman Catholics in their transubstantiation doctrine?

But I want to show you how literally Dr. Rice takes the word of God. He has written some books. I have here his book on "Revelation." On page 15 he says, "One very great mistake people make in studying Revelation is to take all as symbolical, or figurative language. The book of Revelation is one of the most literal in the Bible. Events usually follow in their correct chronological order. The events are always to be taken in their literal sense, unless the Scripture itself indicates a figurative meaning. The numbers in Revelation all are to be taken literally." After making a statement like this, you would think the Doctor takes the whole of Revelation literally; yet in a casual reading of his little forty-seven page booklet, I have counted about twenty-five places where he refuses to take the Revelation literally. The most striking and inconsistent of them all immediately follows his statement about how literal the book is. "The numbers in Revelation all are to be taken literally. The 'time, and times, and half a time,' is really three and one-half years, the forty-two months, the thousand, two hundred and three score days, are likewise literal, and refer to the same period in every case, the great tribulation."

Scanned by TLC

"Oh, Consistency, where art thou?"

"The numbers in Revelation are all to be taken literally" —Rice. Next sentence: "The 'time, and times, and half a time,' is really three and one-half years." Why, the Doctor couldn't stay "literal" long enough to write a single paragraph! So "time" means "year," and "year" means "time." That being true, when Revelation 20 says: "They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand *years*," it means they reigned with Christ a thousand times! Thus the Doctor sacrifices his literal thousand years reign! No, Dr. Rice does not take the whole book of Revelation literally, but he wants to be the judge as to what parts are literal and what parts symbolic. Throughout his book he indulges in this privilege, by saying with reference to one passage, "This is literal," and with reference to another, "This is not literal." He tells us that, "the Book of Revelation is one of the most literal in the Bible." Yet in one short treatise on this book, I have found where he uses more than forty expressions indicating uncertainty as to the book's meaning. We have such expressions as these: "Evidently," "perhaps," "may well picture," "probably," "it may picture," "these may be," "might be," "may refer to," "seems to be," "it seems possible," "likely it refers to," etc., etc. If Dr. Rice is so uncertain about his interpretation of a book which he says is "one of the most literal," what about his interpretation of the other books of the Bible? It begins to look like the Doctor doesn't take any of the Bible literally. And he is the man who talks so much about taking the Bible just as it is written!

My friends, we hear a great deal about the "millennium," "premillennialism," etc. I imagine the man who has not studied the Bible thinks the Bible must be full of these subjects. How many times is premillennialism mentioned in the Bible? Answer: Not one time. How many times do we find "millennium?" Answer: Not once. Oh, I know the "Thousand years" is mentioned once; there is one passage (the 20th chapter of Revelation) which mentions a

Scanned by TLC

thousand years. My opponent will not take that chapter literally. I had hoped he would read it in his first speech. Since it is the only passage in all the word of God which begins to look like it might teach his theory, I should be glad to have time to carefully examine it. Doctor, why not read Revelation 20, and tell us how much of it you take literally?

He makes little effort to define the terms of his proposition, except to insist that the "thousand years" means a literal thousand years. He does, however, say that since Christ will establish the throne, it is not done by preaching the gospel. Doctor, did you mean to infer that gospel preaching is not the work of Christ?

The first Scripture he introduces is one we considered in the discussion of the former proposition—2 Samuel 7: 10-17. This is God's promise to David that he would raise up one of his seed to sit on the throne; but this very prophecy is mentioned by Peter on Pentecost and shown to have been fulfilled in the resurrection, ascension, and coronation of Christ.

"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore 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" (Acts 2:29-33). The seed of David, according to the flesh, was promised the throne. That promise, Peter says, has been fulfilled. "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ."

I also ask my opponent to notice that God promised to

Scanned by TLC

"raise up"—not "bring down," one to sit on the throne. According to his proposition, God will have to "bring down" Christ from heaven for him to be seated on the that God "raised up" Christ from the dead in order that throne; but the truth, according to the apostle Peter, is he might sit on the throne.

Anyway, the Bible teaches that David's throne is in heaven. The term "throne" does not always refer merely to the seat upon which a king sits. According to parliamentary procedure, we say a speaker "addresses the chair." We do not use "chair" in its literal sense. In legal phraseology, we speak of "the bench," without meaning the literal material structure occupied by the judge. We speak of "the bar," having no reference to the wooden structure before which the attorney argues. The throne means "a chair of state, commonly a royal seat, sovereign power and dignity." There is but one throne or source of divine power—that throne is the Lord's. Men—including David—have occupied it only in the sense of God's having delegated authority to them. Solomon sat on the throne of David. "Then sat Solomon upon the throne of David his father; and his kingdom was established greatly" (1 Kings 2:12). But Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord. "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him" (1 Chronicles 29:23). Therefore, the throne of the Lord and the throne of David are one and the same throne. But the Lord's throne is in heaven. "The Lord is in his holy temple, *the Lord's throne is in heaven*: his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men" (Psalms 11:4). Again: "Thus saith the Lord, *The heaven is my throne,* and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of rest?" (Isaiah 66: 1.) Once more: "Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles whom God drove out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David, Who found favor before God, and de-

Scanned by TLC

sired to find a tabernacle for the God of Jacob. But Solomon built him an house. Howbeit the most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, *Heaven is my throne,* and earth is my footstool: What house will ye build me? saith the Lord: or what is the place of my rest?" (Acts 7:45-49.) (1) The throne of David is the throne of the Lord. (2) The throne of the Lord is in heaven. (3) Therefore, the throne of David is *in* heaven.

However, this argument is unnecessary. One of the Scriptures introduced by my opponent himself, expressly says that David's throne is in heaven. Psalms 89:35-37: "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness *in heaven.*" No, Doctor, it is not the sun or the moon that is to be established in heaven. The throne is the subject under consideration. It is the throne that is to be established—as the sun and as the moon—"a faithful witness in heaven." The word "as" preceding "a faithful witness in heaven" is not in the original, as will be seen by its being italicized in our English Bible.

The Bible plainly says that David's throne is in heaven. Jesus now occupies that throne, as taught by Peter in Acts 2. From that throne he exercises "all authority in heaven and in earth" (Matthew 28:18). There is no intimation in the word of God that he is going to abdicate that throne, come to this old earth—his footstool—and reign over the fleshly descendants of Abraham. God has no such demotion in store for his son. Certainly, Christ reigns on the earth, in the sense that he has subjects here over whom he reigns; but he does not leave the throne in heaven in reigning over these subjects. Is Christ ruling over you, Dr. Rice? Do you recognize him as king? The apostles preached "that there is another king, one Jesus" (Acts

Scanned by TLC

17:7). John declared Christ "Lord of lords, and King of kings" (Revelation 17:14). Do you preach King Jesus, Doctor? Is he your king?

Christians are kings. Are we greater than Christ? "And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, And hath *made us kings and priests* unto him and his Father" (Revelation 1:5, 6). Here it is declared: (1) Jesus Christ is the faithful witness. (2) He is the first begotten of the dead. (3) He is the prince of the kings of the earth. The word "prince" (archon) means: "A ruler, commander, chief, leader" (Thayer). Thus Christ is declared to be ruler of the kings of the earth. (4) Christ loved us. (5) Washed us from our sins. And, (6) Made us "kings and priests" unto God. Did Christ love us? Has he washed us from our sins? Just that certain has he made us priests and kings unto God. Though John says Christians are kings, Mr. Rice says that Christ is not king. Again, I ask, are we greater than Christ?

I am criticized for saying that to be "absent from the body is to be present with the Lord." My dear Sir, it was Paul who said that (2 Corinthians 5:6-8). My opponent thinks that if Paul is right about this matter, no one could have been with the Lord during his personal ministry. Why, Paul wrote this after Christ had gone back to heaven, while we "know no man after the flesh" (2 Corinthians 5:16). Certainly, I believe in the resurrection, but we will not be with Christ in these old fleshly bodies. For "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Corinthians 15:50). Doctor, it remains true that if the Jews are converted after Christ comes, they will be converted by sight, and not by faith.

He reads from Jeremiah 23. Let us notice the 5th verse: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will

Scanned by TLC

raise unto David a righteous BRANCH, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." Notice God will "raise" the BRANCH—not bring him down from heaven—to sit on the throne. He did this when he raised Christ from the dead "to sit on his throne" (Acts 2:30). And by the way, Mr. Thayer says, "sit," in this passage, from "kathisia," means: "To make to sit down, to set, appoint, to confer the kingdom upon one." When God raised Christ from the dead, he seated him on David's throne and conferred the kingdom upon him. Certainly, he "shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." He is now doing that, from this throne in heaven.

Again, he reads from Ezekiel 37, that Israel and Judah "shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all," but will have one king over them all. They are not divided into two nations now. The "brotherhood between Judah and Israel" was broken that they might be one when Christ died. Zechariah 11: 10-14 plainly says it was when Christ was sold for thirty pieces of silver. Christ's death not only broke down the difference between Israel and Judah, but also between Jew and Gentile (Ephesians 2:14-16).

But Ezekiel 37 cannot help my opponent. He believes in taking every word of the prophecies literally. His own chapter says, "And David my servant shall be king over them" (Ezekiel 37:24). Again, "My servant David shall be their prince for ever" (Verse 25). If this refers to the millennium of my friend's proposition, and every word in the prophecy is to be taken literally, Christ will not be king. His proposition should read, "David will Establish a Literal Throne in Jerusalem."

His reference to Revelation 21:2 is beside the point. John saw "new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven"—not the old earthly Jerusalem of my friend's proposition.

His next proof text was Micah 4. This was to be fulfilled

Scanned by TLC

"in the last days," and Peter identifies this time with Pentecost (Acts 2:17). At that time "the law went forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Three thousand souls on that day became obedient to the word of the Lord. Verse 3 evidently refers to the peace made between Jew and Gentile by the crucifixion of Christ. It was to be in God's "holy mountain" that peace prevailed (Isaiah 11:9). God's holy mountain is his church. Micah 4:2 says nothing about the house of Jacob. It is "the house of the God of Jacob." "The house of the God of Jacob" is the church. When Jacob dreamed of "a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven," he said, "How dreadful is this place! *this is* none other but *the house of God,* and this is the gate of heaven" (Genesis 28:10-17). From 1 Timothy 3:15, we learn that the house of God is the church of the living God. Since the church is the house of God, and it was "the mountain of the house of the Lord"—"the house of the God of Jacob"—that was to be established, Micah 4 must refer to the establishment of the church. My opponent admits that the church has already been established; hence Micah 4 has been fulfilled. And this is the truth, since the kingdom and the church are the same institution. In Matthew 16:18, 19, Jesus uses the terms "church" and "kingdom" interchangeably.

Zechariah 14 is the premillennialist's much relied on proof text. I shall take up the argument on this passage in a later speech; I want to thoroughly answer it.

I showed, while discussing the first proposition, that Jeremiah 33 is fulfilled in the Christian dispensation. Paul, in Hebrews 8, quotes from this chapter and applies it to the covenant under which we are now living.

I am challenged to find a "country" not on this earth. In answer, I again refer to the "heavenly" country of Hebrews 11:16.

Now to a few rebuttal arguments.

The Old Testament contains many prophecies of a coming kingdom. I shall take time to cite only two of these.

Scanned by TLC

Isaiah 2:2, 3: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: and out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." In prophecy "mountain" is frequently used to signify government. (See Jeremiah 51:25). The Lord's house is his church or kingdom (1 Timothy 3:15). This prophecy points to a time when the government of the Lord's house (kingdom) is to be established above the governments of the earth. At that time many people will go into the house of the Lord. His law will go forth from Zion, "the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." This is to take place "in the last days."

In the 2nd chapter of Daniel we have the record of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. In this dream he saw a great image in the form of a man. "This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay." He then saw "a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became the great mountain, and filled the whole earth." The king had forgotten his dream; Daniel revealed to him the dream and the interpretation thereof. The image represented four world-wide kingdoms: First, The Babylonian kingdom; second, the Medo-Persian; third, the Grecian or Macedonian kingdom, and fourth, the Roman kingdom. After explaining the image to the king, Daniel said: *"In the days of these kings shall the God of*

Scanned by TLC

heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and shall stand for ever." Some time, after the time of Nebuchadnezzar, the kingdom was to be established; it was to be established "in the days of these kings"; therefore, had to be established before the fall of the Roman kingdom. Evidently the time for the establishment of the kingdom had been selected at the time these prophecies were written, but that time was still in the more or less distant future.

Passing by many other prophecies concerning the coming kingdom, we come down to the time when John the Baptist preached in the wilderness of Judaea. His message was "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew 3:1, 2).

The next preaching we have concerning the kingdom was done by Jesus himself. "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, And saying, *The time is fulfilled,* and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel" (Mark 1:14, 15). When Jesus sent out the twelve, he told them to preach, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew 10:5-7). He next sent the seventy, telling them to preach, "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Luke 10:9).

The expression "at hand" is used forty-two times in the New Testament. A few examples of its use might be in order: John 2:13: "And the Jews' passover was *at hand,* and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." John 19:42: "There laid they Jesus therefore because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulchre was nigh *at hand.*" Mark 14: 42: "Rise up, let us go; lo, he that betrayeth me is *at hand.*" When used with reference to time or place, it always suggests nearness. In fact Jesus said, "The time is fulfilled." What time? The time which, according to the prophets, must lapse before the establishment of the kingdom. "But when the fulness of the time was come," says

Scanned by TLC

Paul, "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law" (Galatians 4:4). Nineteen hundred years ago Jesus said, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom is at hand." Dr. Rice says the time is not yet fulfilled and will not be until the second coming of Christ. Was Jesus a false prophet? Were the twelve and the seventy false prophets? Was the time fulfilled? Was the kingdom of God at hand? My opponent talks much about believing the Bible. Does he believe these statements?

After the death of Christ and before his burial, we find one of his disciples waiting for the kingdom. "Joseph of Arimathaea, an honorable counsellor, which also *waited for the kingdom of God,* came, went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus" (Mark 15:43). This statement suggests two truths: First, The kingdom had not, at that time, come. Second, It was to come in the near future. If my opponent's theory is correct, Joseph is still waiting.

In Mark 9:1, Jesus said: "Verily, 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." In Luke 24:49, Jesus said to his disciples: "And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." In Acts 1:8 we read: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." From these three Scriptures we learn: First, The kingdom is to come with power. Second, The power is to come with the Holy Spirit. Third, Therefore, the kingdom is to come with the Holy Spirit. The disciples, in accordance with their master's request, "tarried in Jerusalem" until the day of Pentecost. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as a rushing mighty wind, and it filled

Scanned by TLC

all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts 2:1-4).

The kingdom was to come with power. The power was to come with the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit came on Pentecost. Therefore, the power and the kingdom came at that time. Incidentally, we learn from Mark 9:1 the further fact that some of the apostles were to be still alive when the kingdom came. The fact that Jesus says "some" would be alive suggests that not all of them would be. Judas died before Pentecost. If my opponent's theory is correct and the kingdom will not be established until Christ's second coming, some of the apostles must still be on earth. Where are they, Doctor? I am sure we should like to see them. Why, Methuselah would have been a baby at the time he died, as compared with these apostles!

Referring again to the prophecy of Isaiah 2, in which we are told that the kingdom would be established in the last days, let us notice Peter's language on the day of Pentecost. "But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and said unto them, Ye men of Judaea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words: For these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh . . . " (Acts 2:14-17). Peter quotes a prophecy concerning the outpouring of the Spirit which uses the expression "last days"—the same expression found in Isaiah's prophecy concerning the time of the establishment of the kingdom—and tells us that that time was then present. The Spirit was to be poured out "in the last days." It was poured out on Pentecost. But "the mountain of the Lord's house" was to be estab-

Scanned by TLC

lished at the same time; therefore, it was established on Pentecost. The Lord's house was to be established "in the last days," and Peter says, "This is that."

Old Testament prophets spoke of the kingdom as something future. John the Baptist, Jesus, the twelve, and the seventy spoke of it as in the near future. Down to immediately prior to Pentecost, the kingdom was spoken of as belonging to the future. Immediately thereafter, we find the kingdom in actual existence. Paul and the brethren at Colossae were in the kingdom. Colossians 1:13, 14: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us *into the kingdom* of his dear Son: In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." As sure as the Christians at Colossae (1) were delivered from the power of darkness, (2) were in Christ, (3) had redemption through the blood of Christ—just that sure, they were in the kingdom of Christ. (1) One cannot be in a kingdom which does not exist. (2) Paul and other Christians were in the kingdom during the days of the apostles. (3) Therefore, the kingdom existed during the days of the apostles.

While on the isle of Patmos, John wrote: "I, John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ" (Revelations 1:9). Was John a brother to those whom he wrote? Was he a companion in tribulation? Then, he was in the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Could John be in a kingdom that did not exist?

The kingdom was received during the days of the apostles. "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear" (Hebrews 12: 28). Dr. James McNight translates this passage: "Wherefore we having received a kingdom not to be shaken, let us hold fast a gift whereby we can worship God acceptably with reverence and religious fear."

Scanned by TLC

It is impossible for one to believe the Bible and not believe that the kingdom had been received at the time of the writing of the Hebrew letter. The kingdom which Paul and other Christians had received was one "which cannot be moved," or one "not to be shaken." This is the kingdom of Daniel's prophecy "which shall never be destroyed"—"shall not be left to other people"—and "shall stand for ever" (Daniel 2:44). It is certain that the kingdom of Jesus Christ existed in the days of the apostles. It is equally certain that Jesus Christ is king of this kingdom.

I want to ask my opponent if he believes that Christ is now king. Doctor, is Christ your king? Is he reigning over you? Do you accept him as "King of kings and Lord of lords," as John declares him to be? After his resurrection from the dead, Jesus declared "All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matthew 28:18). If there is enough authority in heaven and earth to make a king, Jesus is now king.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE REBATE

Third Session: 7:30 p. m., January 17, 1935

SECOND PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that Christ Will Establish a Literal Throne at Jerusalem and Will Reign Over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies.

(Second Affirmative Address by John R. Rice.)

Mr. Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

Our friend, Brother Oliphant, said last night that the negative is not required to prove a thing. Brother Oliphant, you are the best negative I ever saw! I think Brother Oliphant makes a perfect negative. What in the world will he do next week when he gets in the affirmative though, because the affirmative is supposed to prove something? That's the reason I am enjoying this affirmative. Brother Oliphant said a great deal about Brother Campbell. I thought he would. I hoped he would. He proved exactly what I wanted to get and what I brought the question up for. He proved that there has never been a unanimous opinion among "Church of Christ" people on the millennial question and you can quote Alexander Campbell on both sides. That's so. Brother Oliphant said I misrepresented. I did not mean to, and did not. The fact of the business is that the only quotations that have been used by me are direct quotations. He proved just exactly what I wanted proved. This is not on my part a denominational discussion nor a difference of church creeds. Baptists do

Scanned by TLC

not all agree with me on this. Majorities are usually wrong when it is a matter of human opinion. Say what you will to the contrary, Jesus Christ was in the minority. The apostles were in the minority. This has always been true in the Christian dispensation. What I am saying is that I do not come to represent a denomination, and what I shall say will not be based on my personal opinion, but on the Bible. Brother Oliphant, my good friend and brother, and friends and other leaders of the "churches of Christ" try to make a denominational issue of this thing. That is wrong. I have close friends in all denominations. I am not willing to shut myself up in a narrow denominational creed and shut others out. That would exclude Brother Wood and his son, and Brother Earl Smith, or a great number of "Church of Christ" preachers from all over this country—Dr. Boll, Brother Neal and many others—I will not discuss that now. These believe as I do, that the coming of Christ will be literal and he will rule on the earth.

For my part, I say frankly I don't know anything that could better illustrate the fact that I come simply to teach what the Scriptures teach, than these "Church of Christ" friends here who believe as I do on Christ's Second Coming. I do not represent the Baptists on this question. I am not authorized to represented anybody except what the Scriptures teach. No Baptist headquarters or universities are backing me tonight. To keep in the will of Christ and avoid the sectarian spirit, let us not draw denominational lines and put the debate on the denominational basis. That isn't the thing that will bring out the truth. I am not defending Baptist doctrine and not attacking "Church of Christ" doctrine. I am showing what the Scriptures teach, Many good "Church of Christ" people, on this matter, (still brothers in Christ), do not agree always, but I say that a good many "Church of Christ" people believe in what I believe on this matter—a return of the Lord and a literal reign. That is clear and fine. I am glad my friend took

Scanned by TLC

time for his fun and wise-cracks. It was a good deal better for him than if he had taken up all the Scriptures I brought. I want you to know I come solely on the basis of what the Scriptures teach. I am very happy about the arrangements that have been made about this debate. A preacher once told me, "I am glad to have you for a revival, Brother Rice. We make a good team. You have more zeal and encourage me to win souls and you preach so hard you stir me up, you fire me, get me excited. Then I put brakes on you and keep you from being over zealous. I think we would make a good team." I did not agree to that. I do not need anybody to put the brakes on me. I need someone to say, "Go to it." But Brother Oliphant, I think we make a good team for debate. I teach the Bible, then he entertains the crowd for awhile for an interlude, and I teach the crowd the Bible again! We make a good team! Notice this, my friend, Brother Oliphant, brought up the question. Pay attention please, my own good folks; be careful now. You are not accustomed to debates. You might take it too much to heart; I do not want you to take any personal offense. Don't feel unkindly toward Brother Oliphant or our friends. I am sure you will not.

Brother Oliphant questioned "a time" for a year. Now, Brother Oliphant, you study a little more on that "time." In the Bible a "time" again and again is used for a year. We will not discuss that at this time. "Times" in the Bible is often taken for years; you ought to have known that. The 89th Psalm. I want to refer to that about the throne being established as the sun. Brother Oliphant would have done well to have carried that figure on in every detail mentioned right there. There wouldn't be any doubt about that proposition then. There won't be, anyway. Psalsm 89:36, 37:

"His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me.

Scanned by TLC

"It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven. Selah."

Establish what? As the sun is established, as the moon is established, and as faithful witness in heaven is established, and reading in the Revised Version marginal reading, "As God is faithful in heaven," *he will establish that throne of David!* Brother Oliphant thinks it means the throne will be in heaven. The same verse then would mean it would be in the moon and the same verse would mean it will be in the sun! The same passage says, "as the sun, as the moon, as a faithful witness." In the same verse it means in the sun just the same as it means in the witness in heaven. No, the throne is not in heaven, not in the sun, not in the moon, but that throne will be established as permanently as the sun. But that is good entertainment. He has not answered the other part of it. "Heaven is my throne and earth is my footstool," Brother Oliphant says. Certainly. Let us clear the air. Every Christian I know of admits God reigns in heaven. Every Christian I know of admits that Christ is now seated on the right hand of the Father in his throne. The Scripture expressly teaches that Christ sat down in heaven with the Father in his throne. Revelation 3:21 expressly says that. That is not an issue of this debate. That verse says:

"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne."

Christ is now seated in heaven on the throne of the Father. "To him that overcometh I will, in the future, give you what my Father has already given me; that is, as I am sat down with my Father in his throne, I will give you to sit with me in my throne." He sits with the Father now—eventually he will have his own throne. I will admit surely that Christ has the glory that he had with the Father. But that didn't start at Pentecost. He has the glory that he had with the Father before the world was. John 17:5 says:

Scanned by TLC

"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

Nothing new about that. That did not begin at Pentecost, either. While still on earth, he said: "All power IS given unto me in heaven and in earth." "It is given me, it is mine." The Lord Jesus already had that. Show me the time when he did not have power over life or death, or wind, or wave, or disease or anything else, will you? My friend, that is nothing new. Let us clear the air. We are talking about a kingdom on David's throne, about the kingdom of Christ on David's throne. Christ has had all along the Deity of the Father and the power of the Father. The Father committed all judgment to the Son and many other things. While on earth he had all power on earth and in heaven. This happened before Pentecost too. It was nothing new for Jesus to be God, one with God, ruling with the Father. But now we are discussing that throne which he is going to establish on the earth and then sit on David's throne, not the Father's throne in heaven. He said, "In the last days," Brother Oliphant, "In the last days." You are right. Joel did say, "In the last days," and those last days did begin at Pentecost. But Brother Oliphant, you didn't get exactly what I said. What you wanted me to say you can answer better than what I did say. What you wanted me to say was that the last days were not at Pentecost. What I did say was that that king reigning at Jerusalem, over the earth, was not at Pentecost. That was not in the days of David, was not David's throne. That was what I said too. I verified that. The last days began at Pentecost, but did not end there. We have had other days since and we will have other days until Jesus comes. In these last days, not yet come, "The Lord shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth even for ever," Micah 4:7 says, and verses 7 and 8 say the kingdom shall come to Jerusalem! Micah 4 did say that,

Scanned by TLC

and brother, if I was right on the first verse, I was right on the 7th and 8th verses also. That didn't happen at Pentecost—the Lord reigning at Jerusalem. All right; and he said "REIGN" too. Let's see a little further.

Here is another. "Repent ye for the kingdom is at hand." Brother Oliphant said on that matter—"Let us just take what the Bible says." You are right, let us take the plain statement. It is too plain and too simple to be misunderstood, entirely too plain for your proposition. The kingdom was "AT HAND." Exactly that! That's fine. Now, Brother Oliphant, that is fine; now, tell us the verse that says it has already started! I admit it was "at hand." But when did it start? John the Baptist, in Matthew 3, preached, "It is at hand." Jesus preached it "at hand" in the 4th chapter. I admit it; when he sent the disciples out, that the kingdom was "at hand." At first, the Savior called the apostles and sent them out to territory that had never heard the gospel and said to preach the same thing. You said they preached the kingdom was at hand. But Matthew never once mentioned that it had begun. It did not. The kingdom was offered "at hand" and refused.

Let me ask you this. I have been studying it through, page after page of the Scripture, and I have a book coming off the press on this subject. I challenge you now to make this plain statement, to say so in your next speech. Is there a single time after the tenth chapter of Matthew, when the disciples were first called out to preach the gospel—is there a time after the apostles were first called out and the gospel first preached to neighboring outlying countries and after the first public and open rejection of Jesus —is there another single time that they preached that the kingdom of heaven is at hand? I say it isn't there! At later times the kingdom was mentioned and they preached about the kingdom and they still said to repent, but they did not say, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." After Jesus was rejected definitely by the nation, the kingdom was no longer at hand. In the 24th chapter of Matthew,

Scanned by TLC

the Savior plainly tells of a grievous time. He plainly says that "then shall be great tribulation." That chapter tells of "the signs of thy coming and of the end of the world." He said further of the coming of the Savior, that then "the gospel of the kingdom" will be preached, or the good news of the kingdom, but "the gospel of the kingdom" was not preached during the ministry of Christ, after the Jews rejected him. You are right, the kingdom was only "at hand" not begun, that is exactly what it means. After the 10th chapter of Matthew, the kingdom was not at hand, and will not be at hand again till the tribulation time, when the "good news" of the kingdom shall be preached again. All we need now, Brother Oliphant, is the Scripture that says, "It began." You can't find that!

"Fullness of time," you say: you are right, but that wasn't at Pentecost. The fullness of time was *before Pentecost.* The Scripture says in Galatians 4:4: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." You need to find the Scripture that said the fullness of time for the kingdom was on the day of Pentecost. I am not trying to prove that the kingdom of heaven began when Jesus was born, nor, like some of our Baptist brethren, during his lifetime. The fact of the business is, the kingdom he is talking about was at hand, then rejected, and did not then begin.

There is a lot here. Let us take up the Scripture again. Compare Zechariah 14:1 with Micah 4:1. Micah 4th chapter. Remember this—"In the last days. . . . " Brother Oliphant, "In the last days. . . . " If the last days did begin at Pentecost, was that the end of the last days? Is that what Joel said? No, Joel said the pouring out of the Spirit would begin in the last days, until the great and terrible day of the Lord! If that began at Pentecost, did that end the same day too? You don't think that. No, as long as there were some more days, the last days are still running. This is one day. Micah 4: 1-8 says:

"But in the last days it shall come to pass, that the moun-

Scanned by TLC

tain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it.

"And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

"But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it.

"For all people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever.

"In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted;

"And I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation: and the Lord shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever.

"And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem."

That didn't happen at Pentecost. The first dominion, literally the place of world rule, did not come to Jerusalem, the stronghold of Zion. It will come at the Second Coming of Christ, when the mount of Olives cleaves into two parts, to the north and to the south. Let us see Zechariah, 14th chapter. The Scripture says, Verse 4:

"And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of

Scanned by TLC

Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south."

When that great mount cleaves in two and part moves north, part moves south, when his feet, the Lord's feet, shall stand upon the mount of Olives, then the Lord shall go forth and fight against those nations as in the day of battle. "And his feet shall stand in that day . . . " *Before Jerusalem,* not in heaven—that is what we are talking about. And that is future.

"And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah . . . "

Then the Lord will have glory in the church, and I want to praise him as long as I have breath for it. After we come back to reign with him on earth a thousand years, I know I'll give him glory far more perfectly than I can do it now. Verse 5 says:

" . . . and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee."

The letter to the church of Ephesus was addressed particularly to the church saints. All those saints are coming back. That is when the Jews are going to be brought back, the Scriptures say here. When? Now? No. When " . . . the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst . . ." The Bible tells us in this chapter that part of the living waters shall flow out into the Salt or Dead sea and fish shall come in there—(not in heaven)—the waters shall flow part toward the Mediterranean and part toward the Salt sea, or Dead sea. Verses 8 to 10 say:

"And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former

Scanned by TLC

sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be.

"And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one.

All the land shall be turned as a plain . . ."

Has that happened yet? Did that happen at Pentecost? Not there! There is so much more I would like to get to.

Here is some more. Luke, 1st chapter. Turn with me to where the angel came to the Virgin Mary. Here are sweet words—that a child shall be born literally. What a marvel that God should choose for the child to be born from the womb of a virgin! I believe it was a literal virgin too. Brother Oliphant, I am going to stick to it, this literal business, I believe it literally. You are going to stick to it too before this debate is over. Brother Oliphant says God made Abraham a promise forever, but he does not believe it literally. He doesn't believe it is a literal throne when it says throne. Next week he will not believe when God says, "Believe and have everlasting life," he won't believe that either. He won't take that literally. The Lord promises some more about something else. We'll say a lot more about taking the Bible at its face value. You are dead right, we are going to hear more about this literal business. Take the Bible at its face value. It means what it says and you should listen while it is talking. My good friend, I am going to press this matter of literally taking the Bible at face value. The angel came to Mary and said (Luke 1:30-33):

" . . . Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favor with God.

"And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call his name JESUS.

"He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David:

Scanned by TLC

"And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

Go back and find in First Kings 2:12 where Solomon's coronation was mentioned, and the Scripture says, "Then sat Solomon upon the throne of David his father." Here we are told that Jesus is to sit on "the throne of his father David." It is the same literal throne. Jesus will sit where Solomon sat, on the throne of David. It was literal about Solomon. Was that a literal throne? When the same words are used about Jesus, why isn't that literal too? Is that in Heaven? It is a strange interpretation Dr. Oliphant has! "Here are two who sit on David's throne, and it fits my creed to have Solomon sit on a literal throne but it doesn't fit with my creed to have Jesus sit on the same literal throne of his father David." "This is figurative." "This ain't"! He shall be given the throne of his father David! Luke 1:32 and 33 says that:

"He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David:

"And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

Shall he reign over "the house of Jacob" forever, or over spiritual Israel forever, saved Gentiles forever? Which does the angel say? There are two names for one man—Jacob and Israel. The word has a literal meaning. I remind you—you may call me a crank and a fanatic, any reproach you can put on me—you are right; I am nuts about this matter of taking the Bible at face value. Lay it on, Mr. Modernist. I am a Fundamentalist; you are dead right. God chose the words and he meant them literally. Every word in the Bible in the original manuscripts teaches what God wanted it to do. It would be wrong for you to change one of them. God said "Jacob," not "Israel." This is verbal inspiration. There are two names: Jacob and Israel. One, the natural man Jacob, that lied to his father,

Scanned by TLC

stole Esau's birthright, broke his mother's heart. He was Jacob, the traitor and schemer, the natural man, converted later on. But Jacob is a literal name for a literal Jew. Does anybody deny that? Then one day he met God by a brook and prayed through, got victory and was a prince with God, and had peace and the answer to his prayers. When in Genesis 32, he crossed over the brook in the morning, he was limping but he came as a prince that had favor, and met Esau. That was Israel.

What does it say? Literal Jacob! He shall reign over converted Gentiles too, but we are not talking about that here. He shall reign "over the house of Jacob," the literal man Jacob and his literal seed. Sure! Why doesn't it mean what it says? Now, that is what I mean by taking the Bible at its face value. I mean Jews, not only saved Jews, but flesh and blood Jews. If there is no difference in Jacob and Israel, why did God change his name, then? There is a difference and the angel said literal Jacob here! Turn to Matthew 19:27 and 28. And there is so much of it in the Bible, I can't get to it. I'll take time to read these verses.

"Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?

"And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

"In the regeneration." Not "in regeneration," but "in THE regeneration," the same time as in Acts 3:21 "the times of restitution" of all things spoken of by the prophets, the Scripture says. "Now then in that regeneration," the Savior says, "I will tell you what you will get. As you suffered with me, you shall reign with me here, then, in that regeneration." Christ was despised and a man of

Scanned by TLC

sorrows. Did the world hate him? It will hate you also. The world doesn't bow the knee to Jesus. It will some day. Jesus says about this matter: " . . . In the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones . . . " Now, my friend, put it down here, you are going to know when Jesus is in his throne. When Herod put Peter in jail over yonder, and cut James' head off, and martyred Stephen, the twelve apostles were not reigning then! Here is the way to know about that kingdom—when these twelve apostles, (with a substitute for Judas)—when the twelve apostles sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes! Then the kingdom will be begun! Were the Gentile Christians called twelve tribes? Tell me that! When that happens that kingdom begins. Not until then. Jesus said so. Read it again:

"And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

How rich the Bible is, and I hope your hearts will be blest by it. Just get the doctrine in your heads, get the blessed hope in your hearts. There are so many of you that don't have that blessed hope to make you cry out, "Thy kingdom come," as you go about the business of the kingdom. You don't say, "Come, Lord Jesus," like John did when he wrote the book of Revelation. You ought to get the peace and joy and blessing in your heart. First John 3:3 says: "And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." Get this hope of the coming King. Look at Luke 19th chapter, verses 11 to 27. Well, here it is; we find the words of the Savior:

"And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear."

Scanned by TLC

They thought the kingdom of God was to appear immediately. A good woman said to me the other day, "Brother Rice, I feel sorry for Brother Oliphant, I don't see why he can't see it." She referred to the Lord's prayer, "Thy kingdom come," which Brother Oliphant doesn't pray. I told her to pray for Brother Oliphant. I said, "He hasn't had the chance you have had to hear me preach two and a half years!" Now listen, Brother Oliphant, don't feel bad about it. There were some other folks, when Jesus taught —they thought that kingdom of God would immediately appear. They were wrong like you are, and if you will listen you will learn. They thought the kingdom of God should immediately appear, perhaps at Pentecost!

"He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return."

Does that mean he is to reign in a far country? We will see a little later. The kingdom idea they knew about in the days of Jesus was the Roman empire. Here is King Herod; he goes to Rome and says to the emperor: "Let me reign as my father did in Judaea. I will see that the taxes are paid." And he stays there, wins the friendship of the emperor, and comes back to reign. Let's put it like the Savior said.

" . . . A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, AND TO RETURN.

"And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come."

This nobleman was a king as far as being eligible to the throne. But he had not received the kingdom.

"But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us."

He was a king; he called ten servants, but his citizens hated him. What? His citizens, of his estate (not kingdom now) his citizens—we are talking about somebody, not Christian people, Brother Oliphant; but in this case he is talking about some literal people, "his citizens," and they

Scanned by TLC

hated him. They sent a message after him saying, "We will not have this man to reign over us." "We will not have him." He was a nobleman with an estate fit to be a king, but has not yet received his kingdom. When he does, he will return. In the spiritual sense, I have been translated into the kingdom of his dear Son, but when he, Jesus, receives his literal kingdom, he will return to reign. He went into a far country to get permission to reign over this country. His citizens say they are not going to have him. Let us read on.

"And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much every man had gained by trading."

"Having received the kingdom"—Just before his return, he gets it:

"Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds."

Has he been reigning all the time his lord has been gone? No, the servant reigns after his lord returns:

"And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant; because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities."

When will you reign over the cities? When the king gets back with the commission. Now Jesus is with the Father, and to him the Father said, "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool (Psalms 110:1) and then go back and reign." When Jesus returns he will say, 'All right, come on you faithful ones, and reign with me." Well, when? When the king comes back! A nobleman went away, he is coming back a king, and we will reign with him if faithful. Now, no wonder the Savior said yonder in Revelation 3:21, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne."

Scanned by TLC

"You twelve apostles, when the king comes back to reign in Israel you will rule over twelve tribes on twelve thrones." Now listen, I did not make this up; this is in the Bible. You had better bring your Bible and look on, and you won't be misled. When will that begin? When the king gets back! Reading on a little further, verse 27:

"But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me."

When the king gets back he will say, "Bring hither mine enemies and slay them before me." The king puts down his enemies; his throne is secure. There is peace for a thousand years when the devil is chained. Praise the Lord for it! That is rich. Come on, tell me when that kingdom begins? When the king gets back! That is when one shall have authority over ten cities and another over five cities. The king's enemies will be killed when the king gets back.

I will be through in a little bit. Revelation 2:25-28. Here is some more. When will it happen? It does say when, in simple statements; we can believe it too, Brother. Here it is, verse 25:

"But that which ye have already hold fast till I come."

All right. The Father has said he has given me this right, and he said, "You hold fast until I come." That is the last book written in the Bible, long after Pentecost:

"And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations:

"And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father."

When Jesus returns he will say, "My Father has given me, and I will give you, power over the nations, not heaven, but nations on earth," "He shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers . . . " When Jesus returns then the smiting stone will break to pieces all the kingdoms of this earth, as

Scanned by TLC

pictured in Daniel, chapter two. Not a dust of them shall be left. He means he will break and destroy the evil citizens on his return, as mentioned in Luke 19:27. Praise the Lord for this sweet assurance. I like the Bible for its plain simple statements. Yes, the kingdom was "at hand." Let us see a statement that the kingdom has already begun! There is a kingdom all right, and Christ is there with the Father. He was there before the world began. That kingdom did not begin at Pentecost, but long before. But the throne of David, on which Jesus will rule with a rod of iron, that throne is going to be set up for ever, when Jesus comes back. Let me read you a plain verse which says so. Matthew 25:31:

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory:"

When is Jesus going to sit on the throne? Somebody says he is reigning now. The Savior ought to have said so if he was. He didn't say so. I say, let me read it to you out of the Bible, and let that settle when Jesus will reign on his throne: "When the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *THEN* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory:" That is the time the twelve apostles will reign with him. Then he will say to one servant, "Rule thou over ten cities," to another, "Rule thou over five cities." "Hold fast till he comes." That is the time; it is going to come. "Hold fast. I will give you rule over the nations. I will rule them with a rod of iron." That is the time the kindgom will come!

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Third Session: 7:30 p. m., January 17, 1935

SECOND PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that Christ will Establish a Literal Throne in Jerusalem and will Reign Over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(Second Negative Address by W. L. Oliphant)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Just before he sat down, my opponent made an argument from Matthew 25:31. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Certainly, Christ will be on his throne at the time of his second coming. This does not say he will enter his throne at that time. He took the throne when he went to heaven and "sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high." He will continue to occupy the throne until his coming. Matthew 25 describes a judgment scene—not a coronation ceremony. Our friend should have read the next verse: "And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats."

The Scriptures he introduces about Christ reigning over the earth and about the saints reigning with him are now being fulfilled. God was king of ancient Israel. "And when he saw that Nahash the king of the children of Ammon came against you, ye said unto me, Nay; but a king shall reign over us: *when the Lord your God was your*

Scanned by TLC

king" (1 Samuel 12:12). God reigned over Israel. "And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me *that I should not reign over them"* (1 Samuel 8:7). God reigned over the Israelites on the earth, but he did not come down to the earth and sit on an earthly throne. Christ reigns through his saints. "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness *shall reign in life* by one, Jesus Christ" (Romans 5:17). Christians are now reigning "in life" with Christ. Christians reign with the apostles. "Now ye are full, now ye are rich. Ye have *reigned as kings* without us, and I would to God that ye *did reign that we might also reign with you"* (1 Corinthians 4:8). 1 Corinthians 6:1-6 teaches that Christians reign and judge in this life. Christians are kings and priests. The fact was predicted as far back as Exodus 19:6. "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." Peter says it is now being fulfilled. "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 2:5). John declares that Christ "hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father" (Revelations 1:6). The reigning which it is predicted that Christians will do (Revelations 2:26-28; Revelations 5:9, 10), must be done while we are kings. Christians are now kings and priests—hence are now reigning with Christ.

Matthew 19:28 was introduced: "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Let us also read the 29th verse: "And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall re-

Scanned by TLC

ceive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life." (1) The apostles are to sit upon twelve thrones, while those who have forsaken all for Christ receive "an hundredfold." Mark says this is "now in this time" (Mark 10:29, 30). (2) It is to be "in the regeneration." We are living in the age of regeneration. "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; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior" (Titus 3:5, 6). Let us notice Luke's account of the same incident—a parallel passage. Luke 22:28-30: "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Jesus appoints unto the disciples a kingdom for two purposes: First, "That ye may eat and drink at my table." Second, "And sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Eating at the Lord's table and sitting on thrones are coextensive. We have the Lord's table now (1 Corinthians 11). Therefore, the apostles are now "sitting on thrones." They are now reigning with Christ who is "Lord of lords and Kings of kings." Jesus told them before he left the earth that whatever they bound on earth would be bound in heaven (Matthew 16:19). Their words are as authoritative and as binding as are the words of the Lord Jesus.

Again, Jesus said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." (1) The Lord's table is in his kingdom. (2) Christians had the Lord's table in the days of the apostles. (3) Therefore, the kingdom existed in the days of the apostles. My friend Rice claims to eat at the Lord's table. Since the Lord's table is in his kingdom, Rice, therefore, admits by his practice that the kingdom is now in existence.

Dr. Rice says his people feel sorry for me because I do

Scanned by TLC

not pray, "Thy kingdom come." Paul says Christians have received the kingdom (Hebrews 12:28). Being a Christian, I am a citizen of the Lord's kingdom, and therefore do not need to pray for the kingdom to come. I feel sorry for the man or woman who does not know that the Lord's kingdom has already come. Only those in the kingdom are saved (John 3:3-5). The individual who prays for the kingdom to come admits that he is not in the kingdom—hence is unsaved. It was before his death that Jesus told his disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come." That prayer was answered on Pentecost. I challenge my opponent to find where it was prayed after that time.

We are referred to the parable of the nobleman (Luke 19). I am glad to consider this scripture; it is clearly on my side of this question. Notice the introduction: "And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because *they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear*" (Verse 11). Why did they think the kingdom of God would immediately appear? Because John, Jesus, the twelve and the seventy had preached, "The kingdom of God is at hand"—"is come nigh unto you." In the parable which follows, Jesus did not say they were wrong in thinking "that the kingdom of God should immediately appear." On the contrary, he confirms them in this expectation. "He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country *to receive for himself a kingdom*, and to return" (Verse 12). The "far country" is heaven. Jesus went there to receive the kingdom. Rice says he will come to the earth to receive the kingdom. Verse 13 says that he called his servants, delivered them his goods and said unto them: "Occupy till I come." What were they to "occupy," Doctor? His servants are called "citizens." Of what are the servants citizens, if Christ's kingdom (government) is not to be established until his second coming? Rice talks about Christ's "estate." I have read in the Bible of Christ's kingdom, but I never before heard of his

Scanned by TLC

"estate." Let the man who takes the Bible so literally read anything about Christ's "estate"! It is when he has returned, *"having received the kingdom,"* that he reckons with the citizens of his kingdom. Some have been faithful citizens. He promotes these to places of greater honor. Those who have been unfaithful as citizens of his kingdom, he casts out. Compare this with Matthew 13:41.

Now let us notice Daniel 7:13, 14: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." The "Ancient of days," of course, is God. Christ received "dominion, glory, and a kingdom" when he came "with the clouds of heaven" to God. Now go with me to Acts 1:9, 10: "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and *a cloud received him* out of their sight. And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel." Daniel said Christ would receive dominion, glory, and a kingdom when he came to God with the clouds of heaven. In his ascension, the disciples saw him go to God with the clouds. When he ascended the angelic hosts exclaimed: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the king of glory shall come in" (Psalm 24:7). He was then "received up into glory" (1 Timothy 3:16), and "crowned with glory" (Hebrews 2:9). The object of his sufferings was accomplished when he thus "entered into his glory" (Luke 24:26). Friend Rice, it was at that time—when the nobleman went to a far country (heaven) with the clouds—that he received the kingdom. Some day he will return and reckon with the citizens of his kingdom.

Mr. Rice wants to know if I can find the kingdom of

Scanned by TLC

heaven preached "at hand" after the Jews rejected Christ. I can find his disciples still waiting for the kingdom (Mark 15:43). Very shortly thereafter the kingdom is preached as a present, existing thing. Philip preached the kingdom in Samaria. Acts 8:12: "But when they believed Philip preaching the things *concerning the kingdom of God,* and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Paul preached it in Rome. Acts 28:31: "*Preaching the kingdom of God,* and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him." Of course, they no longer preached the kingdom of God at hand after Pentecost, because they had received the kingdom (Hebrews 12:28).

I am charged with holding the orthodox Baptist position, that the kingdom was established during Christ's personal ministry. No, the kingdom existed only in a state of preparation at that time. It existed only in the sense that Jesus, who was to be crowned king, and the disciples who were to be citizens of the kingdom, were there. Jesus received the kingdom and was crowned king when he ascended to heaven. The kingdom came to earth "with power" when the Holy Spirit came on Pentecost (Mark 9:1; Acts 1:8; Acts 2:1-4). During Christ's earthly ministry, the kingdom was "nigh" or "at hand," as was preached by John, Jesus, the twelve and the seventy. My opponent's contention makes John, Jesus, the twelve and the seventy false prophets. According to him, instead of the kingdom of heaven being at hand, it was thousands of years in the future.

In this connection, I want to call your attention to that which is suggested in his asking me to find the kingdom of heaven preached "at hand" after the Jews rejected Christ. I should like to have seen him come out in the open and clearly express his position on this matter. Though he did not do that, I think I know what his position is. He teaches that the time was fulfilled and the kingdom of God was at hand when Christ came, but that when the Jews rejected

Scanned by TLC

Christ, the kingdom was postponed. If this is true, what follows? Suppose the Jews had been ready and had accepted Christ. The entire course of events would have been different. First, Christ would not have died on the cross —though it had been prophesied that he would die. Second, We would not have Matthew, Mark, Luke and John—no gospels. Third, The church would not have been built. According to premillennialists, the church is a mere accident —a substitute, to occupy the interim between Christ's rejection by the Jews and the establishment of his kingdom at his second coming. Fourth, We would not have Acts of the Apostles. Since this book is a history of the early church, it could not have been written if the church had not been established. Fifth, The Epistles would not have been written, because they are addressed to the churches. What a tragedy it would have been for the Jews to have accepted God's plan and allowed Christ to establish his kingdom!

But the Jews were ready for an earthly kingdom; in fact, they tried to force upon him such a kingdom. John 6:15: "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to *make him a king,* he departed again into a mountain himself alone." According to my opponent, Jesus will come back to the earth after thousands of years and give to the Jews just what they wanted while he was here the first time. It will not be a case of the Jews' being converted to Christ, but of Christ's being converted to the Jews! Because Jesus did not give them the kind of kingdom they wanted—an earthly kingdom such as my opponent says he will establish at his second coming—they rejected him and crucified him. According to Doctor Rice, Jesus made a mistake, and by his own blunder, caused himself to be crucified on Calvary! After thousands of years in heaven, he will come back to the earth, give the Jews what they wanted all the time, and thus correct the mistake that he, himself, made while on the earth. How ridiculous! Is it not a shame that any

Scanned by TLC

man will hold to a theory which drives him to such an absurdity?

Rice keeps talking about the house of Jacob. Can he see no difference between the house of Jacob and "the house of the God of Jacob"? Micah 4 predicts the establishment of the house of Jacob's God—not Jacob's house. I have shown from Genesis 28:10-17 and 1 Timothy 3:15, that the house of God is the church.

My opponent talks about the throne of Christ and the throne of God, as if there were more than one throne. That which belongs to God belongs also to Christ. "And all mine are thine, and thine are mine" (John 17:10). In Revelation 22:3, we read of "the throne of God and of the lamb." One throne—the throne of both God and Christ. "The kingdom of Christ and of God" (Ephesians 5:5), is one kingdom.

Is Christ now on *his* throne? Turn with me to Zechariah 6:13: "Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule *upon his throne;* and he shall be a priest *upon his throne:* and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." Note this: He will be a priest on *his* throne—not the Father's. Now hear Paul: "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: *We have such an high priest,* who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens" (Hebrews 8:1). (1) Christ is high priest now. (2) But he was to be priest on *his* throne—not the Father's. (3) Therefore, he is now on *his* throne—not the Father's. Hear Paul again: "Seeing then that *we have a great high priest,* that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession" (Hebrews 4:14). First, He is priest on his throne. Second, But he is priest in heaven. Third, Therefore, his throne is in heaven.

Another quotation from Paul: "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law" (Hebrews

Scanned by TLC

8:4). First, If Christ were on earth, he could not be a priest at all. Second, But he was to be a priest on his throne. Third, Therefore, his throne cannot be on earth. Now read Hebrews 1:3: "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when had by himself purged our sins, *sat down* on the right hand of the Majesty on high." (1) Jesus is on his throne when "sitting" (Zechariah 6:13). (2) He is "sitting" now (Hebrews 1:3). (3) Therefore, he is on his throne now. Again, (1) Jesus was to "sit and rule upon his throne" (Zechariah 6:13). (2) He is sitting now. (3) Therefore, he is ruling now.

In Romans 15:12, Paul quotes from Isaiah: "There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust." (1) Jesus is reigning when the Gentiles trust in him. (2) Gentiles trust in him now. (3) Thereforee, he is reigning now. Again, (1) Jesus is king when lord (Revelation 17:14). (2) Jesus was made Lord when he ascended to heaven (Acts 2:36). (3) Therefore, he was made king when he ascended to heaven.

I invite your attention to two parallel scriptures. Matthew 20: 20, 21: "Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping him, and desiring a certain thing of him. And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, *in thy kingdom.*" Mark 10:35-37: "And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire. And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, *in thy glory.*" You will see that while the account in Mark says "thy glory," Matthew speaks of it as "thy kingdom." They believed that to be

Scanned by TLC

with Christ in his glory was to be with him in his kingdom, and such must be the truth, or they were deceived; and Christ, by his silence, contributed to their deception.

Christ suffered in order to enter into his glory. Luke 24:26: "Ought not Christ to have *suffered* these things, and *to enter into his glory?*" The Holy Spirit was given when Jesus was glorified. John 7:39: "The Holy Spirit was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." When Christ suffered on the cross and ascended to heaven, he entered into his glory; and just as certain as Christ did not contribute to the deception of his disciples; just that certain is it that when he entered into his glory, he received the kingdom. This is in harmony with Daniel 7: 13, 14, from which we learn that when Christ ascended with the clouds and came to God, "There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom." Unless my opponent is willing to say that the disciples were deceived and that Christ willingly allowed them to entertain a false idea, he must admit that when Christ entered into his glory, he entered into his kingdom.

I invite your further attention to a passage of scripture which was originally introduced by my opponent and which has been considered several times in this debate. It is God's promise to David. 2 Samuel 7:12, 13: "And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever." The 14th verse is quoted by Paul in Hebrews 1:5, and shown to have been fulfilled when Christ "sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Note, that it is while David "sleeps with his fathers," that God will place his seed upon the throne. This could not be at the time of my opponent's millennium, because he says the righteous are to be raised at the beginning of the millennium. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, calls attention to the fact that David still "sleeps with the

Scanned by TLC

fathers," and adds, "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore 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" (Acts 2:29-33). Peter plainly says the promise to David, that one of his seed should be established upon his throne, was fulfilled when Christ was raised from the dead. Christ was raised up "to sit on his throne." That was the purpose of his being raised. Did the resurrection of Christ fail to accomplish its purpose?

I again call attention to the distinction between being "raised up" to sit on the throne and being "brought down" to sit on the throne. According to the Bible, Christ was raised up to sit on the throne, which is in heaven. According to Dr. Rice, he will be brought down to sit on the throne, which will be on earth.

On Pentecost, Peter said, "For David is not ascended into the heaven; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, *Sit thou on my right hand, Until I make thy foes thy footstool*" (Acts 2:34, 35). Now notice Hebrews 10:12, 13: "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, *sat down on the right hand of God; From heenceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.*" Now turn to 1 Corinthians 15:23-26: "But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's *at his coming. Then cometh the end,* when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; *when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*" From these Scriptures we

Scanned by TLC

learn: (1) Christ began his reign when he sat down at the right hand of God. (2) He will continue his reign until he has "put down all rule and all authority and power," or (3) Until he "hath put all enemies under his feet," or (4) Until he makes his "foes his footstool," or (5) Until death is destroyed, or (6) Until "his coming," or (7) Until the end—for "then cometh the end." Christ's reign is co-extensive with his sitting at the right hand of God. He reigns continuously from the time he sat down at God's right hand until his second coming—"then cometh the end." If Christ is not reigning now, he can never reign; since at his coming, he shall "deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father."

Again, it is during the time of his reign—while he is putting his enemies under his feet, putting down all rule and all authority and power, making his foes his footstool —that we have sanctification through the offering of his body (Hebrews 10:12-14). If Christ is not now reigning, we have no sanctification through the offering of his body.

I next invite you to consider a prophecy which is specifically declared to have been fulfilled. Psalm 2:6-8: "*Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.* I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, *Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.* Ask of me, and *I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance,* and *the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.*" (1) God will set his king upon his holy hill of Zion. (2) Declare the decree: "the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." (3) Give him the heathen for his inheritance. (4) Give him the "uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." Paul tells us when this was fulfilled. Hebrews 1:1-5: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, *Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things,* by whom also he made the worlds; Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his per-

Scanned by TLC

son, and upholding all things by the word of his power, *when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;* Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?* And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?" God set his king upon mount Zion. When? (1) "In these last days." This is the time Isaiah said, "the mountain of the Lord's house" will be established, (Isaiah 2:2-4), and the time Peter on Pentecost declared to be present. (2) When God speaks to us through his Son. (3) When Christ is appointed heir of all things. (4) When he purges our sins. (5) When he is "set down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." If Christ is not now king, ruling from God's "holy hill of Zion," God is not speaking to us through his Son, Christ has not been appointed heir of all things, he has not purged our sins, and he has not sat down at God's right hand.

But we have even a more specific reference to this prophecy in Acts 13:30-39: "But God raised him from the dead: And he was seen many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people. And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that *the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children,* in that he hath raised up Jesus again; *as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David. (Margin: holy or just things.) Wherefore he saith also in another psalm, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: But he, whom God raised

Scanned by TLC

again, saw no corruption. Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." This passage plainly says that the prophecy of the Second Psalm was fulfilled when Christ was raised from the dead, when forgiveness of sins was preached through him, and believers were justified from the things from which the law of Moses could not justify them. It was at the time of his resurrection from the dead that he was given the "sure mercies (or holy or just things) of David." If this does not refer to the throne of David, let my opponent tell us what it means. This, I want every one to see: God, in the Second Psalm, said he would set his king upon mount Zion. Paul, in Acts 13, quotes the Second Psalm—even citing the reference—and says it has been fulfilled; was fulfilled when Christ was raised from the dead. But my opponent says it has not yet been fulfilled, and will not be until Christ comes. How far men do sometimes stray from the teaching of Holy Writ!

My friends, there is no doubt about this matter. When the Holy Spirit states specifically that a certain prophecy has been fulfilled, we can know, beyond the possibility of a doubt or question, that it has been fulfilled. I know that God's King (Christ) has been seated on his "holy hill of Zion;" and therefore, I know my opponent's proposition is false. He could not, if he had from now until the judgment day, evade the force of these plain statements of inspiration. I challenge him to answer this argument. I allege and urge, with all the force of my being and all the earnestness of my soul, that it completely refutes his proposition!

Once more: According to the Second Psalm, at the time Christ is seated as king upon the holy hill of Zion, he is to be given "the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." Just before Pentecost, Christ told his disciples, "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is

Scanned by TLC

come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and *unto the uttermost part of the earth"* (Acts 1:8). When the Holy Spirit came on Pentecost, the disciples began the execution of the world-wide commission (Matthew 28:18-20); that is, started their work as Christ's ambassadors unto his possessions—"the uttermost part of the earth." I challenge my opponent to deny that the Second Psalm has been fulfilled and that Christ is king upon God's holy hill of Zion. Will he try to meet and overthrow these plain truths? We wait for a reply, which I predict will never come.

Allow me to briefly reiterate an argument made in my first speech. My opponent has not even mentioned it. First, Jesus said the kingdom would come with power (Mark 9:1). Second, He said the power would come with the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8). Third, Therefore, the kingdom came with the Holy Spirit. If I say Brother Nelson will come with Brother Pullias, and Brother Pullias will come with Brother Hines, you know that Brother Nelson and Brother Hines are coming at the same time. (1) The Holy Spirit, the power, and the kingdom were to come together. (2) The Holy Spirit came on Pentecost. (3) Therefore, the kingdom came on Pentecost.

My friends, this is the truth of God. All of the premillennialists on earth cannot shake it!

Before closing, I must say something about "A Brief History of Premillennialism," by Edward V. Wood. This tract has been circulated here ever since the debate began. It has been constantly referred to and quoted from by my friend of the opposition. I charge that Brother Wood misrepresents Alexander Campbell and other pioneers of the Restoration. My charge could be sustained on any number of counts. I shall select two quotations from the tract, and rest my case on a comparison of these quotations with the original. On page 19, Wood gives the following quotation from Campbell: "THAT THE LORD JESUS WILL PER-

Scanned by TLC

SONALLY DESCEND FROM HEAVEN AND REVISIT THIS EARTH IS NEITHER DOUBTED NOR DENIED BY ANY CHRISTIAN" (Emphasis Wood's). Certainly not! What does Brother Wood hope to prove by this quotation? But let us turn to Millennial Harbinger, 1843, page 49, and read the next sentence from Campbell: "But *when, in what manner, and for what special purpose,* are questions of doubtful disputation; concerning which diverse and contradictory opinions have been promulgated and are still entertained by many sincere professors" (Emphasis Campbell's). The author introduced Campbell to show "in what manner," and "for what special purpose" Christ will return. The statement quoted from Campbell says nothing whatever on these subjects, but in the very next sentence he says these "are questions of doubtful disputation." Vernon, why did you not quote the next sentence?

But the same page of Wood's little tract on Premillennialism contains an even more glaring misrepresentation of Campbell's position. Here is the quotation from Campbell, exactly as given on page 19 of the tract: "IN ONE WORD, I YET BELIEVE IN A MILLENNIUM—A THOUSAND YEARS—A SABBATH OF BLISS BEFORE THE SCENES OF GOG AND MAGOG ARE TRANSACTED—I BELIEVE DAVID, ISAIAH, JEREMIAH, EZEKIEL, DANIEL AND THE APOSTLE JOHN . . ." (Emphasis Wood's). In this instance, the author is not content with cutting one of Campbell's paragraphs in two; he stops in the middle of a sentence! The quotation is from Campbell's Millennial Harbinger, 1843, page 74. Let us now read the rest of the sentence, directly from Campbell's paper: " . . . and because I believe them, I know not how to believe the old or the new editions of an entirely new dispensation and administration of Christianity by the King in person, after the resurrection of the dead, and before the end of time." Alexander Campbell said exactly the opposite of what Wood quoted him to prove! Pre-

Scanned by TLC

millennialism advocates a "new dispensation and administration—by the King in person, after the resurrection of the dead, and before the end of time." Campbell insists that, because he believes David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and John, he "knows not how" to believe any such theory! Brother Wood, Campbell not only says he does not believe your theory, but that—since he believes the Bible—he does not even *know how* to believe such things as you advocate!

I have always liked Vernon Wood, but I am heartily ashamed of him. How can any honest man deliberately cut a sentence in half, and thereby make the author say exactly the opposite of what he intended to say? It is bad enough to thus maltreat the living, but to so misrepresent the dead seems almost unpardonable. Any theory is certainly "hard put" for proof, when its advocates must resort to such tactics in their efforts to sustain it!

I regret that Brother Wood and Dr. Rice have made it necessary for me to deal with these ugly matters. After all, what difference does it make, what Brethren Wood, Mullins, Smith—or even Alexander Campbell—teach on this question? "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isaiah 8:20). Dr. Rice, your theory is "not according to this word." I beg you to abandon it.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Fourth Session: 7:30 p. m., Friday, January 18, 1935.

SECOND PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures teach that Christ will Establish a Literal Throne at Jerusalem and Will Reign Over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(Third Affirmative Address by John R. Rice.)

Brother Chairman, Brother Oliphant and this Congregation of Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy again to bring testimony to the truth of the Scriptures:

"The Scriptures Teach that Christ Will Establish a Literal Throne at Jerusalem and Will Reign Over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years."

I hope you have the list of Scriptures there with you. Perhaps some others I will use in this discussion, as many as I am able to. I am happy to be here. For my part, as I have told you before, I have never before engaged in a public, religious discussion with a man of another faith. I told Brother Oliphant and others as we planned this debate, I wanted it to be a big one. I appreciate my friend, Brother Oliphant. I am glad they selected him. I think he is a representative man. His brethren told me so. I suggested and rather insisted that they bring, if they would and could, Dr. Hardeman. They felt that Brother Oliphant would adequately represent the "Churches of Christ." I bowed to their good will that my friend and good neighbor represent his people in this tabernacle, in this discussion.

Scanned by TLC

I say frankly, I believe Dr. Oliphant is doing as well as anybody you could get with the material he has to work on. I am glad you have him. I told the brethren as we talked about this, that I do not stop work to go hunting very often. I used to go hunting on the farm when it rained and we couldn't work. I have done that, but when I do sometimes go hunting, I want to get game, and we did last night! I am thoroughly enjoying this debate. Last night I gave some Scriptures and some things outstanding, which I remind you, Dr. Oliphant did not even mention and others he did mention but jumped over a great deal of them. One Scripture he did not mention was Ezekiel 37th chapter, verses 21, 22, 24.

"And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land;

"And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all:

"And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them."

Another Scripture he did not mention was Zechariah, 14th chapter. That "the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee" (verse 5). "His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives" (verse 4). "And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem" (verse 8). "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth" (verse 9). Another Scripture that he didn't even mention was Revelation 2:25-28. And in that Scripture I remind you that the Savior said, "Hold fast till I come. And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations."

"But that which ye have already hold fast till I come.

Scanned by TLC

"And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations:

"And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father.

"And I will give him the morning star."

When will that be? When Jesus comes! Jesus said, "I will give power over the NATIONS, to him that overcometh," "and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father. And I will give him the morning star." As far as I recall, Brother Oliphant didn't even mention that and I know he did not discuss it. Some foolish answers were given on some other Scriptures. And I will get to them in a little bit.

My Brother Oliphant brought Scriptures from Luke 22: 29 where Jesus said, "I appoint unto you a kingdom." Brother Oliphant said that meant that the kingdom began at Pentecost, and was going on now. But I remind you if it meant anything at all like that the kingdom began at that time, if it began there it began BEFORE Pentecost. If it meant present or past, then the kingdom certainly began before Pentecost. If it meant future, no one could find a hint in that Scripture that the kingdom was to begin at Pentecost. Happily, we have other passages which state it will begin with the return of the Savior. And the next verse, Luke 22:30, says that when that kingdom comes, the twelve apostles will sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. There is no hint there of a kingdom beginning at Pentecost. That use of the Scripture, of course, won't prove anything. Mark you, "I appoint unto you a kingdom." If present tense, all right, this is before Pentecost. If past, it meant nothing. If future tense, then you have not proved anything by it. Jesus did not say, "I appoint unto you a kingdom to begin sometime in the near future." In Matthew 25:31 the Scripture expressly says when Jesus will reign. His disciples were anxious to know.

Scanned by TLC

They had preached about it. In Matthew 24:3 they had inquired about these future events, including the return of Christ. So in the same long passage, in Matthew 25:31, the Savior tells the exact time when he will sit on the throne of his glory. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory;"

All right, now get this. That will be, when? "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." When shall he sit upon the throne of his glory? When the Savior comes, the Scripture says, THEN. I say with the Scriptures, that when Jesus comes, then he will sit on the throne of his glory to reign. Brother Oliphant says he has been reigning on the throne of his glory all the time. The obvious use of language must indicate that the passage was given to make something clear. The only way to make clear something is to take at face value what it says. It does expressly say, that when Jesus comes, then he will sit on his throne. Here are some others. I have said before and I say again, the very heart and center of this debate is not Brother Oliphant's ability; he has lots of it; not good looks; he is a fine looking fellow: not logic, though he is a little weak there. He does the best he knows how. That is not the way this question is to be settled. I am reminding you that the important matter of this debate is this: we affirm "That the Scriptures Teach." Again and again we affirm that "the Scriptures teach," and the heart of this debate is this: Anyone can understand the Bible; and it means what it says. You don't need priests to tell you; legal counsel isn't needed, or high school or a college education to tell you what it means. Take it at what it says. It can be understood. You need an humble, prayerful, believing heart to take it for what it says. I affirm tonight that Christ will establish a literal throne at Jerusalem. Again and again and again this throne and

Scanned by TLC

kingdom is mentioned and Jerusalem is mentioned. The literal throne is mentioned, mark you, I make this assertion. It says that and I believe it. I make it after a careful study of the Scriptures.

I was a Postmillennialist. You say, why? I did not know better, I was a Postmillennialist because all my life I had gone where it was taught. The teaching was Postmillennialism, never any Premillennial teaching. My father was a country Baptist preacher, and what I heard was of a general resurrection, a general judgment, etc. Later on I went to college and the Bible department of the college taught the Postmillennial theory. The president was a Bible teacher. He was a good man, and although he hates me because I am a Premillennialist, and is one of the hardest enemies I have today, he is a man I love dearly. But my teaching was all the same way, Postmillennial. It was so at Baylor University. I went to Southwestern Baptist Seminary in Fort Worth, and the teaching there was Postmillennial all the way through. I finally got down to preaching the gospel. I preached it several years and dug it out myself, threw the commentaries away and I came to the position I now hold. I say the truth in Christ when I say the word of God itself forced that position upon me; as it has on most others who preach this blessed truth. Do you suppose my good friend, Dr. Wood, came to this position because he wanted the scorn and jeers of his brethren? To do so makes him a marked man. Brethren R. H. Boll, Earl C. Smith, James M. Neal, O. E. Phillips, and many others of the well known Christian and scholarly preachers in "Churches of Christ" are Premillennialists. Do you suppose they chose that doctrine deliberately in order to be called traitors, renegades, and Judas Iscariots, as they have been? Do you suppose they did that by choice and to get popularity? No, it never has been particularly popular. No, I say honestly, men have been driven to that position by the word of God. It isn't popular. Never-

Scanned by TLC

theless, it is the word of God. Mark my word, a Postmillennialist can be in either of two positions but no other. Either he does not know what the Bible says; or, he does not believe it. The Bible definitely and explicitly again and again and again mentions that throne and that kingdom and mentions *it as on the earth,* and at the return of Christ. Now it is only a case of whether you believe it. The Bible does say one thousand years. The only question is, do you believe it? I do, and Brother Oliphant does not.

Solomon sat "on the throne of David his father" (2 Kings 2:12). Jesus shall sit "upon the throne of his father David" (Luke 1:32). Jesus will sit on the throne of David like Solomon did. The Bible expressly says the throne of David and his kingdom. There is no doubt about what it says but it is whether you believe it or not. I say Postmillennialists or no-millennialists are that either by ignorance or by disbelief of the word of God. Many good men know a lot of things, but do not know the truth on this question, but the fact of the business is that this cannot be denied, and again and again I have seen it proven. I come to a rather unpleasant feature. It is too bad, but I feel this is true. I am sorry that it is so but the truth ought to be told. I beg you to notice this. My friend Brother Oliphant denies the one thousand years. He scorns and laughs and scoffs at the idea of a thousand years. It seems strange to me why men should hate that idea and scoff at it when the Bible so deliberately and expressly says a "thousand years." Six times God's Word calls a "thousand years." I did not know for a long time why men opposed the idea. Men may deny this one thousand years which the Bible states and describes because they have a theory, and if they take the Bible at face value, it will ruin their theory. That is exactly the reason my friend here denies it. I come a little further. He says the word millennium is not in the Bible. I grant you that, Brother

Scanned by TLC

Oliphant, and it is not in this statement I am affirming either. The thousand years is in this statement and the one thousand years is what I am affirming. The fact is that "millennium" is a Latin term for one thousand years, and it is expressly and exactly that. That is not a fair, honest, representative way of speaking of the Bible. Furthermore, though it is that way in the English Bible, "one thousand years;" in the Latin Bible it is the millennium. Whether Latin or Greek or English or any other language, nevertheless, brethren, it is there. If you were translating the Bible, you would translate it that way too. It is in every Bible. It is in every Bible that is translated accurately at all and I challenge you to deny it. That kind of argument may seem good debating to you, but it is not sound, honest teaching of the word of God. He said, "How many times is one thousand years mentioned? Only one time in the Bible." I took it down word for word. How many heard that statement last night? Don't say unless you heard it. I did hear it. Now listen to me. I say to you, my friend, that is another misstatement, whether deliberate or accidental, I do not know. But the fact of the business is, six times in the chapter I was discussing, it is expressly mentioned; three times "the thousand years," "the thousand years," "the thousand years; three times "a thousand years, "a thousand years," "a thousand years," and for that statement my Brother should apologize or retract. It was a misstatement, maybe accidental. I leave it to him. I say that is not the way to find the truth of the Bible. However, as far as I am concerned, if God only said it one time, that one time would settle it for me. How often does God have to say a thing to make it so?

Then we go back to Genesis. "God said, Let there be light: and there was light," and it only says it one time. It will have to say it more than six times before Brother Oliphant will believe it! How many times did God say, "God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed

Scanned by TLC

into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul?" How many times? Not as many times as he mentioned the thousand years reign of Christ on the earth, yet I believe it. I may be old fogey but I believe anything the Bible says, even one time! It does expressly say a thousand years reign on earth. It talks about a reign of a thousand years and that the saints would reign for a thousand years, and that the devil won't deceive the nations until the thousand years are ended. I want to say to you again, that that may be counted good debating or good work for a criminal lawyer before a jury, but is not honest Bible teaching! I urge my friend to leave that crooked way aside and face the honest, plain statements of the Bible. I am coming now to the most important part of this debate, when salvation will be discussed, and I beg you to throw aside these little crooks, twists and turns that deceive and mislead people and the brethren. I don't know how they are meant. I will not judge. But it is not fair and honest Bible teaching. For my part, I have no fear about the truth coming out of the Bible, for it will work. It is the wrong kind of religious debating that makes the Bible out to say what it didn't say. I am anxious about that and I judge not his motives at all, but I say that is not fair and honest Bible teaching; and I believe my Brother will correct it when he comes to the platform. Brother Oliphant says, "no one thousand years, no millennium," but the Bible says a thousand years six times!

How different that is from his brothers of the "Church of Christ." No millennium, no one thousand years! He says I misrepresented when I said many of the great people of the "Churches of Christ" are Premillennialists. This is no time here to discuss that, but if anybody wants to know, they can find out. Brother Wood has a fine tract here on "A Brief History of Premillennialism," quoting word for word from Moses E. Lard, David Lipscomb, Alexander Campbell, and many others. Their statements are on record in many other books, many times. All right,

Scanned by TLC

I say you ought to know them better than I do, and it would be the easiest thing in the world to prove it is a lie, if it is. If it is not, no one ought to ever, from this platform or any other platform, make such statements like that. Now a matter like that ought to be found out and such statements in religious debates do not do your debate any good at all. Now a matter of fact like that can be found out and ought to be found out while slanderous charges will not do any good at all. Intelligent, Christian people can find out the truth. Whether "Church of Christ" people back yonder, people of the Restoration Movement, believed in the millennium, is the easiest thing to prove in the world. I will do it by calling attention to two words, and when I call those two words, every member of the "Churches of Christ" here will be convinced. Premillennialists and Postmillennialists will admit it and no man here will stand on his feet and deny it. Those two words are — MILLENNIAL HARBINGER! MILLENNIAL HARBINGER! The forerunner of the millennium, the announcer of the millennium! The Millennial Harbinger was the name for some one half century of the principal publication of that movement! Nobody denies that. Alexander Campbell led in that movement, of which, of course, you are proud, and named his paper the Millennial Harbinger! Every one of the leaders in the Restoration Movement believed in a millennium, taught a millennium, and no honest, intelligent, truth-loving man here tonight can deny it in the face of the Millennial Harbinger. Now my friends, I am not mad, and this man is my friend, but I say that I am here for the truth. Again, that may be good debating, I doubt it, but it is not honest Bible teaching and it does not help to get at the truth. But I say again, I am here for the truth. I have got all I can do without debates. I have no ambitions as a debater. I have invitations to go here, yonder and everywhere for revivals. I am anxious for the one in Corsicana and one in Brownwood (a man has already gone

Scanned by TLC

to see about that city auditorium which will seat four thousand people). I have plenty to do. I am on the radio. I am not much of a preacher and I am not debating to get publicity. I have come to this business for the sake of the truth. But misstating things and arousing enmities will not help anybody. I say that, because it ought to be said and needs to be said.

I say this because I want you to come here with open, humble, contrite hearts and not be too smart, and take what God's Word says about it. God's Word says six times—a "thousand years," in one chapter. God could not have said it any plainer and it must have meant what it said. If that reign is to be not one thousand years, then how long is it to be? If it meant the 1900 years since Pentecost, if that was the time it was talking about, why did it not say that? Was it to be a rule of 2000 years, 3000 years? If that was the time it meant, why didn't he say that? He did not say it! I say Postmillennialists do not know what the Bible teaches and stands for simply because they do not believe what God's Word says, but it says it—a "thousand years." The Bible says it, brother—a "thousand years." And that proves beyond a shadow of a doubt to humble believers in the Bible that the kingdom did not begin at Pentecost. If it did, it stopped in the year 1032, 1033, 1028, or wherever it is agreed to be the thousandth anniversary of the Pentecost. Take it at face value, brother! Honest people have no choice but to take it, believe it, and follow it. You can bet your bottom dollar, I believe it is literal when it says so. Brother Oliphant, what do you say the thousand years means? You deny it means what it says. What does it mean then? Now my friend, if the Bible is true we had just as well take it. So I say in all kindness, what do you think "a thousand years" means?

My brother said something last night, something he wishes he could take back. A religious debate is no place to twist or deny the Scriptures nor to deliberately arouse

Scanned by TLC

prejudice by impugning the motives of others in this debate. He may have conclusions of his own, but I believe this platform is no place or time to impugn the motives of others. He said, if I mistake not, that Dr. Wood and Vernon Wood and the others, for the purpose of publicity, joined in with Frank Norris and John Rice. He will correct it if I have misquoted him. It had no place in this discussion. I do not believe these good men were actuated by base motives. They may be ever so much mistaken, but this is no place to accuse men of base motives when they stand for what they think is right. That is not the way the religious truth and Bible truth may be known. Now you talk about "apostate"—over in Fort Worth, one called Brother Wood that. Brother Wallace used the term "renegade," referring to Brother Wood, because he believed in a thousand years like Alexander Campbell did. I say again he did believe it, and he said so and no one can deny that he and his group called their official publication the *Millennial Harbinger,* the forerunner or announcer of the millennium. And because these brethren do, they are back numbers and because they are Premillennialists their motives are slurred. They believe in a thousand years! My friends, you talk about "apostate" or "degenerate!" The fact of the business is that this movement has gone far from the place where it started. May I say this is usually true about religious movements. What is true about this is true about the movement Martin Luther began. When he started out, Lutheranism meant justification by faith, individual salvation and less form. But Lutheranism has degenerated. It is true about other movements and Protestantism in general. You have degenerated from the position of the Restoration Movement.

This church stands for the independence of the local church, no denominational bosses nor leaders nor programs, no set salary for its pastor, no literature in Sunday school, but the Bible. You did not use this man-made Sunday

Scanned by TLC

school literature in the old days, and you bragged about it too, that you used the Bible. You used to tell the Methodists and Baptists that they were wrong in using literature, but you have gotten modern. On my table now is a quarterly put out by the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company and it has the heresy of hell in it. You have left the old faith. I am honest about it. Nobody here will deny you have gone from the place you once stood on this matter. Some may not have, but the movement has. You are following the course of other human movements and people who grow away from the Bible and the purity of New Testament doctrine and practice. Time was when men in the Millennial Harbinger and Moses E. Lard's quarterly could discuss the millennium, believing it, a literal thousand years, without being "hypocrites," "renegades" and worse than that, and that time ought to be again. There was a time when this movement started out on the basis of non-sectarianism and non-denominationalism, and you were right about that back there. I have been telling my Baptist friends about it and that is why I quit them. Nobody turned me out. I didn't want in. I gave it up. I was not turned out. I was a graduate of Baptist schools, was campaign director in Baylor University of the 75 million campaign, was teacher in a Baptist college, then moderator of my association, and I quit it all to get away from denominational machinery and unscriptural institutions and practices. You started undenominational and unsectarian, you claim, but you have left that. Don't you call these brethren apostate! They are where you were long ago. We need to come back and talk about these simple, plain fundamental truths with open mind in the Spirit of Christ. Postmillennialism has a bad, wicked, sectarian Spirit when it calls men "Judas Iscariot" or "apostate" for standing for the whole truth, the old time faith. Listen to me. Here are some things that ought to be said! There was a time back there when

Scanned by TLC

Alexander Campbell admitted there were Christians in all sects. So does Brother Wood and it is a matter of conscience with him. I am attacking the kind of system that leads a man away from the literal interpretation of the Bible, that is, taking it at face value, and makes him despise one who does take it at face value. I love my Brother, Dr. Wood. He doesn't agree with me about everything and I do not agree with anybody about everything. My Brother Oliphant here is embarrassed, and for reasons of his own I have no doubt, he does not call me his Brother; he also affirms I am not his Brother. Perhaps he means no unkindness. I give him that right. It is his right already. I don't impugn his motives. It is his right. I don't want to embarrass him. But I am proving there is a definite sectarian spirit here, utterly foreign to the movement called "the great Restoration Movement." That is true! Come a little further. Now about the Scriptures, I say this whole matter hinges on the Bible. It comes back to the question whether the Bible is to be taken at face value. Last night my friend here (I am sorry this is true), but Brother Oliphant took the Scriptures last night and twisted them and by taking a line here and there, and omitting a line here and a verse there, and made them mean what they did not say, the very opposite of what they expressly say! For instance in 2nd Samuel 7:10-12, Nathan speaking to David, said:

"Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime,

"And as since the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel, and have caused thee to rest from all thine enemies. Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee an house.

"And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall

Scanned by TLC

proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom."

My brother endeavored to show this meant that when David was in the grave, Christ would reign, not after David's resurrection at the second coming. That is what he said repeatedly, though he must have read the following verse, 2 Samuel 7:13, wherein it expressly teaches that it was Solomon who should reign after David's death, while David was in the grave.

"He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever."

Solomon built the temple after David's death. But that throne is to be established forever.

In Acts 2:30, we learn about David that,

"Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;"

Christ is to reign on David's and Solomon's throne but it was Solomon who would build the temple, after David died. 2 Samuel 7:14, just after that, says:

"I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men:"

Is that Jesus? No, no, that is Solomon. Jesus did not commit iniquity. It was Solomon. Surely my brother has read that verse in the Bible before. If he hasn't, this is a mighty good book to read. It didn't mean what Dr. Oliphant said it meant, and another verse would have shown it. Why didn't he honestly read the next verse? I turn to Zechariah, 6th chapter. Nothing suits me better than the word of God. I thought these good brethren would have been glad to come and ask me questions Sunday afternoon as I offered, but they would not come. Why? Well, they didn't want to. I thought Brother Nelson and Brother Joe Warlick would have been glad to have been here

Scanned by TLC

and pop me questions and see if I could answer them. I could do it from the Bible, too. I have no doubt about what the Bible teaches on this question. I have been urging you to bring your Bibles. My people are bringing theirs. I wish the rest of you had your Bibles. Here is what my friend, Brother Oliphant, read from Zechariah, 6th chapter: (This is a sample of what his teaching is. He read the verses which say), verses 12 and 13:

"And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch, and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord:

"Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both."

And he said, "That is Jesus" and that this verse proves Jesus is going to reign while he is a priest! I don't know if he ever read the verse before it or not. I think he did. And if he did, this is a wicked perversion and wresting of the Scriptures. The verse before it expressly tells who it was, calls his name, and the name of his father, and makes clear at the time that it was not the reigning of Jesus at all, it was "Joshua, the son of Josedech, the high priest"! This man Joshua, the high priest, reigned at Jerusalem when the remnant came back from Babylon! No honest man could say it was Jesus, if he ever read the verse just above it. Read it with me and see! 11th verse:

"Then take silver and gold, and make crowns, and set them upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest;"

Upon the head of whom? Jesus? No! Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest. I say that is a misstatement of the Scriptures for which there is no excuse for any man. If my Brother simply made that mistake, he will correct it. It comes down to whether the Bible is true or not and whether we will take it at face value. Verse 14,

Scanned by TLC

just after the verses he read, again shows no reference was made to Jesus:

"And the crowns shall be to Helem, and to Tobijah, and to Jedaiah, and to Hen the son of Zephaniah, for a memorial in the temple of the Lord."

The time is given, the name of the man is given, name of his father, and the names of his companions are given. I say that to argue from this verse that Jesus is now reigning, that is a misstatement and a perversion of the Scriptures that is inexcusable. My Brother need not make a mistake like that. I think my Brother is an honest man. If so, he will correct it. Again, Acts 2:30 showed, Brother Oliphant said, that Jesus was to reign yonder in heaven, not here, for he said, "God has raised him up to sit on his throne." He said the resurrection proved Jesus was now reigning on David's throne. But if it proves that, it proves that he began to reign right when Jesus was raised from the dead, on the day of his resurrection. If the resurrection proves that Jesus is now reigning, then his reign began the night Jesus rose from the dead. Is that what you believe? If Acts 2:30 proves he was to reign immediately, if it proves he was now reigning when Peter spoke, then where does the kingdom begin? Not at Pentecost, but the day of the resurrection! Not at Pentecost, but the night when Jesus rose from the dead! Acts 2:30 does not prove that Jesus is now reigning on David's throne. The Scripture does not say he began to reign then and any casual reading of that verse will show that it had no reference to a reign beginning at Pentecost. Pentecost was not even mentioned in connection with it. I say Jesus arose from the dead and will sit upon David's throne according to the flesh. Yes, and he is going to do that according to the flesh. But it didn't begin the day he rose from the dead, it did not begin at Pentecost, and that verse didn't say so either. Turn to Hebrews 2:14, and you will see a companion case:

Scanned by TLC

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;"

The Scripture says that he died in order to slay the devil. If Brother Oliphant's argument be true, then when Christ rose from the dead, the devil died! Do you believe that? Brother Oliphant argues that if Christ was raised from the dead to reign, then his reign began immediately (or at least soon thereafter, at Pentecost). According to the same argument, since Christ died to slay the devil, then the devil has been dead ever since! If Jesus is reigning now, then the devil is dead now, according to this wonderful argument of Brother Oliphant. The devil is dead and Christ is on David's throne, proved by the same kind of twisting of Scriptures! If one Scripture proves that Jesus began to reign immediately, the other one proves that the devil died immediately. If Acts 2:30 proves anything from Brother Oliphant it proves that Christ began to reign on David's throne the day he rose from the dead. But if it proves that, the same use of Scripture proves the devil is now dead!

Moderator: Your time is up.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Fourth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 18, 1935

SECOND PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that Christ will Establish a Literal Throne in Jerusalem and will Reign Over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(Third Negative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Well, we have had quite a change in spirit, haven't we? The Doctor is quite warm! For the first time in this discussion, we are hearing about "dishonest men," "dishonest, interpretation," "Crooked debating," "slanderous charges," etc. There is no surer sign of defeat than for a man to begin feeling that way. He thinks Dr. Wood and Vernon should not have been brought into this debate. I say "Amen" to that! Why didn't Dr. Rice think of that earlier? He is the man who injected them into it. He has talked about them every night since this debate began, either in his regular speeches or in preliminary talks. He talked about these brethren until I was forced to say something about them, and now he gets terribly excited, because I finally said something in reply to the many things he has said. It seems that Dr. Rice knew he could not prove his proposition without help, so he began, on the very first night, enlisting the aid of these few brethren who differ from me and the great body of Christians with whom I stand identified.

Dr. Rice says I am doing well, considering the material

Scanned by TLC

I have to work on. Thank you, Sir! Being in the negative, I am following you and have only such material as you furnish. It is true that you have not given me much to work with. You did not make a single new argument in your last speech, but spent your entire time criticizing me for referring to extraneous matters which you yourself brought into this discussion.

Last night my opponent said Alexander Campbell could be quoted on either side of this question. The only way he can be quoted on Rice's side is to misrepresent him, as Vernon Wood did in his tract.

Tonight he calls attention to the name of Campbell's paper, "The Millennial Harbinger," and insists that Campbell must have believed in a millennium. Seeing a mighty movement away from denominationalism and toward the simple teaching of the New Testament, Campbell thought there was beginning a period of unprecedented prosperity for New Testament Christianity. It was his opinion, that the preaching of the gospel would bring about a period of widespread adherence to the simple gospel. He hoped, through his paper, to assist in the ushering in of such a period—hence the name, "Millennial Harbinger." Campbell did not believe in a thousand years' reign of Christ between two future, literal resurrections. He did not believe in a millennium following Christ's second coming. He did not believe that Jesus will come to the earth and occupy a literal throne, but that he is now on the throne of David. He did not hold the position advocated by Premillennialists in any essential particular.

I want to make one more statement about this business of taking the Bible literally. I think this audience understands that I believe the Bible from the first chapter of Genesis to the last chapter of Revelation. When the authors intended that its language should be taken literally, I want to take it literally. When they used a figure of speech I want to understand and believe it, as such. When Jesus said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat

Scanned by TLC

the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life" (John 6:53, 54). My opponent and I both know that he was not teaching cannibalism. I want Dr. Rice to tell us whether he understands that there are symbolic statements and figures of speech in the Bible. I am not going to charge him with ignorance in this respect. He has gone to school; he has told us several times about having gone to college, and having taught in college. He knows something of the English language. He knows it is not disbelief in the Bible to accept its figures of speech as figures of speech. Why then, does he make such a fuss about the matter? I can reach but one conclusion. He knows the intelligent people of this audience see that he is defeated. To save himself in the eyes of at least a few, he is trying to appeal to the prejudices of the unintelligent. Doctor, I think you have misjudged this audience. I do not believe there is anybody here who is sufficiently ignorant and uninformed to be misled by your quibbles about the creation of man, the virgin birth, etc.

He is somewhat disturbed about our apostacizing from the position held by Campbell. In the first place, his charge is false. In the second place, it makes no difference whether we agree with Alexander Campbell or any other uninspired man. His evidence that we have apostacized is that we use quarterlies to assist in learning and teaching the Bible. This comes with poor grace from a man who has written and published what he calls "a correspondence course through the Bible." I have in my hand a little tract entitled "Bible Lessons on the Book of Revelation," by John R. Rice.

He says the restoration movement started under the Campbells, and other pioneers, as an undenominational movement. Correct. It has continued so. Churches of Christ of today have no denominational affiliation whatever. Each congregation is a distinct entity, free from domination by any Board, Conference, Synod, or ecclesiastical

Scanned by TLC

association of any nature whatsoever. We have no king but Christ, recognize no authority but the authority of him who has all power in heaven and in earth. We preach no message but the gospel; wear no name but the divine name. Alexander Campbell founded no church. He advocated a return to the simple teaching, practice and organization of the New Testament church. Present-day churches of Christ contend for that same program.

Rice says he and his church are undenominational. Still, he calls his church the Fundamentalist Baptist Church. The term denomination is defined: "A class distinction, name, epithet, appellation, a body of Christians having a distinguishing name, sect." He belongs to just such a group. The New Testament church contains all the saved. According to Rice's own admissions, the church with which he is associated, is not the New Testament church. His name is strictly denominational. I challenge him to find the Fundamentalist Baptist Church, or any other kind of Baptist church, in the Bible. I did not discuss the Baptist Church until he brought it up. He seems to find it easier to discuss the Baptist Church, Alexander Campbell, Dr. Wood, his personal experiences, etc., than to prove his proposition.

I do not care to discuss Ezekiel 37 further. I have shown that it does not teach my opponent's position. I again remind him that it says: "David my servant shall be king over them," and "My servant David shall be their prince." He has not attempted to harmonize this with his insistence upon a literal interpretation of the chapter.

He refers to Luke 22, but makes no effort to answer my argument on the passage. I showed that Jesus appointed unto his disciples a kingdom, that they might eat and drink at his table in his kingdom. The Lord's table is in his kingdom. We have the Lord's table, according to the Bible and according to Rice. Therefore, we have the kingdom. My argument stands untouched. It does not help him any that this was before Pentecost. Jesus here "appointed unto them a kingdom." In Mark 9:1, he told them

Scanned by TLC

when they would receive the kingdom. He could not in a thousand years harmonize these scriptures with his future kingdom theory.

No one denies that Christ will "sit upon the throne of his glory," when he comes again, as stated in Matthew 25:31. What we do deny is that he begins his reign at that time. The next verse shows this is the time he will judge the nations, not the time he will establish his kingdom.

My opponent says I "laughed, and scorned, and scoffed" at the idea of a thousand years' reign, as taught in the 20th chapter of Revelation. My dear sir, I do not know whether or not you intended to misrepresent me—I will not impugn your motives—but I do say, there is not one solitary iota of truth in your statement! I may have been amused at your ridiculous and absurd theory concerning a millennium, but I heartily accept everything taught in the 20th chapter of Revelation, and I did not "laugh, scorn, and scoff" at even your false theory.

I may have said the thousand years is mentioned only one time in the Bible. What I meant, is that it is mentioned in only one passage of scripture—the 20th chapter of Revelation. I want this audience to bear in mind that my opponent's position is that Christ will return to the earth and reign for a literal one thousand years on a literal throne in literal Jerusalem, and that there is only one chapter in all the Bible that says anything whatever about a thousand years' reign, and he has not even read that chapter to you. It is the only passage that might be so twisted and strained as to even seem to hint at his theory; still he refuses to introduce it. I believe the 20th chapter of Revelation just as it reads. I charge that my opponent does not. I want him to introduce it and make an argument on it. I will then show that he is the man who will not take Revelation 20 as it reads. He has but one more opportunity to introduce the only passage that says anything about a thousand years' reign. Is he afraid of it? We shall see.

He now says 2 Samuel 7:12 does not refer to Christ on

Scanned by TLC

David's throne. Then, sir, why did you introduce it on that question?

He says "the BRANCH" of Zechariah 6:12, 13 means Joshua, and not Jesus. The prophecy was given to "Joshua the son of Josedech," but concerns Christ. See also the 8th verse of the 3rd chapter: "Hear now, O Joshua the high priest, thou, and thy fellows that sit before thee: for they are men wondered at: for, behold, I will bring forth my servant the BRANCH." Jeremiah 23:5, 6 tells us the name of "the BRANCH"—"this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."

Oh, yes, I seem to remember that my opponent made an argument on "the BRANCH," and said it referred to Christ! Doctor, have you forgotten your argument on Isaiah 11? He who attempts to prove a false theory should have a good memory, he is likely to contradict himself. Yes, Zechariah 6 refers to Christ. It teaches that he will be priest at the time he is on his throne. He is priest now; hence is now on his throne. I introduced a series of arguments on this passage. I should be glad to have him examine them before this audience.

My friend Rice says the Bible teaches that Christ will "sit on the throne according to the flesh." It teaches no such thing. Talk about twisting the Scriptures! Sir, I will borrow a dollar from your moderator and give it to you, if you will find anything in the Bible about Christ "sitting on the throne according to the flesh." Acts 2:30 says, "that of the fruit of his (David's) loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on the throne," but there is nothing said about Christ's sitting on the throne according to the flesh. Besides, Peter says this was fulfilled when Christ was raised from the dead and exalted to the right hand of God. "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ" (Verse 31).

I have asked my opponent several questions; he will not answer them. He just will not answer questions! I leave it to the audience to guess the reason. I do want to ask

Scanned by TLC

one more question: Are there any prophecies in the Old Testament concerning the church? If Christ intended to establish his kingdom, but had his plans foiled by the Jews, and built the church—merely to "fill in," until his second coming—there cannot be any prophecies about the church in the Old Testament. The Premillennial theory makes the church a mere accident; and that in the face of Paul's declaration, that God is to receive "glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end" (Ephesians 3:21).

His theory drives him to some terrible inconsistencies. For instance, he says the time was fulfilled and the kingdom of God was at hand when Jesus so declared in Mark 1:15. Then, all of the Old Testament prophecies concerning the establishment of the kingdom were ready to be fulfilled; but the Jews rejected Christ, and God postponed the establishment of the kingdom until the second coming. Still, my opponent goes to the Old Testament prophecies to find a prediction concerning his future kingdom! If the plan of God was changed and the kingdom postponed when the Jews rejected Christ, how can any of the Old Testament prophecies refer to this new plan? Let him explain his glaring inconsistency at this point.

I have shown from John 6:14, 15, that the Jews were ready for an earthly kingdom, such as my opponent expects Christ to establish at his second coming; but that Jesus refused to give them that kind of a kingdom. If God's plan was changed, it was not because of anything the Jews did, but because Christ failed to understand God's plan. I had hoped my opponent would try to explain this, but I suppose he thinks that to try to explain it will do him more harm than to leave it alone. Perhaps he is right.

Pilate was a materialist and thought of Jesus' kingdom as an earthly, material reign—such as Dr. Rice's proposition calls for. But Jesus declared, "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews:

Scanned by TLC

but now is my kingdom not from hence" (John 18:36). My opponent's theory is that Christ's kingdom will be established through carnal fighting. Jesus expressly denies ever having any such kingdom.

Now to Zechariah 14. I purposely refrained from replying to this argument last night, because I wanted to take it up when I would have more time. The 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters of Zechariah have reference to that period of time beginning with the personal ministry of Christ, going through Pentecost and concluding with the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. I cannot take up everything in these chapters, but I will examine enough of them to show you that my contention is correct.

(1) Zechariah 13:1. "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness." The opening of the fountain for sin and uncleanness in Jerusalem certainly is not an event yet future. "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God" (Hebrews 10:12). Will my opponent say that there is now no fountain for sin and uncleanness? (2) "And also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land" (Zechariah 13:2). Jesus cast out unclean spirits during his personal ministry. (3) "And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends" (Zechariah 13:6). Thomas saw "in his hands the print of the nails" (John 20:25). This could not refer to Christ's second coming. He will not come again in a mutilated body, but in a glorified body. "We know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (1 John 3:2). Though Christ was once known in a wounded body of flesh, he will never again be so known. "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more" (2 Corinthians 5:16). (4)

Scanned by TLC

"And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on my name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is my people: and they shall say, The Lord is my God" (Zechariah 13:9). Paul said "a remnant had been saved" (Romans 9:27). They were refined through the fire. God's word is as a fire (Jeremiah 23:29). Three thousand Israelites passed through this process and "called upon his name" on the day of Pentecost. (5) "And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be" (Zechariah 14:8). Will my opponent tell us that the "living waters" have never gone forth from Jerusalem? When Jesus promised the Samaritan woman "living waters," did he mean what he said? (See John 4:10-14.)

Now to the particular verses especially relied on by my friend. "Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city. Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south. And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee" (Zechariah 14:1-5). (1) This cannot refer to

Scanned by TLC

the establishment of Christ's kingdom. We have already learned that his kingdom, not being "of this world," was not established by carnal warfare. (2) This passage mentions—not the return of Christ—but of God. The Revised Version says Jehovah. The "returns" of God in the Old Testament are not to be taken literally. Joel 2:14 says, "Who knoweth if he (*God*) *will return* and repent, and leave a blessing behind him?" In Psalms 6:4, David prayed; "*Return,* O Lord, deliver my soul." Jeremiah 15: 19: "Let them return unto thee; but *return not thou unto them.*" Are these passages to be understood as referring to a literal return of God? If so, from where? (3) This prophecy was fulfilled in A. D. 70, when the Roman army, under the leadership of Titus and composed of men from all nations, descended upon Jerusalem and destroyed it. "I will turn mine hand upon the little ones" (Zechariah 13:7). "And the land shall mourn, every family apart" (Zechariah 12:12). "And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains" (Zechariah 14:5). "Their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth" (Zechariah 14:12).

Now, I want to read the fulfillment of these prophecies. Describing the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, Josephus, the great Jewish historian, says: "All hope of escaping being now cut off from the Jews, together with their liberty of going out of the city, the famine began to extend its progress, and devour the people by whole houses and families. The upper rooms were full of women and children that were dying by famine; and the lanes of the city were full of the dead bodies of the aged. The children also, and the young men, wandered about the marketplaces like shadows, all swelled with the famine, and fell dead, wheresoever their misery seized them. As for burying them, those that were sick were not able, and those that were well were deterred from doing it by the great multitude of those dead bodies, and by the uncertainty there

Scanned by TLC

was how soon they should die themselves. For many died as they were burying others; and many went to their coffins before that fatal hour was come. Nor was there any lamentation made under these calamities; nor were heard any mournful complaints. But the famine confounded all natural passions. For those who were just going to die looked upon those that were gone to their rest before them with dry eyes and open mouths. A deep silence also, and a kind of deadly gloom, had seized upon the city. While yet the robbers were still more terrible than these miseries themselves. For they brake open those houses which were no other than graves of dead bodies, and plundered them of what they had; carrying off the coverings of their bodies, went out laughing, and tried the points of their swords in their dead bodies; and in order to prove what mettle they were made of, they thrust some of those through that still lay alive upon the ground. But for those that entreated them to lend them their right hand, and their swords to dispatch them, they would not grant their requests, but left them to be consumed by the famine. Every one of these died with their eyes fixed upon the temple; and left the seditious alive behind them. Now the seditious at first gave orders that the dead should be buried out of the public treasury; as not enduring the stench of the bodies: but afterwards, when they could not do that, they had them cast down from the walls into the valleys beneath." (WARS OF THE JEWS," Book 5, Chapter 12, Page 390.) Josephus says the Roman guards were stationed upon the mount of Olives. ("WARS OF THE JEWS," Book 6, Chapter 2, Page 405.) "And the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley" (Zechariah 14:4). Josephus tells us that a trench—"a very great valley"—was actually cut through the mount of Olives by the Roman army. ("WARS OF THE JEWS," Book 5, Chapter 12.)

The times of great tribulation predicted by Jesus in Matthew 25 and Luke 21 were fulfilled in this destruction

Scanned by TLC

of Jerusalem. "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be" (Matthew 24:21). "But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people" (Luke 21:23). Josephus tells of the inhabitants of Jerusalem fleeing to the mountains and of the terrible distress of those who were unable to escape. Mothers ate their own children. The number of the dead was so great that the living could not bury them.

Of course, not everything in the prophecy of Zechariah can be taken literally. God did not, personally, engage in carnal warfare. God is often spoken of as fighting in a spiritual or figurative sense. "I have slain them by the words of my mouth" (Hosea 6:5). "He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness of girdle of his reins" (Isaiah 11:4, 5). I think I have shown that the prophecy of Zechariah 14 has been fulfilled and does not refer to a literal return of God to the earth. If the fulfillment I have shown is not literal enough to suit my opponent, I invite his attention to another Old Testament prophecy and its fulfillment.

Isaiah 40:3-5: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain: And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." The prophet here mentions "wilderness," "way," "desert," "highway," "valley," "mountain," "hill," "rough places," and "plain." In the fulfillment of this prophecy, not one of these items was literally affected in any way. The prophecy was fulfilled in the work of John the Baptist. (See Matthew 3:3; Luke 3:4-6; and Mark

Scanned by TLC

1:3.) Luke quotes the entire prophecy; the others quote only a part, but make it clear that the prophecy has been fulfilled. A literal fulfillment by John the Baptist would have required the mountains to be torn down and the rough country made smooth and level. Here is a good place for my opponent to apply his literalism to the prophecies and their fulfillment. I think I understand why the kingdom was not established: It was to be built on a mountain, and John tore the mountain down! Excuse the levity; I am only showing the ridiculousness of Dr. Rice's position.

I invite your attention to a few more rebuttal arguments. Turn to Jeremiah 22:28-30: "Is this man Coniah a despised broken idol? is he a vessel wherein is no pleasure? wherefore are they cast out, he and his seed, and are cast into a land which they know not? O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah." Jeconiah (Coniah) was the last king who sat on the earthly throne of David by divine authority. He was king at the time the Jews became captive to the Babylonians, some six hundred years before the Christian era. In the passage under consideration, God makes an announcement to the earth with a triple emphasis: "O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord." What is the announcement? That "no man of Coniah's seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah." From the 1st chapter of Matthew, we learn that Jesus was the seed of Coniah. God has specifically said that he cannot rule on an earthly throne in Judah. Christ cannot be an earthly king any more than he can be a priest on earth. "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest" (Hebrews 8:4). Christ is now ruling "over the earth" from his throne in heaven (Philippians 2:5-11; Ephesians 1: 19-23). But he can never rule "on the earth," from an earthly throne. God ruled as king over Israel (1 Samuel

Scanned by TLC

8:7; 1 Samuel 12:12); but God did not come down to earth and sit on an earthly throne. He ruled through his divinely appointed government. Christ rules through his government, from his throne in heaven.

I invite your attention to the 110th Psalm: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the places with the dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries. He shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head." We have the day of Christ's power described. The day of his power will be: (1) When he is at God's right hand. (2) When he is priest after the order of Melchizedek. (3) When his subjects are willing. (4) When he rules in the midst of his enemies. (5) When he strikes through kings and judges among the heathen. If we can find when these things occur, we can know that is the day of his power—the time of his reign. (1) He is now at God's right hand. "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted" (Acts 2:33). "Sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high" (Hebrews 1:3). (2) He is now priest after the order of Melchizedek. "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (Hebrews 5:6). Hebrews 7:17 quotes this prophecy as being fulfilled in the Christian age. (3) His subjects are now willing. It is only "whosoever will" that serves him. (4) He now rules in the midst of his enemies. "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Acts 2:34, 35). "For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last

Scanned by TLC

enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (1 Corinthians 15: 25, 26). Notice that Christ, not only is now reigning in the midst of his enemies, but will continually so reign until the last enemy is destroyed. (5) He now judges. "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God" (1 Peter 4:17). In the providence of God, governments are overturned, Christ "strikes through kings" and "wounds the heads of many countries." However we need not find the specific fulfillment of every point in the prophecy to know that we are living in the day of Christ's power. All of these things are to exist simultaneously, co-extensively; all are to be during "the day of thy power." Will my opponent deny that Christ is now priest after the order of Melchizedek? If Christ is now at God's right hand, and if he is priest after the order of Melchizedek, then this is the day of his power—the time of his reign. I beg my opponent to examine this argument. I insist that it establishes my position on this question and completely annihilates the proposition he is affirming.

Now to Psalm 45:6, 7: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." "Thy throne" and "thy kingdom" belong to the time when this prophecy is fulfilled. In Hebrews 1:8, 9, Paul quotes the prophecy and shows that it is now being fulfilled through Christ. "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, if for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." If we are to believe the prophecy of the 45th Psalm, and Paul's quotation of it and announcement of its fulfillment, we know that Christ's throne and his kingdom are now in existence.

Referring to the dynasty of David, God said: "Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the

Scanned by TLC

same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him" (Ezekiel 21:26, 27). Has Christ come? Was it his right to occupy the throne of David? The angel so announced to Mary: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:32, 33). And Peter announced on Pentecost that the prophecy and promise have been fulfilled, and that Christ has been raised from the dead to sit on the throne of David (Acts 2).

My opponent's theory is that the righteous dead will be raised when Christ comes, that Christ will then reign for a thousand years, after which the resurrection of the wicked and the general judgment will occur. In the few remaining minutes before I close, I want to show the utter falsity of the theory of a thousand years reign between the resurrection of the righteous and the resurrection of the wicked.

The resurrection of the righteous and the wicked will occur at the same hour. John 5:28, 29: "Marvel not at this: for the *hour* is coming, *in the which all that are in the graves* shall hear his voice, And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." This resurrection includes "all that are in the graves." There are but two classes: First, They that have done good (the righteous). Second, They that have done evil (the wicked). All are to be raised at the same time.

The resurrection of the righteous dead and the transformation of the living saints will be at the last trump. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we which are

Scanned by TLC

alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord" (1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17). 1 Corinthians 15:51, 52: "Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." (1) The righteous will be raised at the last trump. (2) The living will be changed at the last trump. (3) This will be at the second coming of Christ. Therefore, the second coming of Christ will be at the last trump. This must mean the last resurrection. If there is another resurrection a thousand years after this, it will be a resurrection without a trump. Will the dead wake up accidentally?

The resurrection of the righteous will occur at the last day. John 6:39: "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again *at the last day*" John 6:40: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up *at the last day*." 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*." John 6:54: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up *at the last day*." John 11:24: "Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection *at the last day*."

The judgment of the wicked will be at the last day. John 12:48: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him *in the last day*." (1) The resurrection of the righteous will be at the last day. (2) The judgment of the wicked will be at the last day. (3) Therefore, the resurrection of the righteous and the judgment

Scanned by TLC

of the wicked will be at the same time; and since they are to be at the "last day," there cannot possibly be a thousand years reign to follow.

The judgment of the righteous and the judgment of the wicked will be at the same time. Matthew 25:31, 32: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered *all nations;* and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." 2 Corinthians 5:10: "For *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." Mark 8:38: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, *when he cometh* in the glory of his Father with holy angels." From these Scriptures we learn that at Christ's second coming: (1) All nations will be gathered before him. (2) He shall separate the sheep from the goats. (3) Everyone will be rewarded or punished; both the righteous and the wicked—"receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (4) He will be ashamed of the wicked. Again: the wicked will see Christ at his second coming. Revelation 1:7: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and *they also which pierced him:* and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." (1) This is when Christ comes with the clouds. (2) The wicked (those who pierced him) will see him. (3) Therefore, the wicked will be raised when Christ comes with the clouds.

2 Thessalonians 1:7-10: "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord,

Scanned by TLC

and from the glory of his power; When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed in that day." (1) When Christ comes he will punish the wicked. (2) He will reward the righteous (be glorified in his saints). (3) Therefore, the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked both take place at his coming. The Bible plainly teaches that the resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked, as well as the rewarding of the righteous and the punishing of the wicked, will occur at the second coming of Christ. There is no room for a thousand years' reign between the two.

I thank you!

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Fourth Session: 7:30 p. m., Friday, January 18, 1935.

SECOND PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that Christ will establish a Literal Throne at Jerusalem and Will Reign over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(Fourth Affirmative Address by John R. Rice.)

Mr. Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

Brother Oliphant, if I misquoted you and if you did not scoff at the thousand years, but believe it, I take back what I said. I am sure the people understood it as I did. I misunderstood you, and that will end the argument. I am glad you accept the thousand years. I would not willingly mistreat Brother Oliphant nor misquote him. If I did, I apologize. I take whatever he says are the facts in the case. If he says he did not scoff at it, he did not. Two or three things are important. If he says he takes it; fine, that's what I do. Now we are agreed on a literal thousand years.

I am glad Brother Oliphant brought up the case of Coniah. Let us clarify the case of Coniah, one of the last kings reigning in Jerusalem. Go back, as he did, in Jeremiah 22:30 where the Lord says:

"Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah."

Scanned by TLC

No seed of his, the Scripture says, shall prosper on the throne of David, in the land of Israel. Now Brother Oliphant, I am glad to take this Scripture at face value; and the Scriptures said about this man Coniah, one of the last kings of the line, before the Babylonian captivity, about the time of the captivity:

"Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah."

That is right. But from there on Brother Oliphant, you are dead wrong. The Scripture does not say anywhere Jesus came from Coniah. If you will turn and read the genealogy in Matthew, 1st chapter, you will find there it expressly states that Jesus did not come of Coniah. Here, you will find, is the official genealogy, if you want to call it so. Look at it, to be sure. I want to quote what it says. Matthew 1:1:

"The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."

All right, but listen. The Scripture expressly states that it is the genealogy of Joseph, not of Mary and Christ. It says a little further down here, in Matthew 1:16:

"And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ."

Now if Brother Oliphant's argument proved anything, it proved that Jesus was not virgin born. If Jesus was the seed of Coniah, his father was Joseph. But the case of Coniah is one of the best in the Bible to prove the virgin birth! Jesus is of David's kingly line, but not of this line (Solomon's, Coniah's and Joseph's), not through this branch of David's seed—"Write ye this man childless." Joseph was to come of that line, but he is not the father of Jesus! He is not the seed of the promise! And then we read the actual genealogy as given in Luke 3, which expressly says Christ's and Mary's line goes back through

Scanned by TLC

Nathan to David, not through Jehoiachin, or Jechonias, who is the same as Coniah, not through Solomon but through Nathan. That is interesting, not well known, but so. A slight investigation will verify it for anybody. It will be mighty good for you brethren to do it. I found a great joy in it back yonder.

The case of Coniah, in Jeremiah 22:30, proves that Jesus is not the seed of Coniah, therefore Joseph was not his father but he was the virgin born Son of God. That Scripture does not deny the literal reign of Christ on David's throne.

Now Zechariah 14, my good friend here says, (I can sympathize with his trouble, and realize why he did not go on before), it has been fulfilled! Then he quickly left it and turned to 13th chapter of Zechariah! But in Zechariah 14:1, the Scripture says very clearly about it: "Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee." Notice now "the day of the Lord cometh." When is the day of the Lord? It is mentioned in the second Thessalonian letter, 2 Thessalonians 2:2:

"That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand."

He says it has happened, says it came at Pentecost, and is going on now. But 2 Thessalonians says, "Do not be deceived, as for that day of the Lord is at hand." The day of the Lord, Paul says, has not yet happened, and will not come till after the man of sin is revealed! No, Zechariah 14 has not happened, Brother Oliphant. Zechariah 14:8 says:

"And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be."

Brother Oliphant says this water going forth was at Pentecost, that the other verses tell of the destruction of

Scanned by TLC

Jerusalem in A. D. 70, or words to that effect! In the same chapter, Zechariah 14, verses 3 and 4 say:

"Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle.

"And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south."

Now was that Titus' feet? The Scripture says, "In that day (the day of the Lord), his feet (the Lord's feet), shall stand upon the mount of Olives." And the Scripture says, "The mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south." It did not say some one shall come along and dig a trench in it. No, it "shall cleave in the midst toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley" . . . *and there shall be a very great valley!* Did it cleave in the middle, toward the east and toward the west and make a great valley in A. D. 70? And notice, it did not say somebody dug a trench. "And half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south." Half of the mountain was not shoveled away toward the south by the army of Titus. The mountain is still there. And the Scriptures said at the same time (Zechariah 14:5) " . . . and the Lord my God shall come and all the saints with thee." The coming of the Lord with all his saints will take place at the same time as these other events! Now Brother Oliphant, when did that happen? At Pentecost or at the destruction of Jerusalem? Which one? Obviously, neither one! It has not happened yet. Neither has the literal reign of Christ occurred yet.

Now Acts 2:30. I am glad Brother Oliphant asked me

Scanned by TLC

to show where God raised Christ up according to the flesh, to sit on David's throne. I want to say that I am sure Brother Oliphant meant to be right. He asked me to show where God would raise him up according to the flesh to sit upon the throne. He should be familiar with not only one version, the Revised Version, the American Standard, but also with the Authorized Version. The best known English version in the world, the King James version, expressly says, "According to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." Read Acts 2:30 in this Authorized or King James version:

"Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, ACCORDING TO THE FLESH, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;"

Now Brother Oliphant ought to have been familiar with that. It is the most familiar English version of the Bible in the world. Leave that as it is and see whether anybody perverted the Scripture or not! It is very clear.

Notice this other thing about the matter. The original Greek text would show that the resurrection did not necessitate an immediate reign. Wherever there is honest preaching from the Scriptures, the Greek will not be misquoted, for so reliable are the translations that the English and Greek do not materially differ. Many famous preachers, I am sure, do not know very much about Greek. I do not know much about the Greek, and don't claim to. The Scripture says here, Acts 2:29 and 30:

"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.

"Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;"

Now our friend, Brother Oliphant, said here that God

Scanned by TLC

did raise him up to sit on that throne and that the raising up was the resurrection to get the throne right away. But notice this Scripture here in the original Greek language. The Greek word here for "raise up" is "anistemi," meaning, according to Young's Analytical Concordance, "to set or place up again." It refers then to the future enthronement of Jesus, not primarily his resurrection. The next verse says David, knowing about this future enthronement, gave the Scripture of Psalms 16:10, "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." That is about the resurrection. "Raise up", in Acts 2:30, refers to the enthronement of Christ, yet future, *not* to the resurrection. The Emphatic Diaglot or the original Greek will prove it to any student. As far as that is concerned, Christ is raised from the dead, sure. That general passage means he was raised from the dead, sure. But no Scripture say Christ will not come down to reign. It says he is going to be raised up of the "fruit of his loins," that is physically to reign. Of the "fruit of his loins," (and the most familiar translation says "according to the flesh,) he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." Now read Luke 19:11-27:

"And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear.

"He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.

"And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come.

"But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us.

"And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money,

Scanned by TLC

that he might know how much every man had gained by trading.

"Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds.

"And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities.

"And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds.

"And he said likewise unto him, Be thou also over five cities.

"And another came, saying, Lord, behold, here is thy pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin:

"For I feared thee, because thou art an austere man: thou takest up that thou layedst not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow.

"And he saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow:

"Wherefore then gavest not thou my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with usury?

"And he said unto them that stood by, Take from him the pound, and give it to him that hath ten pounds.

"(And they said unto him, Lord, he hath ten pounds.)

"For I say unto you, That unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him.

"But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me."

The Scripture is clear. The reign comes after the return of the King! People will rule over literal cities. But see 2 Timothy 4:1:

"I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus

Scanned by TLC

Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom;"

Here we see that the judgment throne and the throne of Christ's kingdom are the same and that Christ will sit on that throne at his appearing or second coming. Now our friend said Jesus already sat on that throne. Matthew 25:31 tells us that "When the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Brother Oliphant gave another explanation last night. He said that was the throne of judgment. But 2 Timothy 4:1 shows that he "shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom!" He did not think of that last night. He gave another explanation last night of Matthew 25:31, saying that that is the throne of judgment. As far as that is concerned, neither one of his explanations are correct. It expressly says what it means, "at his appearing and his kingdom." The kingdom of Christ on David's throne will be at his appearing. You say, was there a judgment yonder in Matthew 25? Yes. Certainly it is a judgment, but not THE judgment. The Bible never speaks of "THE judgment." There are several judgments; of saved and unsaved, of nations and of individuals. The work speaks of Christians judging themselves. The Bible does not speak of "THE judgment" in the sense that it would exclude other judgments. There is a judgment of angels; the Bible speaks about Christians judging them. It isn't proper to speak of THE judgment unless perhaps you mean by that the last great judgment of all the unsaved dead. If you mean that, no, this was not "the judgment." This in Matthew 25 was a judgment of the living nations on the earth. There are three groups mentioned: sheep, goats and brethren. It is not the judgment of Revelation 20. That judgment will be out in space. Revelation 20:11, 12 say:

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on

Scanned by TLC

it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them.

"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.

That is only one class the Scripture is talking about here, the dead, and they are condemned and going to hell. Nothing is said in Revelation 20:11 and 12 about people being saved. But in Matthew 25:31 there are three classes. It is not "the judgment," but the kingdom, at his appearing.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory."

That is when he comes in his glory, and the nations are gathered before him. Where are the nations? In this case there are three classes; it is actually when the king will put down his enemies, as he will when he comes to reign. Again in Luke 19th chapter—here is a good Scripture which my friend did not mention. Notice particularly this part which he did not mention. Of course he will bring it up, it is important. I want him to discuss it. Luke 19:9-11:

"And Jesus said unto him, This day is salvation come to this house, forsomuch as he also is a son of Abraham.

"For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.

"And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear."

Why did Jesus tell this? Because some folks thought the kingdom of God would immediately appear. "For a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." If Brother Oliphant had been

Scanned by TLC

there he would have said it had already begun, or have said it would begin at Pentecost. May I remind you of this. The kingdom in the minds of the people meant one thing only. For hundreds of years there were no separate; individual, independent kingdoms. There was one kingdom over the whole world, had been since in the days of Babylon. One king ruled the whole known world. If outlying peoples were not actually governed, yet God had given the world empire power to do so. Rome now ruled the world when Christ was born. Jews were accustomed to petty kingdoms with kings who were subject to Caesar, the world emperor at Rome. Herod might have gone to Rome to make friends with the emperor and receive the right to rule in the province of Judaea, as his father had. Receiving the kingdom from the emperor he would return to Palestine to reign. That had actually happened in the days of all the people present when Jesus spoke. Jesus said in effect, "I will illustrate about my coming kingdom with the kind of kingdom you know about!" Therefore in Luke 19: 12 we are told, "He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return."

And not until he receives it will he come back, and having received the kingdom, he will come back to reign. "A certain nobleman" was Jesus all right. He was a kingly one, but had not yet received his kingdom. When he speaks, does he compel them now to listen? No, he is not reigning now—he has gone after the kingdom, and not until he receives the kingdom will he come back to reign. When will he return? Not before he receives the kingdom. That was just like Herod did, and any citizen of the Roman empire would understand. Certainly it was a subordinate throne, but David's throne was subordinate to the God of heaven. Hasn't he, Christ, always been subordinate to the throne of God?

When Christ was here, the only crown he had was a crown of thorns. The world that crucified him then, hates

Scanned by TLC

him still and hates his true disciples. But one day he will come to reign and his disciples with him. Notice that the Scripture says expressly that when Christ returns, some will rule with him over cities, Luke 19:16-19:

"Then came the first, saying, Lord thy pound hath gained ten pounds.

"And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities.

"And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds.

"And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities."

Our friend said last night it meant to rule over heaven. No, were these men in heaven? It means over five cities. When did these servants begin to reign with their Lord? When he returned. So we will reign with Christ when he returns. In Revelation, 2nd chapter, is exactly the same teaching. It is direct and explicit and it ought not to be misunderstood. If you have open, honest hearts it will not. "But" it says in Revelation 2:25: "But that which ye have already hold fast till I come." Till when? "Till I come." Who is speaking? Jesus Christ to the messengers to the churches! Notice this, people. Is this to Jews? No, to the churches. What are you church folks to do? You are to reign, but not now. You are to suffer, and hold out and overcome until Jesus comes. What about it then? Then you shall reign. But in this present life we should go with Christ outside the gate, bearing his reproach like Abraham who was a stranger and a pilgrim on the earth. Here we are to suffer with him, later we are to reign when he reigns. Therefore Jesus tells us, "Hold fast till I come." Revelation 2:26, 27 says:

"And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations:

"And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the

Scanned by TLC

vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my father."

"When I come," he said, "he that holds out to the end or overcomes to the end, then will I give him power over nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers." When does that rule begin? When he comes! The Scripture expressly says so, *when he comes!* All right, now the word of God is clear on that matter at least. God gave a like promise to Abraham. It says in Hebrews 11:13:

"These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth."

Abraham is not reigning. He died without receiving the promises. Here is some more of it. In Acts 1:6-8 it says:

"When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?

"And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.

"But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

I know there are those who would like very much to scoff at the apostles. To be sure, they were unlearned and ignorant men, I grant you that, but nevertheless, they had a training the Seminaries could not give. Brother Oliphant, you have had many debates. I have not had. Yet Peter knew more about the mind of God than any of us do. These apostles were no fools, my friends!

What are they asking? He had said unto them, in Acts 1:4, 5:

"And, being assembled together with them, commanded

Scanned by TLC

them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me.

"For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."

Now notice this question they asked Jesus:

"When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou AT THIS TIME restore again the kingdom of Israel? (vs. 6.)

They did not ask, "Lord, wilt thou restore again the kingdom of Israel?" The fact of the restoration of the kingdom to Israel had been taught them plainly many times. No, here they are asking about the time of the kingdom, "Lord, wilt thou AT THIS TIME restore again the kingdom to Israel?"

That restoration of the kingdom to Israel had been promised many times in the Old Testament. It was that Peter was preaching about in Acts 3:20, 21 when he said,

"And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you:

"Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."

The kingdom will be restored to Israel at the times of restoration of all things. These apostles knew that all his holy prophets had foretold that since the world began. No, in Acts 1:6, they are not asking IF the Lord would give that kingdom back to Israel. They knew he would. They had been with Jesus three and one-half years almost constantly and had heard his teaching about the kingdom. Besides that, after he arose from the dead, their spiritual understanding had been opened, too, so they would not misunderstand the Scriptures. Luke 24:45 says:

"Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures."

Even before that, in the same chapter, turn to Luke 24:27 and there it says:

Scanned by TLC

"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

They are not asking if the Lord would give a kingdom. No, they knew he would. How did they know? Because they had been with Jesus three and one-half years almost constantly. He arose from the dead, and Luke 24:45 says, "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures." Reading again Luke 24:27, it says:

"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

This expressly mentions the law of Moses. Their minds were opened to understand the Scriptures and Jesus had already breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John 20:22). He had opened the Scriptures to them. And Luke 24, verses 32 and 44 say:

"And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?

"And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.

Notice Acts 1:3:

"To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God:"

What had he been doing with them for the last forty days since their understanding had been opened? Here it is: "Speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." They may have been unlearned and ignorant, but they knew what Jesus meant by the kingdom of God! They knew he was talking about the kingdom of Israel and about the

Scanned by TLC

throne of David. They asked, "Is this the time, is this the time to restore it"? What did Jesus say? He answered back, " . . . It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." "It is not for you to know about the times of the restoration of Israel, of the kingdom to Israel, of David's throne." What he said is (listen to this), "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." "But" he said, "there is another matter that I have just warned you about, one which is for you to know"— "But ye shall receive power . . . " verse 8, read it carefully, "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

Notice two things, some things God has kept within his own power. Don't meddle with them. It is not for you to know. But soul winning power you can have. My Brother Oliphant, you are right about these date-setters, about the Seventh Day Adventists, the Russellites, Millerites, or anybody else who sets certain dates and who says, "I know when Jesus is going to come." You are right about that. The same thing exactly applies in this age who sets dates, for Jesus expressly says, "It is not for you to know." If it had been for you to know, he would have told you. He said, "I will not tell you the time because it is connected with the second coming." Again and again he said, "Watch for you know not the day or hour." No man knows. You don't know about the time the kingdom will begin either. We will know when he comes, when Jesus comes, and not before. The Savior expressly said, "It is not for you to know the times or the season which the Father has put in his own power." Yes sir, listen to me. The Savior expressly says it is not for you to know the times or seasons.

But Verse 8 says, "you will receive power to win souls in just a few days and don't leave town until you get it, until you receive power from on high." Acts 1:4 says:

Scanned by TLC

"And, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me."

Two things: Jesus said one thing about the restoration of the kingdom. The power and authority is mine and the Father's, don't you bother it. You don't know. It is mine. The other about witnessing:

" . . . ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

"You will receive power in a few days, and don't leave this town until you get it." Jesus knew about this and these apostles knew too; knew what Jesus had been teaching them for forty days concerning the kingdom. Some one should give Brother Oliphant help on this, for he is going to need it. Here is another. Revelation 5:10. I am telling you, brother, the Scripture is clear on this matter, take it at face value. That is right still, and will be right through the rest of this debate. And I am going to insist on taking what the Bible says about salvation too. When the Bible speaks about salvation, it expressly says what is basic. There isn't anybody here who believes in baptism more than I do. For my part, I believe every Christian should be baptized. The Scripture commands Christians to be baptized, and expressly teaches what it is for. These friends can speak what they want to Saturday night. This point always: Does the Bible say it? What do the Scriptures teach? The Bible does say about Jesus' coming. Revelation 5th chapter, verse 10. But first begin with verse 6, "And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." Where is it? Up around a throne. Amid those holy creatures, not animals, but seraphim the Bible sometimes calls them, four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb. Now

Scanned by TLC

read on a little further, down here in verse 8: "And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints." In heaven around a throne, now the Lamb is on the throne with his Father. And he is sitting there until the time comes to take his own throne. But reading on: "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou was slain, and has redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation!" Here is a scene in heaven. Here are twenty-four elders, saints whose souls are now in heaven. The Lamb, as it had been slain, is Jesus after his resurrection and ascension. We know they are saints because they say to Jesus, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;" They sing in heaven, before Christ, who sits now on the throne with his Father. Who are they? People saved by the blood. They are falling down before Jesus and praising him. What are they saying? Listen. Verse 10 says, "And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: AND WE SHALL REIGN ON THE EARTH."

They said he "hast made us . . . kings and priests: AND WE SHALL REIGN." They do not say, "We are reigning" but they say, "We SHALL reign." In the future, these saints now in heaven shall reign. Where? In heaven? No, "ON THE EARTH!" "And we shall reign on the earth," the Scripture says. It does not say, "Over the earth" but "ON the earth." And it is still future. Not that we are reigning, but we are going to reign on the earth. One day those dead in Christ will receive their glorified bodies. Their spirits will come with Jesus at the second coming. Their spirits and their bodies one day will be united when Jesus comes and our bodies will then be glorified. We are going to come back here and we shall reign ON THE EARTH. That Scripture is unanswerable. I thank God

Scanned by TLC

there is a time coming when the saved shall reign with Christ on earth. Now turn to Revelation the 19th and 20th chapters. You said I did not get to this. Well, there is plenty in the Bible about it, but as far as I am concerned I will take it all. Any book in the Bible would plainly prove this proposition and certainly the 20th chapter of Revelation does do it. I am not afraid of the thousand years. If it only said a thousand years one time I would believe it. Since it says it six times I still believe it. I am not afraid to take it six times. I take the Scripture, all of it. It does mean just what it says. Now about these statements, these plain statements of God's word, about the thousand years. Please tell us if you can, Brother Oliphant, what that means. If the thousand years mentioned here six times does not mean a thousand years, then what does it mean? No other particular period of time is mentioned in the Bible as the reign of Christ. There is no place in the Bible which says, "The thousand years means so and so." Then what does it mean if it doesn't mean what it says? In Revelation the 19th chapter we find the Savior coming from heaven, in verse 11:

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war."

You say, is that a literal horse? Help yourself. What do you say it is, Brother Oliphant? It does not matter to me. What it says is horse. It has some meaning. You wouldn't find it in the Scripture if it didn't have some meaning. I will take what it says. Don't you know? There are a lot of things I don't know, but I say when the Bible says something, then I know frankly it means what it says. I am humble enough to admit when I don't know. If you will find in the Scriptures an explanation which explains it, I will take it. But I don't want you explaining it away. Revelation 19:13-16:

Scanned by TLC

"And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God.

"And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean.

"And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.

"And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."

His name is called Faithful and True. He is to be ruler of the nations, on the earth. He is coming back; he went up from the mount of Olivet. When he comes he will rule. Rule who? The nations. Where? On earth. Who will rule? Jesus, when he comes from heaven, with all his holy angels. When he went up a cloud received him out of their sight, and the Scripture says, "Behold, he cometh with clouds: and every eye shall see him." He went up from the mount called Olivet, and behold, "his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives." No wonder the angels will come. The angels will come with him when he comes back. The angels were with him when he went away, and said, "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." A literal Jesus went away and a literal Jesus is coming back. He had literal feet before. He will have literal feet again. They were literal clouds before, they will be literal clouds again. They were literal angels before, they will be literal angels again. When the Bible says it, why not take it for what it says? Why not take it that it says what it means?

He is coming, and is coming to rule the nations. Now turn on to Revelation the 20th chapter. Mark you this, the chapter headings and divisions are not in the original manuscripts. Read on:

"And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having

Scanned by TLC

the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand.

"And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years."

What does the dragon mean? The same verse tells us what the dragon means. There it is. I know. If it did not tell us, I would not know, but I do know for the Bible says. There are symbols and figures of speech but don't explain them unless the Bible explains them. I take it at what the Lord says. If the Bible does not make any explanation, don't you make any.

"Bound him a thousand years." How long? A thousand years. That is what it says. That is the way to read it—"thousand years." No other explanation is given. "And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season." You say it is figurative. We will take it for what it says. You say, Brother Oliphant, the one thousand years has begun now or you say it is figurative perhaps. Does the devil deceive the nations any more? Huh? Does he deceive the nations any more? Huh? Does he? Well, if so, this has not happened yet. This is when Jesus comes. Read on:

"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

We have just read about some of them in heaven. Some of the saved and redeemed out of every country, and it said they were beheaded. They have been beheaded, after living for the Lord. They were saved, and were murdered because of their faith, and died. People die when they are beheaded. These live again. They are resurrected, and

Scanned by TLC

then they reign; "and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

"But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection."

Where does it say they will reign? "We will reign on the earth." Revelation 5:10, put it down, Brother Oliphant, and deal with it. Now they were beheaded and then they lived and then they reigned. After Christ comes back with the armies of heaven . . . "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ *a thousand years.*" We will reign on earth, and with Christ for one thousand years. How long is one thousand years? You do not have to explain it away. I take it at what it says. It means what it says. Read on, "But the rest of the dead lived not again until *the thousand years* were finished. This is the first resurrection." What does it mean about them? I take it that it means what it says. My friend, if God does not explain it, we should not attempt to. It says a thousand years. Don't explain it away. If it does not mean that, what does it mean? Why guess and why suppose? It says one thousand years, the Bible says that. Why should you argue and split hair if you don't know. Take it at what God says. If you know what it means, why don't you tell us?

It says it again. Read on: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him *a thousand years.*" How many resurrections? Two! This is the first resurrection. God says, blessed is he that has part in it; they shall reign with Christ a thousand years! How many resurrections? When Jesus comes we will have the first resurrection, a

Scanned by TLC

resurrection of saved people. Part of the first resurrection will be at the rapture, the rest of it, mentioned here, when he returns to reign on the earth. This is the first resurrection. The second one is a thousand years later. The Bible says so. You can argue all you want to.

"On such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and SHALL REIGN WITH HIM A THOUSAND YEARS." That is what Revelation 5:10 also says: "And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and WE SHALL REIGN ON THE EARTH." Here are the same people, saved people, saints. Revelation 20:6 says they shall reign with Christ a thousand years. Revelation 5:10 says they shall reign on the earth. The thousand years reign of Christ is on the earth. It is proven right here. The reign is after Christ returns to the earth. He shall reign one thousand years. There is no doubt about that. "And when the thousand years are expired!" Another thousand years? No, the same time. It must mean a thousand years for the Lord doesn't tell anything else. I think it means what it says. If you don't know what it means, then take what God said about it. He knows. If we had needed some other explanation he would have said so.

"And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison,

"And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea" (vss. 7, 8).

Where are these nations? ON THE EARTH! Where have the saints been reigning? ON THE EARTH! My friend, let us take it at what God says. Here it is. Here we have it. I think there can be no doubt. It must surely have been established from the word of God that "The Scriptures Teach that Christ will Establish a Literal Throne at Jerusalem and Will Reign Over the Whole Earth for a

Scanned by TLC

Period of One Thousand Years." Notice several things. We have proven that Christ will establish a literal throne at Jerusalem and reign literally. If it is a throne at Jerusalem, it will be literal, won't it? Why not believe the Scriptures? Many, many times the Scriptures said it, why not believe it. If it doesn't mean Jerusalem, what does it mean then? "And will reign over the whole earth for a period of one thousand years:" Blessed be the name of the Lord. Then the Scripture says, (Isaiah 35:5-10):

"Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped.

"Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert.

"And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes.

"And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein.

"No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there:

"And the ramsoned of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

John says, "Even so come, Lord Jesus," and I say it, too. I say the prayer that Jesus taught us to pray, and it is not out of date, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven . . . " His will isn't done on earth as it is done in heaven. Men don't obey God like the angels do. But there will come a time when they will. That is the time when the meek shall inherit the earth, and the pure in heart shall see God. Praise God, Jesus is going

Scanned by TLC

to establish a literal throne at Jerusalem and will reign over the whole earth for a period of one thousand years. But let me read on, there is more in the Bible on it. In Zechariah 14:4 we read:

"And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south."

Brother Oliphant, will you answer these plain questions? That great mount of Olives, has half of it moved toward the north and half of it moved toward the south? Answer me that. A trench dug across the mountain wouldn't be the mountain dividing in two, moving half of it toward the north and half of it toward the south. A trench wouldn't be "a very great valley:"

"And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee."

"The Lord my God shall come" and "his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives." Did that happen in A. D. 70? The Lord will rule over all the earth. That didn't happen when Jesus died, did not happen at Pentecost nor in A. D. 70. It will happen in the day of the Lord, when Jesus comes:

"And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea; in summer and in winter shall it be" (vs. 8).

After the desolation, when the day of the Lord comes, living water shall flow out from Jerusalem and flow into the sea (not in somebody's heart). A part of it will flow into the former sea, which is the Mediterranean Sea, and

Scanned by TLC

part into the hinder sea, the Salt Sea or Dead Sea. And the Scripture tells more about that. In Ezekiel, turn to the 47th chapter. There the Lord expressly tells about this river and what effect it will have, how the Salt Sea will be cured by it and have fish, how the tree of life will grow on either side of this living stream of water. This is the river that will flow out from the presence of God, out from under his throne in Jerusalem. Then God will keep his covenant, his promise to place his eyes and his heart at Jerusalem perpetually as 1 Kings 9:3 says:

"And the Lord said unto him, I have heard thy prayer and thy supplication, that thou has made before me: I have hallowed this house, which thou hast built, to put my name there for ever; and mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually."

God will place his name and his heart there for ever. Jesus said, don't swear by Jerusalem for it is the city of the great King (Matthew 5:35), not David, but Jesus himself who will return to the earth and sit on David's throne and reign a thousand years. After the thousand years then God the Father will come down out of heaven to reign with Christ. Then the tabernacle of God will be with men, we are told. His house of many mansions will come down out of heaven to be a new Jerusalem. And the Savior will deliver up the kingdom to God the Father.

Brother Oliphant, the time is coming when they will sit together; when the Father and Lamb will again both be on the same throne, when the New Jerusalem comes down from God out of heaven to the earth, then they will reign together.

Thank you and God bless you.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Fourth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 18, 1935

SECOND PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that Christ will Establish a Literal Throne in Jerusalem and will Reign Over the Whole Earth for a Period of One Thousand Years.*

John R. Rice Affirms
W. L. Oliphant Denies

(Fourth Negative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you to deliver the last speech on the present proposition. The rules of honorable controversy, as well as common courtesy, limit me to a discussion of those things which have beeen heretofore introduced.

In an attempted reply to my explanation of Zechariah 14, Dr. Rice refers to the eighth verse: "And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be." We are told that this means literal water. In the first verse of the thirteenth chapter, referring to the same thing, Zechariah said: "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness." Does the Doctor believe that literal water can atone for sin and uncleanness? If he isn't careful, he may accuse someone of believing in salvation by water when we discuss the baptism question. I want it to be remembered that I have never contended that the "fountain opened for sin and uncleanness" is literal water!

I wish to remind Dr. Wood that he has Dr. Rice's per-

Scanned by TLC

mission to preach on any subject he may choose, in this tabernacle, Saturday night. I hope he chooses to preach on the plan of salvation. However, since he has lined up with Rice throughout this discussion, I venture to guess that he will preach on some subject on which they are in agreement.

I am satisfied with the exegesis I have already offered of Zechariah 14. I think I have shown that it has been fulfilled. My interpretation of this prophecy certainly does not force me to such an unreasonable position as that literal water can atone for sin!

In a former speech I showed from Jeremiah 22:26-30, that no man of the seed of Coniah "shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah." In reply, Dr. Rice tries to show that Jesus was not of the seed of Coniah. Granting that Matthew's account of the genealogy of Jesus traces the line through Joseph, it also contains Judah; and Paul says: "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah" (Hebrews 7:14). So my friend's dodge on this question does not relieve him of the difficulty of explaining how Jesus can sit on the literal throne of David in Jerusalem, and prosper.

The truth of the matter, my friends, is, that Jesus will never sit on an earthly throne. "The Lord's throne is in heaven" (Psalms 11:4). "Heaven is my throne" (Acts 7:48). Christ was "raised up to sit on the throne" (Acts 2:30). He cannot any more be a king on earth than he can be a priest on earth, and Paul said; "If he were on earth he would not be a priest at all" (Hebrews 8:4).

No, I did not ask my friend to show where the Bible says God would raise up Christ of the fruit of David's loins, according to the flesh, to sit on the throne. Acts 2:30 says that, and I had already quoted this scripture and made an argument on it. I am thoroughly familiar with that statement. But Dr. Rice said the Bible expressly says that Christ is "to sit on the throne according to the flesh." I denied there being any such statement in the Bible. I still

Scanned by TLC

deny it! He now quotes from the Authorized Version: " . . . . that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." He accuses me of not being familiar with the King James Version. Why Doctor, I have quoted Acts 2:30 from that version several times in this debate! Can't my friend see the difference betweeen Christ coming from the fruit of David's loins, "according to the flesh," and his "sitting on the throne, according to the flesh?" No, the Bible does not, anywhere, say that Christ "will sit on the throne, according to the flesh." He simply charged the Bible with saying something it does not say! You read that out of your Premillennial theory, Doctor—Not out of the Bible! After quoting God's oath to David, "that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne" (Acts 2:30), Peter—in the very next verse Peter tells when this prophecy was fulfilled. "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." Rice tries to leave the impression that the "raising up" of Christ does not refer to his resurrection and exaltation; but, unfortunately for him, Peter says it does.

We are again referred to the 19th chapter of Luke. The eleventh verse tells us that Jesus spoke this parable "because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear." If they were wrong in thinking that the kingdom of God should immediatley appear, do you suppose Jesus would have allowed them to remain in their deception? He did not attempt to disabuse their minds of this expectation, but, on the contrary, spoke a parable indicating that they were right. "He said therefore, a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return" (Verse 12). It was not at the time of his "return" that the nobleman was to "receive for himself a kingdom," as Rice contends, but when he went into the "far country" (heaven). Did Jesus receive the kingdom

Scanned by TLC

when he ascended to heaven? Daniel says he did. "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And *there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom,* that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (Daniel 7:13, 14). Christ went to the "Ancient of days" (God) when he ascended with the clouds (Acts 1:9). Daniel says "there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom." He was at that time "received up into glory" (1 Timothy 3:16). And "crowned with glory" (Hebrews 2:9). This is in thorough harmony with the parable of Luke 19.

I again remind my opponent that Jesus called the servants whom he left in the world, "citizens." Of what are Christ's servants, citizens, if his government has not been established? His servants are told to "occupy till I come." What are the Lord's servants to occupy until his coming, if they are not in his kingdom? The nobleman's return is to reckon with the citizens of the kingdom, which he received when he went into the "far counrty." They are then to account for their use of the goods which he left in their custody.

Second Timothy 4:1 has been introduced. I am glad the Doctor has at least made one effort to prove his future kingdom by New Testament scripture. He has not yet explained how there can be Old Testament prophecies concerning the establishment of the kingdom at the second coming, when the intention to establish the kingdom at that time did not, according to premillennialism, originate in the mind of God until the Jews rejected Christ. But let us notice 2 Timothy 4:1: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and at his kingdom." This says nothing about whether the kingdom has been estab-

Scanned by TLC

lished, or is to be established in the future. Christ will judge the quick and the dead "at his appearing," and "at his kingdom." The Revised Version says, "by his appearing, and his kingdom." The passage does not even intimate that the kingdom is to begin at Christ's appearing. However, it does say that the dead will be judged "at his appearing," while the premillennialists say that the dead will not be judged until a thousand years later.

Dr. Rice says the judgment of Matthew 25 is "a judgment," but not "the judgment." He looks for a bigger judgment later. Well, Doctor, this is to be a pretty good sized judgment, itself! "And before him shall be gathered all nations" (Matthew 25:32). I am wondering how there can be a bigger judgment than one which contains all nations. It still remains true that Matthew 25 describes the judgment, and not the establishment of the kingdom.

It is insisted that Revelation 2:25-27, and Revelation 5:6-10 teach that the saints are to rule on the earth. I have shown that Christians now "reign in life by one Jesus Christ" (Romans 5:17). That Christians now reign with the apostles (1 Corinthians 4:8). We reign by enduring (2 Timothy 2:12). We "endure" now. We reign by "overcoming" (Revelation 3:21). We "overcome" now. "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God" (1 John 5:4, 5)? Does Dr. Rice believe that we overcome the world in this age? If so, we reign with Christ in this age. When we get to the apostacy question he will probably contend that children of God have eternally, unalterably and unconditionally overcome the world. It is obvious that Christians' reigning is co-extensive with their being kings. They are now "kings and priests unto God" (Revelation 1:5, 6). Therefore, they are now reigning. But if there should be a future reign on earth predicted, does the Doctor not know that there is to be a "new earth" (Revelation 21:1)? Does he

Scanned by TLC

not know that "the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up" (2 Peter 3:10)? And this is to take place at "the day of the Lord." Dr. Rice has contended that the "day of the Lord" is the day of Christ's second coming. It would be hard to explain how there can be a reign of a thousand years on this earth, after it has been burned up.

Let us go a little further into this theory of the saints reigning a thousand years on the earth. According to Dr. Rice's theory, when Christ comes the righteous dead will be raised and there will follow a thousand years, in which these saints will reign with Christ; one saint will be made ruler over ten cities; another over five cities, etc. But the wicked are to be destroyed at Christ's coming, and the wicked dead are not to be raised until the end of the thousand years. If each saint is to rule over one or more cities, and only the saints are living during the thousand years, I am wondering over whom the saints will reign! It seems to me that the Doctor's theory offers a rather empty honor. Each saint will rule over one or more deserted cities! Remember, the "rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished."

Dr. Rice thinks he sees a future kingdom in Acts 1:6-8. Immediately before Christ's ascension, his disciples asked: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Hear his answer: "And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons *which the Father hath put in his own power, but ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you* and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judaea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." This was before the disciples had received the Spirit, which was to teach them "all things" (John 14:26). Although they had a misconception of the nature of the kingdom, they were expecting its immediate establishment. Christ did not attempt to rob them of this expectation. On the contrary, he assures them that, while the Father now

Scanned by TLC

has this matter "in his own power," "ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you." They will know about the kingdom then. Why? Because they were to receive the kingdom at the same time they received the power and the Holy Spirit (Mark 9:1).

Our attention is called to Isaiah 35:5-10: "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened." Jesus opened the eyes of the blind during his personal ministry. "The ears of the deaf shall be unstopped." Our Lord caused the deaf to hear while he was on earth. "Then shall the lame man leap as an hart." Jesus and the apostles healed the lame. "The tongue of the dumb shall sing." Dumb men were given voice in the first century. "And an highway shall be there and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it." Jesus said: "I am the way" (John 14:6). Paul says we have "a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh" (Hebrews 10:20). Is not this "the way of holiness?" I assure Dr. Rice that I can find a more literal fulfillment of Isaiah 35 than he can find of Isaiah 40, which we know has been fulfilled. See Luke 3:4-6; and, by the way, Dr. Rice, you have not yet harmonized your theory of literal fulfillment with the fulfillment by John the Baptist of Isaiah 40. Did John literally tear the mountains down and make the rough country smooth?

Dr. Rice quotes 1 Kings 9:3: "And the Lord said unto him, I have heard thy prayer and thy supplication, that thou hast made before me: I have hallowed his house, which thou hast built, to put my name there forever; and mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually." What a pity the Doctor did not read the next few verses! Although they completely annihilate his theory, love of the truth compels me to read them to this audience. "And *if* thou wilt walk before me, as David thy father walked, in integrity of heart, and in uprightness, to do according to all that I have commanded thee, and wilt keep my statutes

Scanned by TLC

and my judgments: *Then* I will establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel for ever, as I promised to David thy father, saying, There shall not fail thee a man upon the throne of Israel" (Verses 4 and 5). The Lord is talking to Solomon. He promises to put his name, his eyes and his heart upon the temple "perpetually," on the condition that "thou will walk before me . . . in integrity of heart and in uprightness to do according to all that I have commanded thee, and will keep my statutes and my judgments." It is said, on these conditions, that God promises to "establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel for ever," and that "there shall not fail thee a man upon the throne of Israel." But what if these conditions are not met? The next few verses give the answer: *"But if* ye shall at all turn from following me, ye or your children, and will not keep my commandments and my statutes which I have set before you, but go and serve other gods, and worship them: *Then* will I cut off Israel out of the land which I have given them; and this house, which I have hallowed for my name, will I cast out of my sight; and Israel shall be a proverb and a byword among all people: And at this house, which is high, every one that passeth by it shall be astonished, and shall hiss; and they shall say, Why hath the Lord done thus unto this land, and to this house? And they shall answer, Because they forsook the Lord their God, who brought forth their fathers out of the land of Egypt, and have taken hold upon other gods, and have worshipped them, and served them: therefore hath the Lord brought upon them all this evil" (Verses 6-9). No more need be said about this scripture. Although introduced by Dr. Rice, it is a complete refutation of his theory.

At last, our friend gets to the twentieth chapter of Revelation. His proposition calls for a thousand years' reign of Christ on earth. This is the only passage in all the Bible that says anything about a thousand years reign of anybody, anywhere. Still, Dr. Rice does not even read it until his last speech on the proposition, and then only

Scanned by TLC

after I have from time to time begged him to introduce it. Though it is the only scripture which even mentions an essential factor of his proposition—and he has insisted that he believes in taking the Bible literally—I have charged that he will not accept this passage literally. I have said, and I repeat: that I am willing to place a much more literal interpretation on Revelation 20 than is the man who has said so many times, "the Bible means what it says, and says what it means."

Before reading this much discussed prophecy, let me call attention to the essential points which must be found in it before it can be made to sustain the premillennialist's position. It must contain: (1) the second coming of Christ. (2) A bodily resurrection of the saints. (3) All saints living and reigning with Christ on earth. I insist that it does not contain a single one of these elements essential to the proof of Dr. Rice's proposition. But let us read Revelation 20:1-7: "And I saw an angel (*not Christ*) come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more until the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season. And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls (*not the bodies*) of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands: and they (*only the martyrs—not all saints*) lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. (*Nothing said about this reign taking place on the earth.*) But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the

Scanned by TLC

second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison."

Now, for a moment, let us compare the statement of the apostle John with the position of Dr. Rice, and see how literally the Doctor believes Revelation 20. First, Rice: "Christ will come down to the earth at the beginning of the millennium." John: "And I saw an angel come down from heaven." Rice says, "Christ." John says, "An angel." This is difference number one! Second, Rice: "There will be a resurrection of bodies at the beginning of the millennium." John: "And I saw the souls of them—" Rice says, "bodies." John, "saw souls." Difference number two! Third, Rice: "There will be a resurrection of all the saints at the beginning of the millennium." John: "I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God—" Rice says the bodies of all saints will participate in the thousand years reign. John saw only the souls of the martyrs—those who had been beheaded for Christ. Difference number three! Fourth, Rice: "Christ and the saints will reign on the earth for a thousand years." John says nothing about this reign being on the earth. Variance number four!

Please bear in mind that Revelation 20 does not even mention the following essential elements of Rice's theory: (1) It does not mention the second coming of Christ. (2) It does not mention a reign on earth. (3) It does not mention a bodily resurrection. (4) It does not mention all the saints. (5) It does not mention Christ on earth. If Dr. Rice believes that Revelation 20 "says what it means, and means what it says," he does not believe that it teaches his theory!

He has charged that I do not believe in a thousand years reign—has even said that I laugh, and scoff and scorn the statement of Revelation 20. We shall now see who believes Revelation 20, just as it reads. Doctor, I believe "an angel

Scanned by TLC

came down from heaven." What do you believe? I believe "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God—lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." What do you believe? I do not know when or where this reign occurred, or will occur, because the passage does not say. When you tell us it is to occur on earth after the second coming of Christ, you have to learn it from some other source than the Bible. In other words, I believe just what John says about the thousand years reign—no more and no less. Will Dr. Rice shake hands with me on that sort of faith? If he will, I guarantee that he can never again affirm that Revelation 20 teaches a thousand years reign of Christ and all the saints on earth between two bodily resurrections. Now, Doctor, what do you have to say about taking the Bible literally?

His reference to the 19th chapter of Revelation does not help him to get the thousand years of Revelation 20 after Christ's second coming. This chapter does not tell of the second coming. John said he saw Christ (or one described much as Christ might be described), seated upon a white horse. The angels who talked with the disciples at Christ's ascension said Christ would "so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." He did not go into heaven on a white horse; therefore, we need not expect him to return on a white horse. Besides, Revelation 19 says nothing about Christ coming to the earth. John saw him in heaven. True, there are some things said to have happened on the earth; but there is also the narrative of some happennings in the sun (Verse 17). I do not suppose my friend will say the chapter teaches that Christ will ride the white horse to the sun! No, the 19th chapter of Revelation does not provide Friend Rice with a second coming of Christ, to precede his millennium. Why not take Revelation 19 literally, too? Then, we cannot find the premillennial theory in either the 19th or the 20th chapter.

I believe I have answered every argument and every

Scanned by TLC

quibble offered by my opponent. In the time left at my disposal, I want to review the arguments I have made—many of which have never been so much as mentioned by the opposition.

1. The second chapter of Daniel names four world kingdoms, the last of which is the Roman kingdom, and adds; "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom" (Daniel 2:44). Since the Roman kingdom has long since ceased to exist, we know that the Lord's kingdom has been established.

2. Isaiah 2:2-4 predicts that in the "last days" the kingdom will be established. Peter, on the day of Pentecost identifies that time as being the time designated in Old Testament prophecies as "last days."

3. John the Baptist, the forerunner of the Lord Jesus, preached, "the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew 3:1, 2).

4. The twelve apostles, whom the Lord sent out to preach during his personal ministry, were told to preach; "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew 10:5-7).

5. The Seventy were told by the Lord to preach; "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Luke 10:8-11).

6. Jesus, himself, during his personal ministry, preached; "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand" (Mark 1:14, 15).

For centuries, the prophets had predicted that at some future date the Lord's kingdom would be established on the earth. Jesus said that time had been fulfilled, and the kingdom was, therefore, "at hand." Premillennialists admit that Jesus told the truth when he said the time was fulfilled, but that because the Jews rejected Christ, the Lord's plan was changed and the establishment of the kingdom was postponed. What a tragedy it would have been had the Jews accepted Christ! What would have followed? (a) There would have been no gospels. (b) Christ would not have died, and there would have been no atonement for sin, and the prophecies concerning Christ's death would

Scanned by TLC

have proved untrue. (c) There would have been no church, since, according to the premillennialists, the church is a mere substitute to occupy the interim between the rejection by the Jews and the second coming of Christ. (d) Since there would have been no church, and the Acts of the Apostles is a history of the early church, the Acts of the Apostles would have never been written. (e) Since the epistles are letters to the churches, there would have been no epistles.

Premillennialism makes the church a mere accident, and the New Testament, as we have it, merely the result of the rebellion of the Jews. But, as I have shown from John 6:14, 15, the Jews were not adverse to such a kingdom as Dr. Rice says the Lord will establish when he comes again. I have charged that, if, Christ comes to earth and establishes the kind of kingdom Rice's proposition calls for, it will be—not a conversion of the Jews to Christ—but a conversion of Christ to the Jews! In answer to which charge, nothing has been said.

7. After the death of Christ, one of his disciples, Joseph of Arimathea, waited for a kingdom of God (Mark 15:43).

8. Paul said the brethren at Colosse had been translated "into the kingdom of God's dear Son" (Colossians 1:13, 14). Still, my opponent says the kingdom did not exist then and does not exist now!

9. Paul taught that the kingdom had been received at the time he wrote the Hebrew letter (Hebrew 12:28). Still, my opponent does not expect it until the second coming of Christ.

10. John, the apostle, declared that he was a "brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ" (Revelation 1:9). As surely as John told the truth—and about that there can be no question—he was in Christ's kingdom. John could not have been in a kingdom which did not exist. Therefore, the kingdom of Christ existed when John wrote Revelation.

11. From Matthew 20:20, 21, and Mark 10:35-37, we

Scanned by TLC

have learned that when Christ entered his glory, he entered his kingdom. We learn from Luke 24:26 that Christ died in order to enter his glory. Therefore, he died to enter his kingdom.

12. Daniel predicted that when Christ went to God "with the clouds of heaven—there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom" (Daniel 7:13, 14). He ascended to God with the clouds after his resurrection (Acts 1:9). This is one of the many arguments introduced by the negative, which has not been at all mentioned by the affirmative.

13. In Mark 9:1, Jesus said some of the apostles would not taste of death until the kingdom had come. He also promised that the kingdom would "come with power." After his death, he told the disciples to tarry in Jerusalem "untill ye be endued with power from on high" (Luke 24:49). He told them the power would come with the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8). The Holy Spirit came on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection (Acts 2:1-4). (a) The kingdom was to come with power. (b) The power was to come with the Spirit. (c) Therefore, the kingdom was to come with the Spirit. (d) The Spirit came on Pentecost. (e) Therefore, the kingdom came on Pentecost. We are still wondering why Dr. Rice has not seen fit to reply to this argument!

14. (a) Jesus was to be priest on *his* throne (Zechariah 6:13). (b) He is now priest (Hebrews 4:14). (c) Therefore, he is now on *his* throne. Again: (a) Jesus was on *his* throne when "sitting" (Zechariah 6:13). (b) He is "sitting" now (Ephesians 1:20). (c) Therefore, he is on *his* throne now.

15. (a) Jesus was to "sit and rule upon *his* throne" (Zechariah 6:13). (b) He is "sitting" now (Hebrews 1:3). (c) Therefore, he rules on *his* throne now.

16. (a) Jesus was "reigning when the Gentiles trusted in him." (b) Gentiles trust in him now. (c) Therefore, he is "reigning" now.

Scanned by TLC

17. (a) Jesus is "King" when "Lord" (Revelation 17:14). (b) He was Lord on Pentecost (Acts 2:36). (c) Therefore, he was king on Pentecost.

This series of arguments stand just as I made them early in the debate.

18. From Acts 2:29-35; Hebrews 10:12-14; and 1 Corinthians 15:23-26, we learn that Christ began his reign on Pentecost and that he "must reign" until all his enemies are under his feet, till death is destroyed, till he has put down all rule and all authority and power, till his coming, or until the end.

19. It was promised to David that; "When thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom" (2 Samuel 7:12). Or, as it is recorded in 1 Chronicles 17:11: "And it shall come to pass when thy days be expired that thou must go to be with thy fathers, that I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons; and I will establish his kingdom." On the day of Pentecost Peter quoted this promise and showed that it was fulfilled in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ (Acts 2:29-35).

21. From the 2 Psalm, we have learned that when God set his king upon the holy hill of Zion, he would declare the decree, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee:" that he would give him the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost part of the earth for a possession. This prophecy was quoted in Hebrews 1:1-5, and applied to this age. But to make the matter still surer, we called attention to Acts 13:30-39, wherein the prophecy is not only quoted, and declared to have been fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ, but the reference given . . . . "As it is also written in the second Psalm." In other words; in the Old Testament, God promised to "set his king upon the holy hill of Zion." In the New Testament, he says that promise has been fulfilled. I have insisted that this, alone, shows positively that the reign of the

Scanned by TLC

Lord Jesus Christ is now going on, and that, therefore, Dr. Rice's proposition is false. This is another of the many arguments which no attempt has been made to refute.

22. In the 110th Psalm, it is predicted that the day of Christ's power would be when he sits at God's right hand; when he rules in the midst of his enemies; when he is priest after the order of Melchizedek. (a) Christ now sits at God's right hand (Acts 2:33). (b) He now rules in the midst of his enemies. (1 Corinthians 15:25, 26). (c) He is now priest after the order of Melchizedek (Hebrews 5:6; 7:17). (d) Therefore, this is "the day of his power."

23. In Psalms 45:6, 7, the establishment of Christ's throne and kingdom is predicted. In Hebrews 1:8, 9, this prediction is quoted and declared to have been fulfilled. Another arugment which has not been mentioned by Dr. Rice.

24. In Ezekiel 21:26, 27, it was prophesied that the royal dynasty of David would be restored when "he come whose right it is." Luke 1:30-33 declares Jesus to be the one, "whose right it is." Acts 2:29-34 assures us that he is exercising that right . . . that he has been raised up to sit on the throne of David. Our friend has not so much as referred to this argument.

25. In answer to the contention that Christ and his saints are to reign on earth, I have shown that he now reigns through his saints (Romans 5:17; 1 Corinthians 4:8; 1 Corinthians 6:1-6). Christians are kings and priests unto God (Revelation 1:5, 6). In olden times God reigned over Israel on the earth, but he did not leave his throne in heaven by so doing (1 Samuel 12:12 and 8:7).

26. The Lord's table is in his kingdom (Luke 22:28-30). The Lord's table existed in the days of the apostles (1 Corinthians 11). Therefore, the kingdom existed in the days of the apostles. Doctor, why did you not answer this argument? Although I have stressed this matter, you have not given it any consideration whatever.

Scanned by TLC

27. To refute the contention that there is to be a thousand years reign between the resurrection of the righteous and the resurrection of the wicked, I have shown: (a) That the righteous and the wicked are to be raised at the same hour (John 5:28, 29); (b) That the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked will be simultaneous, and will occur at Christ's coming (Revelation 1:7; 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17; 1 Corinthians 15:51, 52); (c) That the judgment of the righteous and the wicked will be at the same time (Matthew 25:31, 32). (d) That the resurrection of the righteous and judgment of the wicked will be "at the last day" (John 6:39, 40, 44 and 54; John 11:24; John 12:48).

28. I have shown that Christ could not be priest on earth; that his throne is in heaven, and that he could not prosper sitting on an earthly throne (Hebrews 8:4; Psalms 11:4; Acts 7:49; Jeremiah 22:26-30).

29. I have shown that the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of God are one and the same kingdom, and that the throne of God and the throne of Christ are one and the same throne, and that Christ is now seated on that throne (Ephesians 5:5; Revelation 22:3; Acts 2:29-34).

I have repeatedly asked Dr. Rice if he believes that Jesus is king. No answer has beeen forthcoming. In his silence at this point, he was running true to form—since he has consistently refused to answer my questions. But my friend *has finally* answered one of my oft-repeated questions. He says *there are* symbols and figures of speech in the Bible. Let us hope that he will not again accuse me of not believing the Bible, when I insist on accepting its symbols and figures of speech—as such!

My friends, Dr. Rice has utterly failed to establish his proposition—not because of a lack of ability on his part—but because it is not true—not taught by the word of the living God. He has failed to establish a single essential element of his proposition. No one questions the second coming of Christ. I believe in and hope for the coming of my Lord as much as anyone could, but because the Bible does not

Scanned by TLC

so teach, I am not expecting him to establish a literal throne on this old sin-cursed earth. On the contrary, I am expecting to go with him to that home eternal, where the disappointments, heartaches and pains of this old earth are unknown. I worship him as "King of kings and Lord or lords." I would not, for my right arm, cast the reflection upon him which Dr. Rice has cast. You will remember that he compared the Lord Jesus Christ with a political hireling, such as Herod; and compared Christ's ascension to heaven, and the thousands of years that he has remained there, with a political puppet, journeying to Rome and bowing in abject humility before the Roman Emperor, pleading for the right to rule over a province. I want it distinctly understood, and forever remembered, that Dr. Rice has said that Jesus occupies a "subordinate" position, while the word of God declares that he is "all and in all" (Colossians 3:11), and has all authority in heaven and in earth (Matthew 28:18). Dr. Rice has failed to explain how Jesus can ever occupy a higher position than he now occupies. My opponent's position is a slander to the Lord Jesus Christ; and I beseech him to abandon it, accept him as the King of kings, and ascribe to him that universal authority given him by the God of heaven.

The triumphant "King of glory" now sits "upon the throne of his glory." Some day, he shall come again to receive the righteous unto himself, taking them "to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved *in heaven* for us" (1 Peter 1:4; and to send the wicked to the place of "everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matthew 25:41). By now "bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;" and bowing in humble submission to him before whom "every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;" let us prepare to "enter into the joys of the Lord" in that great day!

May God's blessings rest upon us.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Fifth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 22, 1935

THIRD PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to his Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."*

John R. Rice Denies
W. L. Oliphant Affirms

Opening remarks by the moderator for the affirmative, J. B. Nelson:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am going to ask that you stand and reverently bow your heads while Brother Flavil L. Colley, of Trinity Heights Church of Christ, leads us in prayer.

(After the prayer Brother Nelson continues.)

It certainly is encouraging to see such a wonderful audience this evening following the severe cold spell we have been having, and it is still cold. This great audience proves that there is much interest in this discussion and in the questions being discussed. I recognize people here tonight from many of the towns of Texas: Fort Worth, McKinney, Terrell, Cleburne, Greenville, Corsicana, and many other places which I shall not attempt to name. We welcome all you visitors, and I am sure both of the speakers join me in expressing appreciation of your presence. We invite you to continue to be with us through the next three nights. The discussion will close Friday night. We had a wonderful time last week; let us have a better one this week. I want to compliment the speakers on their deportment. It has been all that could be asked.

Scanned by TLC

Notice carefully the reading of the proposition:

"The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to his Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."

W. L. Oliphant affirms; John R. Rice denies. Brother W. L. Oliphant will be in the lead during all of this week. This subject will be discussed this evening and tomorrow evening. The first speaker will speak for thirty minutes in the affirmative; the next speaker in the negative for thirty minutes; and then the affirmative thirty minutes, then the negative follows for thirty minutes, each speaker having two thirty-minute speeches each. I am sure you will enjoy the evening. We are beginning on time if "Bulova" time is correct! Brother W. L. Oliphant will now speak in the affirmative for thirty minutes.

(First Affirmative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

After having enjoyed some more of the good things of life, it pleases me very much to have the privilege of continuing this investigation of the word of God. The unusually large number of people present, in spite of extremely inclement weather, indicates a great interest in the word of God and especially in the question now under discussion.

Personal victory should never be the aim of anyone during such investigations as this. The supreme desire upon the part of every person should be that the truth as it is taught in the word of God should prevail. It is my prayer that every person present will be like those Bereans, whom Paul said "were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so" (Acts 17:11).

Tonight I take upon myself the obligation of showing that the scriptures teach the truth of the proposition which has been read in your hearing. One of the rules of de-

Scanned by TLC

bate is that the terms of the proposition under discussion should be so clearly defined that the precise points at issue can be easily seen.

"The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to his Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."

This proposition I believe with all of my heart. By "scriptures" I mean the word of God, consisting of the Old and New Testaments. By "teach" I mean to declare in so many words, or the logical conclusion derived from a single passage or the collation of a number of passages in the word of God. By "baptism" I mean immersion in water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. By "Penitent believer," I mean a person who believes in Christ and has repented of his past sins. Only a proper subject can be scripturally baptized. I would not knowingly, for my very life, baptize any person who is not a penitent believer. It is only to the penitent believer that baptism is offered. By "essential" I mean necessary. The meaning of this term, as I use it in this proposition, will be easily discerned as I continue with my affirmation. By "salvation from past or alien sins" I mean remission or forgiveness of the sins committed before baptism; that is before one becomes a Christian, while he is an alien from the government of Christ. The design of baptism is not the forgiveness of sins which have not been committed at the time baptism is performed, but only for the remission of the sins of the individual's past. In other words; it is my contention, that in the process of one's being converted from sin to Christ, salvation from past sins is preceded by baptism. This is the order of the New Testament. Baptism and salvation, or its equivalent, are mentioned together six times in the New Testament. In each of these six references, baptism is placed first and salvation, or its equivalent, afterward. I am sure that we shall make no mistake in believing the Bible order.

Mark 1:4: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and

Scanned by TLC

preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Notice the order: First, "baptism;" second, "remission of sins."

Luke 3:3: "And he, (John the Baptist), came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Again we have: First, "baptism;" second, "remission of sins."

Mark 16:16; "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Again we have the divine order; First, "baptized;" second, "saved."

Acts 2:38: "Then Peter said unto them, (inquiring sinners), 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." Here we have First, "baptized;" second, "remission of sins."

Acts 22:16: Ananias to Saul of Tarsus—"And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." The same order: First, "baptized;" second, "wash away sins."

Once more; 1 Peter 3:21—"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." First, "baptism;" second, "saved."

These plain passages of scripture suggest what I mean by my proposition, that baptism is essential to salvation. I mean that our heavenly Father has seen fit to place baptism before salvation. This is the divine order. Does it not seem strange that if, as Dr. Rice contends, salvation comes before baptism, the Holy Spirit does not at least once place them in that order? My friends, let it be forever remembered that the Holy Spirit, in giving us the waybill from earth to heaven, mentioned baptism and salvation, or its equivalent, six times and that each time, the Holy Spirit saw fit to put baptism first and salvation following.

Scanned by TLC

While my opponent was in the affirmative last week I asked him several questions. They were never answered. I want to ask him some questions in the very beginning of my affirmation. We have seen that he will not answer questions in his affirmative. Will he do any better in the negative? I trust he will not ignore these questions. I consider them vitally important. I ask them in my first speech, so that he will have plenty of time in which to answer them. Doctor, will you please answer these questions in your first speech, so that this audience and I may know your position with reference to the proposition we are discussing?

First: *Is baptism a part of the gospel?* He can answer this question with a simple "yes" or "no."

Second: *Does baptism belong to the righteousness of God or to the righteousness of man?*

Third: John 1:17 says, "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Question: *Does baptism belong to the law as given by Moses, or to the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ?*

One more, Doctor. This is a personal question as to your belief on the design of baptism. You can help a great deal in clarifying the issue and in making this audience see exactly where you stand on the question by giving us a simple frank answer.

Do you believe that a person who knows that Jesus said (Mark 16:16), *"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," but refuses to be baptized, will be saved?*

Plain straightforward answers to these questions will be worth a great deal in the study of this proposition. I am sure that every honest person in this audience joins me in the earnest hope that Dr. Rice will not evade these questions, but will tell us exactly what he believes in reply to them.

It is not my position, nor do I believe at all, that men are saved by the works of the law. If my friend spends

Scanned by TLC

his time in reading the scriptures which say that we are not saved by the works of the law, he will be wasting his time so far as this discussion is concerned. I shall say "amen" to every one of them.

Nor do I believe that we are saved by the righteousness of man—man's self-righteousness. I do not believe that any man merits salvation or that it is possible for any man to earn salvation by meritorious works. So any passage which my friend may quote to show that we are not saved by man's righteousness, I shall readily accept. Such passages have no place in this discussion, because my opponent and I are perfectly agreed upon them. Therefore, I hope he will not spend a lot of time in quoting the many passages of Holy Writ which state that man is not saved on the basis of his own goodness.

My opponent and I are agreed that we are not saved by man's righteousness, and I think that we can also agree that we are saved by God's righteousness. God's righteousness is something to which man submits. Hear Paul on this question:

"Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."

In baptism one submits to something. When an earnest soul, believing with all of his heart in Jesus as the Son of God, thoroughly penitent of all of his sins, confesses his faith in Jesus Christ and is by a gospel preacher led into the water and buried in this liquid grave, he submits to something. Is this any kind of righteousness to which he submits? If so, is it God's righteousness or is it man's righteousness? Dr. Rice puts a great deal of stress on baptism, even to the extent of naming his church the or-

Scanned by TLC

dinance. We should like for him to tell us whether the man he baptizes is submitting to God's righteousness, man's righteousness, or whether the act is a part of any sort of righteousness.

I shall contend that baptism is a part of the righteousness of God. Our Lord insisted that when he was baptized by John in Jordan, he and John were engaging in some sort of righteousness. "For thus it becometh us," said Jesus, "to fulfill all righteousness" (Matthew 3:15). Not only do I contend that baptism is an act of God's righteousness, but that baptism is a work of the Lord. Jesus said, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John 6:29). Man believes—faith is exercised by human beings, yet Jesus declares it to be the work of God. Thus we see that that which is done by the author of God is said to be a work of God. In this connection, I invite your attention to John 4:1-4; "When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,) he left Judaea, and departed again into Galilee." Jesus never, with his own hands, baptized anyone; yet it is said that Jesus baptized more disciples than John. All those who were baptized by the disciples of Jesus, under his authority, are said to have been baptized by Jesus. It is a principle of law, both human and divine, that one may act through a duly constituted agent. That which is done by one's authority through an agent is as much his act as if he himself did it. Every person who is scripturally baptized is baptized by the Lord.

In giving the great commission to his disciples, Jesus said "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:28, 19). When a child of God baptizes

Scanned by TLC

a penitent believer on this authority from the Lord, that penitent believer is being baptized by the Lord, through a divinely constituted agent.

Furthermore, I believe in salvation by faith. I do not think that my affirmation of the present proposition eliminates salvation by faith, or indicates that I do not believe in salvation by faith as strongly as anybody could believe it. I have no doubt that my friend and opponent in this discussion would affirm that repentance is essential to salvation. Did he mean to exclude faith? Certainly not. If Dr. Rice should affirm, as I am sure he would, that repentance is essential to salvation, would he thereby declare that he does not believe in salvation by faith? If my opponent can affirm that repentance is essential to salvation and at the same time hold that salvation is by faith, cannot I, by the same rule, affirm that baptism is essential and still believe in salvation by faith?

When Dr. Rice reads a passage from the word of God which says we are "saved by faith," he understands that repentance is not thereby excluded from the plan of salvation. Why? Because the same Bible in other places teaches the necessity of repentance. Why cannot he, on the basis of the same sort of reasoning, understand that the scriptures which say we are saved by faith do not deny the necessity of baptism, since other passages in the same Bible make baptism essential?

I want it further understood that when I affirm that baptism is essential to the salvation of the penitent believer, I do not believe the ridiculous thing that Christians have sometimes been accused of believing; that there is value, per se, in the water—that there is power in water to wash away sins. I certainly do not so believe, and I am sure that no sensible person does. A prophet of God commanded Naaman, the Syrian king, to dip himself seven times in the river Jordan in order that he might be healed of leprosy. (2 Kings, 5th chapter.) I do not believe that

Scanned by TLC

the waters of Jordan contained any peculiar medicinal qualities which could be used to heal one of leprosy; and while I am sure there was no efficacy in the waters of Jordan, I am equally sure that Naaman's dipping in these waters, as commanded by the prophet of God, was essential to his being healed from leprosy. I am also sure that there is nothing in water than can wash away man's sins, but I am just as sure that the sinner's being baptized, as commanded by the Lord Jesus Christ, is essential to his salvation from sin. In Naaman's case the power to heal was in God; but one of the terms upon which God offered to heal Naaman was that he dip himself in the Jordan river. It is God who has the power to forgive sins; but in the Christian dispensation, God has seen fit to make baptism one of the conditions through which man's sins are forgiven. It is certainly a prerogative of our God to stipulate the terms upon which he shall pronounce blessings upon mankind.

The sinner is justified by faith. Dr. Rice and I are agreed that the Bible so teaches. The issue between us is not whether man is saved by faith, but "when" and "how" does faith save? Let us study Paul's dissertation on justification by faith in Romans 5:1, 2.

"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." You will notice that Paul includes himself among those who are justified by faith and have peace with God. If we can learn when Paul had peace with God, we can know when he was justified by faith. Did he have peace with God on the Damascus road? His faith began there. If Saul was justified by faith and had peace with God while on the way to Damascus, neither he nor the Lord knew it. "And he (Saul) trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and

Scanned by TLC

it shall be told thee what *thou must do*" (Acts 9:6). Though being justified by faith, there is something which Saul *must do*. After receiving this command from the Lord, Saul went into the city of Damascus. For three days he was "without sight, and neither did eat nor drink," but continued in earnest prayer. Did he have peace with God then? The Lord sent Ananias to Saul. If Saul had already been saved when Ananias arrived, this minister of God did not know it. Finding Saul praying, he said to him; "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts 22:16). Ananias understood that though Saul already believed in Christ, there was yet something for him to do before his sins were washed away. The Lord had told him, in answer to his anxious inquiry on the Damascus road, that in Damascus he would be told what he *must do*, and Ananias now tells him to be baptized and wash away his sins. Evidently both Saul and Ananias understood that Saul *must* be baptized.

All of this occurred in the process of Saul's being "justified by faith" and finding "peace with God." Immediately after his baptism we read: "And when he had received meat, he was strengthened. Then was Saul certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus. And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God" (Acts 9:19, 20). His actions are now those of a man who has been "justified by faith" and has "peace with God." Contrast his attitude now with his attitude immediately preceding his baptism.

But we shall let the apostle himself explain how he and others were "justified by faith." After announcing in the 5th chapter of Romans the principle of justification by faith, he, in the 6th chapter, proceeds to explain the process. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like

Scanned by TLC

as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (Romans 6:3, 4). It is through the death of Christ that we are saved, and Paul explains that we are baptized into his death. Thus it is, that we are "justified by faith and have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." But let the apostle explain further. Galatians 3:26: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Again Paul is talking about "by faith." He says the Galatian Christians are children of God "by faith" in Christ Jesus. But, Paul, why are they children of God "by faith" in Christ Jesus? What is involved in this expression? Listen to the apostle's answer in the next verse. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Paul taught that salvation is in Christ. 2 Timothy 2:10: "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." Salvation is in Christ. We are baptized into Christ. Hence, baptism is essential to salvation. In being saved "by faith" in Christ Jesus, men and women are—in obedience to the command of Christ Jesus, and through faith—baptized into Christ, where God has placed salvation for the human family. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (Corinthians 5:17).

The best definition of any term, as used by any writer, is found in the use which the writer himself makes of the term. The Bible is its own best interpreter, and certainly the apostle Paul is the best interpreter of his own language. Let us see if we can learn how the apostle uses the expression, "by faith." Sometimes an example is plainer than the mere announcement of a principle. The 11th chapter of Hebrews contains a long list of characters who are said to have received certain blessings and accomplished cer-

Scanned by TLC

tain things "by faith." Let us see what was involved in this expression as used by Paul in Hebrews 11.

Abel was blessed "by faith." "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh" (Verse 4). What is meant by the expression "by faith" in this case? Was Abel active or passive? We shall call John as a witness: "Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous" (1 John 3:12). Thus we see that Abel engaged in righteous works, works which God commanded him to do, and still all that Abel obtained is said by Paul to have been obtained "by faith." "By faith" in Abel's case included righteous works.

Enoch is our next example. "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God" (Verse 5). But in Genesis 5:33 we read: "And Enoch walked with God . . ." So we see that "by faith" in Enoch's case included walking with God.

The apostle next cites Noah as an example. "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith" (Verse 7). In saving himself and his house "by faith," Noah: (1) "Was warned of God." (2) "Moved with fear." (3) "Prepared an ark." And it was by the doing of these things that he "became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." Can you not see that the "righteousness which is by faith" involves obedience to God's commands? If my opponent can see that Noah, in being saved "by faith," was required

Scanned by TLC

to hear God, move with fear, and prepare an ark, can he not see that the sinner in being saved "by faith," must repent of his sins and be baptized into Christ?

Our next example of Paul's use of "by faith" concerns Abraham. "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise" (Verses 8 and 9). In receiving a blessing "by faith," Abraham (1) "obeyed," (2) "went out, not knowing whither he went," (3) "sojourned in the land of promise," and (4) "dwelt in tabernacles." All these things Paul includes in the process which he designates, "by faith." "By faith Abraham . . . obeyed." And this is the kind of faith which brought the blessing to Abraham. "By faith" the sinner is saved, but not until it may be said of him, "by faith he obeyed."

I could continue this list of examples of Paul's use of "by faith" on and on. The apostle tells us that it was "by faith" Moses delivered the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. But we are told that Moses (1) "Chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season," (2) "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasurers in Egypt," (3) "had respect unto the recompense of the reward," (4) "forsook Egypt," (5) "endured, as seeing him who is invisible," (6) "kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood," and (7) "passed through the Red sea as by dry land." All of these things which Moses did are described by the apostle Paul by the simple phrase, "by faith." "By faith," we are told, the walls of Jerico fell down, but it was "after they were compassed about seven days. If Dr. Rice can understand that the walls of Jericho fell "by faith," but that they did not fall until after the children of God, in obedience to God's command, had

Scanned by TLC

marched around them for seven days, can he not also understand that the sinner is saved "by faith," but not until he has, in obedience to God's command, been baptized for the remission of his sins? Many other examples of those who achieved "by faith" are given by Paul in Hebrews 11. The principle taught in every instance is the same: that when Paul uses the expression "by faith" he means a living, acting, obedient faith. "For in Jesus Christ neither crcumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but *faith which worketh by love*" (Galatians 5:6).

I want to issue a challenge to my friend, Dr. Rice. If he will come out and meet this challenge fairly and squarely, I think the issue will be made so clear that no one can possibly misunderstand it. Here is my challenge, Doctor: *Find a single instance in the word of God where an individual is said to have been blessed by faith, without that individual's faith expressing itself in some overt act of obedience.* Can you find it? If so, you will then have some ground upon which to contend that the sinner is inactive in being saved by faith.

My friends, while emphasizing as much as any one that the sinner is saved "by faith," it is my contention that the faith which saves is a living, obedient faith. This position makes clear such passages as these: Acts 6:7: "And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were *obedient to the faith.*" Hebrews 5:9: "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that *obey him.*" John 3:36; (R. V.) "He that believeth on the son hath everlasting life: and he that *obeyeth not the son shall not see life;* but the wrath of God abideth on him." Romans 1:5: "By whom we have received grace and apostleship for *obedience to the faith* among all nations, for his name." There are many scriptures which my friendly opponent may use to show that the believer is saved; such as: "For God so loved

Scanned by TLC

the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). "He that believeth on him is not condemned . . ." (John 3:18). ". . . He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but it passed from death unto life" (John 5:24). "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts 10:43). " . . . Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house" (Acts 16:31). " . . . Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace" (Luke 7:50).

But he need not quote all these scriptures and the many others like them in the word of God, in an effort to refute my proposition; because they do not refute it. I believe these passages as strongly as he or anyone else believes them. What kind of believers are contemplated? Are they believers who have a "faith which works by love," or are they disobedient believers? I think I can read about some believers whom Dr. Rice, himself, will say were not saved. Listen to John 12:42, 43: "Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees 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." Were these believers saved? By their refusal to confess Christ they denied him; and Jesus says, "But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven" (Matthew 10:33). The devils believe. "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble" (James 2:19). Are the devils saved?

The second chapter of James makes this matter plainer than I could possibly make it. Let us read from the 14th to the 17th verses. "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and

Scanned by TLC

destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful in the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." Listen, my friends: To attempt to be saved by faith that will not obey the Lord's command to be baptized is comparable to trying to feed the hungry mouth without food or to clothe the naked body without clothes—"What doth it profit?"

While the children of Israel journeyed in the desert of Zin, they became thirsty, and God commanded Moses; "Speak ye unto the rock before their eyes; and it shall give forth water." But Moses, instead of speaking to the rock as God had commanded, smote the rock twice with his rod. "And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, *Because ye believed me not*, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them" (Numbers 20:12). The belief in God which counts, includes obedience to God. When Moses failed and refused to obey God, God said, "Ye believed me not." Thus, it was because of a lack of obedient faith that Moses was not allowed to enter Canaan. From lonely Mount Nebo's height, poor old Moses viewed the land flowing with milk and honey, the land toward which he had been journeying for more than forty years; and there, on one of God's summits, he died and was buried by the hand of God, not being permitted to enter beautiful Canaan, because he "believed not God." The reason we know that he "believed not God" is that he failed to obey God. Now we are saved by faith, but Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved . . . "(Mark 16:16). When the sinner refuses to be baptized, may we not say that it is because he "believes not"? Can the unbaptized believer—in the face of the plain language of the Lord that baptism precedes salvation—justly claim to belong to that group of believers of whom it is said they are "justified," saved," "have ever-

Scanned by TLC

lasting life," "shall not come into condemnation"? Does he not, in fact, belong to that group of believers which includes the devils (James 2:19), and the cowardly rulers (John 12:42, 43), and to whom no blessing is promised?

My position in this matter is in thorough harmony with the definition of the Greek word from which we get faith (pistic), as given by Mr. Thayer in his Greek-English Lexicon: "Used especially of the faith by which a man embraces Jesus; i. e., a conviction, full of joy, trust, that Jesus is the Messiah—the divinely appointed author of salvation in the kingdom of God, conjoined with obedience to Christ." (Thayer's Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament, 1886 Edition, Page 511.)

Every inspired statement, since the Lord gave the Great Commission, which speaks of the believer as being saved refers to the believer who has repented of his sins, confessed his faith in Christ, and been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Dr. Rice can understand how this class of believers contains only those who have repented of their sins, because the Lord commands repentance. Can he not as easily see that it contains only those who have been baptized; because, likewise, our Lord commands baptism? Just let him remember that in the passages he may quote about the believer being saved there is no mention of repentance. He will say that their repentance is taken for granted. I assure him that by the same door through which he brings repentance into these passages, I shall bring baptism. My Lord commands it; it is a work of God and an act of faith; and I accept it as a part of the scheme of redemption given by my Savior.

My friend, in closing, allow me to call your attention again to the Great Commission as given by our Lord. Meeting his disciples after his resurrection from the dead, he said; "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." These

Scanned by TLC

were among the last words spoken by the Son of God before he left this sin-cursed earth. I had rather suffer the loss of my right arm, have my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, or my body placed in the narrow limits of the tomb, than to deny or disregard these final words of my Lord and Savior. This commission contains the orders under which the disciples worked in their evangelization of the world. How did they understand it?

The acts of the apostles contains a record of the work of the disciples under this commission. In Acts we have a record of the conversion of several thousand individuals. In each instance, we are told that those being converted were baptized. In some cases faith is not expressly mentioned; in others there is no mention of repentance; but without a single exception, in every case, we are told that the person being converted was baptized. I know that faith is necessary to salvation. I know that repentance is necessary. I do not know why the Holy Spirit saw fit to always mention baptism and sometimes fail to mention faith and repentance. Possibly it was because God knew that there would some day be men on the earth who, like my opponent, would deny the necessity of baptism. The Holy Spirit leaves such men without excuse. We see how the apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit, understood Jesus' last commission to them. Let us understand it as they did and tell lost men and women that, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

I have offered enough for this time. I thank you.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Fifth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 22, 1935.

THIRD PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to His Salvation from Past or Alien Sins.*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies.

(First Negative Address by John R. Rice.)

Moderator: John R. Rice will now follow in a 30-minute speech.

My Brother Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and this great Congregation:

It is a great joy to come to speak to you again, and again I come to speak to you on what "The Scriptures Teach." Brother Oliphant affirms that "The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to His Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."

Notice again, I place emphasis on the fact that "The Scriptures Teach." It does not matter particularly which is the smartest logician, which is the best looking man, or the youngest. Brother Oliphant is the best looking and the youngest. That is, he is about five years behind. He disagrees with me about being older. "The Scriptures teach," that is the important question.

Notice again, I place emphasis on the fact that "The (holding up six fingers), a certain thing was said in the Bible. There are not that many, as I will show you in a moment. Well, all right, six times in one chapter, the Bible mentions (as I showed the other night) the millennium,

Scanned by TLC

and it took me four nights to convince him that he believed in a literal thousand years, though he said he didn't know where it was. Well, he will find out from the Scriptures. When he gets off and reads this debate and the Scriptures I give out, he is going to know. Notice again, this is to be what the Scriptures teach. I am so thoroughly convinced on this proposition that I have insisted, and I insist again, and I beg of you, Bring Your Bibles!

I know the Bible teaches definitely what is the state of a penitent believer, and I know you can find out if you will come with open hearts and bring your Bibles and see and check up the Scriptures I use.

I have it so clear in mind that I know I can show honest hearts from the Bible what is the state of the penitent believer without baptism. I was certain of my position long before I entered this debate. That is why I urged all of you to come Sunday afternoon to ask me questions. I was satisfied you would be happy to do it, but you would not. I thought it would please you brethren, Brother Nelson, Brother Oliphant, Brother Pullias, Brother Warlick and the rest of you to bring your objections and bombard me with questions on the subjects discussed in the first week of this debate. But you would not accept my invitation. I am not afraid to face what the Scriptures teach. Brother Oliphant had already conceded the literal millennium of a literal thousand years. I am anxious for these things to be settled by the Scriptures. I know that if these brethren had been willing to accept the Bible at literal face value, I could have shown them on that. I am certain of that. Happily, the thing does not need to be settled in any way but by what the Scriptures teach.

I am glad Brother Oliphant used many Scriptures, though he did not use them very long. He just referred to each one, and then quickly dropped it. That is all right. Mark you now, this should be settled by what the Scriptures themselves teach. Now, Brother Oliphant, I don't want

Scanned by TLC

you to fudge on this. It took too long the other night, it ought not to have taken so long to get you to believe in a literal millennium of a literal thousand years! I don't want to take so long to get you to admit that the Scriptures do literally teach the exact state of a penitent believer; that he is already saved, has everlasting life, is born of God, is justified by the blood of Christ, and shall never perish. The Bible is so clear there need not be any doubt. Again I say, the Bible says what it means and means what it says, and honest, open hearted people can understand it. You don't have to have any system or long outline of theology to understand the Bible. It clearly and expressly tells what is the state of a penitent believer and you will know if you will take the Bible. But I must hurry up and get to the proposition. I believe Brother Oliphant will come to that; but I don't want him to be too long in admitting the literal state of a penitent believer as he admitted a literal millennium of a literal thousand years. More than that, I am certain on the proposition and so clear about it because the Bible tells what the state of a penitent believer is.

Notice the statement of this question. The statement is referring to the *"penitent believer."* Here we have a man who is already penitent, who has already repented toward God. Here is a man who is a believer; he has faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. That is the data that we have about this man already. I put emphasis on the *"penitent."* He has repented. He is a believer in Christ. I mean by that, he has trusted in Christ, he has depended on Christ, accepted Christ with the heart, and believed with the heart on Christ. That part is already admitted in the proposition. We are not debating whether or not he ought to do that. Every one of us admit that all of this has already happened to the man we are discussing tonight. Brother Oliphant, he is now a penitent believer. Notice this other thing about the rest: the statement of this question already

Scanned by TLC

admits that a man need not have been baptized to be a penitent believer. A man can be a penitent believer and not be baptized; and that is clear from the Bible.

But the Bible teaches, not once, but many times, not only in the Old Testament, but in the New Testament, not only by precept but by example, not only in the personal ministry of Christ, but after Pentecost the same way, that a man may be a penitent believer, having sincerely repented, and be trusting in Christ for salvation and not have been baptized. That much is in the very statement of the question, Brother Oliphant. The question admits that. And that is Brother Oliphant's statement of the question, too. Here it is now, "The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to His Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."

Notice that the man this question is talking about can have repented and can have believed in Christ (we mean Bible belief, the kind of faith commanded of sinners to be saved)—a man can be a penitent believer in the Bible sense without having been baptized. The question for debate frankly admits that a penitent believer can be that, not having been baptized. Now the question is: Not whether that man has already repented and already believed, but it is whether baptism is essential to the salvation of the man who has already repented of his sins, the man who already has such faith in Christ, a believer in the Bible sense, with the faith that is commanded for salvation. The man we are discussing is a penitent believer in Christ. Brother Oliphant admits he has already repented, and already believed with all his heart. But Brother Oliphant says still that he is not saved and cannot be saved without baptism. That, I emphatically deny. Mark you, a man can believe with faith for salvation without being baptized, and Dr. Oliphant's affirmative plainly admits that fact.

Baptism is right, and penitent believers ought to be baptized. But when the Bible tells us that the penitent believer is already saved, already is past from death unto life, it

Scanned by TLC

will not do to put in another requirement for his salvation. Do not misunderstand me. Frankly, I believe in baptism so much that I have written on it and preached it and I have practiced it. I had my stenographer to make note of the number I have baptized in Dallas from July 31, 1932, to January 1, 1935. There were three hundred and twenty-one in that time that I have baptized with these hands, besides many others in Fort Worth, Waxahachie, Coleman, Texas, Greenville, Texas, etc. You "Church of Christ" people talk much about baptism, but I believe I have the advantage when we count the penitent believers we both baptize!

I am happy to say I believe in baptism. I practice baptism. I believe people should be baptized as soon as possible after they believe. I frankly confess so it was in Bible times. I believe that is the way it should be done. I have many times baptized at midnight. I have taken them in the country and turned on the car lights and baptized them. I did it because it was commanded, because I thought it was right, and because I believed in it. I do it sincerely. Penitent believers ought to be baptized right away. But this statement plainly says, and the Bible plainly teaches, that a man may have repented and may be a sincere believer with the heart, and not yet have been baptized. Brother Oliphant admits that in his statement of the question. I want you to remember that statement which Brother Oliphant affirms lays emphasis on the fact that the man under discussion is already a penitent believer. He will not deny that. I want to put the emphasis where the Bible does.

Of course Brother Oliphant and I both mean honest, saving faith and sincere repentance from the heart when we discuss the penitent believer.

The Greek word for repent, *metanoeo*, means *change of mind*. This man has changed his mind toward God already and turned toward God. This statement of the question takes for granted, and it is right to take for granted, too,

Scanned by TLC

that the penitent believer is one man and not two men, and the two terms are not necessarily accounts of two separate events.

It is my honest belief, and I think a careful study of the Bible will prove to you, that a man who has repented has believed. Sincere repentance involves belief. It is not that one happens at one time and another later on. I say one may believe, like devils do, that there is a God, but that is not faith in the Bible sense. A man may believe that there was a man named Jesus Christ, and that he is the Son of God, and yet not believe on him in his heart, nor depend on him for salvation. And I make this challenge frankly, the Bible teaches that the man who repents has believed on Christ in the Bible sense, and the man who believes in Christ has also repented. The statement of this question so infers. The point is this: a lost sinner turns to God by repentance toward God, that is, turning from sins toward God in the heart. Now how does he do it? By faith in Christ Jesus! Repentance is his attitude toward God. Turning to God, by faith in Christ, is his attitude toward Christ at the same time, depending on Christ to mediate between him and God. Repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ both happen at the same time and are the same event. The penitent believer is one man, his penitent faith is one act of a surrendered, trusting will. That is why Dr. Oliphant's affirmation speaks of "the penitent believer." Repentance and faith view the same act from two different sides, and are names for different angles of the same attitude of heart, different colors or lights on the same heart and attitude of the man who turns to God.

For example, the Bible uses many other terms as synonymous with faith. Receiving Christ, coming to Christ, and confessing Christ are all terms which the Scripture uses to indicate faith in Christ. John 1:11, 12 says:

"He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them he gave power to

Scanned by TLC

become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name."

Receiving Christ, and believing on him in the Bible sense, are the same act of faith.

Likewise Jesus said,

"Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out," indicating that coming to him is the plan of salvation. That is true, for coming to him is faith, as Hebrews 11:6 tells us: *"But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."*

Coming is believing. That is what the Scriptures say. And many other such like passages show that the plan of salvation by faith is made clear by the use of many other terms. All these terms simply show faith in different lights, from different viewpoints, and shine in different colors on the same great fact that men are saved by faith. No honest Bible student can deny or dissent from this Scriptural fact. Likewise, repentance and faith are the same event. The man who has faith in Christ has repented, and one who has repented has believed.

Notice carefully that baptism is not the same as faith, not the same as repentance, but is an entirely different act, and Brother Oliphant's affirmation plainly states that one may be a penitent believer and not have been baptized.

Now then, this man is a penitent believer. He has in his heart turned from sin toward God, and at the same time he has faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. That is repentance toward God, and at the same time faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. What, then, is the state of that man? I thank God that the Bible tells us what his state is so we cannot deny the truth about that. The thing Brother Oliphant affirms is that baptism is essential to his salvation. He said that it is necessary. And more than that, he said frankly about this, that baptism comes before salvation. He says that it is necessary to salvation. Brother Oliphant has stated very carefully, that according to his viewpoint,

Scanned by TLC

baptism comes before salvation. I take it that he means, from the statement of this question, that it must come before salvation. *It must come before salvation, he says.* According to that, a man who isn't baptized isn't saved. It just means that the man who is not baptized is not saved. His statement does not say—I do not accuse him of it, I never have, I want to be fair and honest—my Brother does not believe water saves a man, but he does believe one cannot be saved without going into the water.

Yes, and that is what our Roman Catholic friends believe, too.

There are many objections to the term *baptismal regeneration.* The fact of the business is, no Roman Catholic believes water saves anybody, nor do you. No, you do not believe that. But the point is: is the water essential, or is baptism in water essential for salvation. Is it one thing without which no man can be saved? Now my brother has a statement here. The statement does not say, "Sometimes essential." It does not say that it is part of the time essential, but it says "Baptism is essential." The statement of the question plainly says, and Brother Oliphant does not deny it (in fact it is the way he stated it, others of you agreed also) that a man cannot be saved without baptism in water.

The issue is very clear on that proposition and I want to help you some here. Actually it comes down to salvation by works. Notice further in this proposition: Brother Oliphant affirms that baptism to the penitent believer is essential to his salvation only "From past or alien sins!" I was glad he put in "past or alien sins" in the proposition. It makes his false plan of salvation by works stand out clearly.

Notice the words *alien* and *past.* When we wrote out this question here, I told Brother Oliphant I did not think *alien sins* was important, but he wanted to put it in. Notice particularly the term, *past or alien sins.* What does it mean? This is what it means. Brother Oliphant, accord-

Scanned by TLC

ing to our brother's own statement, says that not only is baptism essential to salvation, but when you have repented and not only that, but when you have confessed Christ—have repented and believed and have been baptized; even yet that is not all of his plan of salvation. All the salvation you have then is just up to the present time. You have only salvation from past sins. There are many, many other things you have to do yet before you really get to heaven. What else? Actually, this statement does not only make baptism necessary, but makes beyond the time of baptism many other works essential to salvation. This is plainly a human scheme of salvation by works.

Now my brother of course hates the idea, but his plan of salvation that he places before sinners day by day includes a whole lot of man's works and places all these works before salvation. That is affirmed clearly in Brother Oliphant's statement of the question. His proposition affirms salvation by man's works; many, many works, including baptism.

This statement not only includes the affirmation that nobody can be saved without baptism, but it affirms that beyond baptism there are some other things equally essential to final salvation. That is the reason the words *past or alien* were put in there. I challenge my brother to deny that. He believes that the man who repents, believes and is baptized, but who does not do certain other things which it is his known duty to do, will still not go to heaven, no matter if he has been baptized. My Brother Oliphant and our friends believe, and his proposition states clearly, that baptism, as well as many other things, are essential to salvation. Up to the time of baptism, baptism is essential to salvation, he thinks, but beyond that, he thinks many other things are essential to salvation.

I have before me a "Church of Christ" quarterly, printed by "The Gospel Advocate." It is for October, November, and December, 1930. Here are two statements. I give them to clarify Brother Oliphant's position. That is one

Scanned by TLC

reason I do not like these quarterlies. I wish you folks would go back to the Bible itself like you used to. You ought to go back to it. You used to run the Baptists and Methodists ragged because they did not use the Bible only in Sunday School. You ought to go back to the business of using the Bible itself, and I wish you would. You ought to have brought your Bibles here tonight. I wish you would bring them every night.

On page 48 of this "Church of Christ" quarterly is the following passage:

"The terms of admission into the kingdom of Christ are applicable to any member of any race on earth who is old enough and intelligent enough to be a gospel subject. These terms of admission are, first, a wholehearted faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Savior of men, a genuine and thorough repentance from all known sin, a public and unequivocal confession of Jesus Christ in the presence of men as the Son of the living God, and baptism by the authority of Jesus Christ into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Compliance with these conditions brings to each one who complies with them the promise by the authority of Christ of the remission of all past sins . . . ."

This is the same statement he has and for the same reason. The last of this statement Brother Oliphant didn't put in but it is implied in his proposition. Reading further now—

" . . . . the gift of the Holy Spirit as an abiding and indwelling Guest and Comforter, and the promise of a home in heaven throughout the limitless ages of eternity to those who are faithful in the practice of all the Christian duties devolving upon the members of the church of Christ until the hour of death."

Actually what is this statement tonight of Brother Oliphant's position? It is this. Here is a man who has already repented, has already trusted in Christ with his whole heart, but Brother Oliphant says that man is going

Scanned by TLC

to hell if he is not baptized. And even after he is baptized, unless he is faithful in the practice of all the Christian duties until the hour of death, he is going to hell anyway, baptism or no baptism! If he does not keep every duty after baptism he is going to hell. That is the position of Brother Oliphant, there can be no doubt. The statement of this question involves it. His position involves it.

It comes down to this, as Jesus himself illustrated it. There are two men in the temple. One is a good man, has forms, ceremonies, etc. He says, "Lord, I thank you that I am not as other men are. I am a good man, I pray, I fast twice in the week. I go to church, I do not commit adultery." There is a good, praying church member, isn't he? The other man is a dirty publican. The Pharisee looks over where the publican is standing with bowed head and says, "Lord, I thank you I am better than these folks." The other fellow said, "Lord, I confess I am a sinner, have mercy on me." Now the heart of this question is this, which one of those men are saved? I say the man with the penitent heart. Brother Oliphant says, "He is not unless he goes on and does all the other things too." The Scripture does not indicate that the Pharisee was a penitent believer. But the publican truly repented. I do not want to misrepresent Brother Oliphant's position, but the fact of the business is it clearly comes to this: He teaches that after a man has repented with his whole heart, has trusted in Christ, he still has to save himself by baptism, and keeping up every Christian duty until the hour of death! I deny it, and the Scriptures deny it. And I know a man can find out if he comes with an honest, open, believing heart to search the Scriptures. There is no doubt concerning what the Bible teaches about it. My friend says there is much more essential to salvation.

Another thing, I do not care to go by what men say. However, while talking about it, I want to show you, as I said again and again, that you are drifting from the Restoration Movement and its position and spirit. I can't help

Scanned by TLC

remembering with a great deal of anxiety the charges brought against these good men, those members of your own faith and congregations, because they are Premillennialists. I said then, and I say again, you have gone a long way from the founders of the Restoration Movement.

I have before me the *Campbell-Rice Debate* (not this Rice, but a Presbyterian preacher). Both Campbell and Rice were great and good men and you will remember and respect them both, of course. In the debate last week, Campbell was on my side instead of on Brother Oliphant's, and the Millennial Harbinger proved that he believed in a literal millennium. And in this *Campbell-Rice Debate* which I have before me, Mr. Campbell takes my side on this week's debate also, instead of Brother Oliphant's. That does not mean that I agree with Alexander Campbell or that he agrees with me on everything, but on this business of salvation by a bunch of ceremonies, you have gone to seed and you have left the old faith of your fathers and drifted off with those sects with denominational machinery. This denominational machinery was utterly foreign to the leadership of this movement in other days. I charged, and it cannot be denied, that in the days when there was a Millennial Harbinger, people wrote about the millennium, and read and believed it then. Now, you point to a man and call him a traitor and renegade if he believes in the millennium, and you want to disfellowship him! You have left the position of the fathers in the Restoration Movement!

But enough of that. Coming back to the point, I want to show you here that Alexander Campbell plainly refused to say the thing that my friend Brother Oliphant says. On the contrary, he says that baptism is not essential to the penitent believer for salvation from his sins.

I'll be glad for anybody to see it. Here it is, *Campbell-Rice Debate,* page 458, Campbell's Second Speech on *The Design of Baptism.* The speech begins on page 455, and on page 458 he says:

Scanned by TLC

"And yet, how often have the pulpits and the presses proclaimed that we, in all cases, make baptism absolutely essential to salvation—that we suspend the eternal destiny of mankind upon the presence of a certain quantity of water. Nay, we have been gravely asked the question, a hundred times, should a person die on his way to the water, would he be lost forever, because he failed in getting into it! This, I have always said, is a non sequitur: a consequence that follows not from any tenet or saying of ours. Indeed, both in old England and in New England, this was once the current and standing abuse of the Baptists—of all immersionists. But they have survived it. So will we."

He thought you would outlive and survive the charges against you that were once made against Baptists and all immersionists, that you believed baptism was essential to salvation! But you go on more and more and take this sign and seal of salvation, as Campbell calls it, and trust that for salvation! I do not mean you do not believe in repentance and in other good things. You do. But I say, my friend Alexander Campbell would be disappointed if he were here today to see how his prophecy has not come true. People can and do honestly charge you now with what they one time charged you falsely. He said:

"Indeed both in old England and in New England this was once the current and standing abuse of the Baptists —of all immersionists. But they have survived it. So will we."

He said concerning the doctrine of baptism being essential to salvation:

"I have said that such views are not a fair consequence of any thing we have either said or written on this subject."

So says Alexander Campbell on page 458 of the *Campbell-Rice Debate* in his second address on *The Design of Baptism.* That is not all. Let me read on a little further here. There is much more like that. In the fifth address,

Scanned by TLC

there are some more things along the same line. Let me read in the fifth address. Here I give a quotation that is given in this debate from the Millennial Harbinger, Volume I, pages 411, 412, 413, 414, and quoted by Mr. Rice in this debate. On the next page, or the second page after that, page 419, it is acknowledged by Mr. Campbell. What is it? This statement is in the Millennial Harbinger written by Alexander Campbell himself.

"In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe, that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, pagans; and therefore no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world; and the promises concerning the everlasting kingdom of Messiah have failed, and the gates of hell have prevailed against his Church! This cannot be; and therefore there are Christians among the sects.

"But who is a Christian? I answer, every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will.

* * * * *

"I cannot, therefore, make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, not even immersion into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and in my heart regard all that have been sprinkled in infancy without their own knowledge and consent, as aliens from Christ and the well-grounded hope of heaven."

"Should I find a Pedo-Baptist more intelligent in the Christian scriptures, more spiritually-minded and more devoted to the Lord than a Buptist, or one immersed on a profession of the ancient faith, I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him that

Scanned by TLC

loveth most. Did I act otherwise, I would be a pure sectarian, a pharisee among Christians."

So says Alexander Campbell!

That is the reason I say this position of Dr. Oliphant's is a sectarian one. I believe in baptism of believers and think it is important, but the Bible teaches a penitent believer has everlasting life and that he is born of God. Now read on.

"Did I act otherwise, I would be a pure sectarian, a pharisee among Christians. Still I will be asked, how do I know that any loves my Master but by his obedience to his commandments? I answer, in no other way. But mark, I do not substitute obedience to one commandment, for universal, or even for general obedience. And should I see a sectarian Baptist or a Pedo-Baptist more spiritually minded, more generally conformed to the requisitions of the Messiah, than one who precisely acquiesces with me in the theory or practice of immersion as I teach, doubtless the former rather than the latter, would have my cordial approbation and love as a Christian."

Alexander Campbell says that he means baptism is not essential to salvation and he says it in so many words. It isn't essential to salvation, he said.

"So I judge, and so I feel. It is the image of Christ the Christian looks for and loves; and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known."

I read further on page 519, Alexander Campbell speaking, and he says on the bottom of that page.

"The question, then, arises: Is the Bible necessary to salvation, or the promulgation of the truths in it? Mr. Rice says, yes."

(That is the other Rice, but he was a gentleman.)

"Well, then, let him reconcile this contingency first, before he demands of me to reconcile the one he has feigned on baptism. I say feigned; for while I have given him a

Scanned by TLC

real difficulty, on his principles, his is but a feigned difficulty on my principles."

Now, listen. Here I am reading the exact words of Alexander Campbell:

"BECAUSE I DO NOT MAKE BAPTISM ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION IN ANY CASE, while he makes the knowledge of Christ absolutely necessary in all cases."

Alexander Campbell says, "I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case!"

Now my Brother Oliphant may debate on his proposition, but Alexander Campbell wouldn't. You who believe in no millennium and in baptism being absolutely essential to salvation. went off and left poor old Alexander Campbell a long time ago!

If anybody questions this, I will ask the chairman to take time out and let them see that. I represent the facts in this case. Yes, sir. I know what I am talking about! It is right here and anyone may see it if he wants to. My friend is affirming in this debate something Alexander Campbell would not affirm. Alexander Campbell further than I think he should have. But you have led your people further than he did on this thing. You have lost the spirit of that Great Reformation which did a great thing in this world in its day.

You say that baptism is essential to salvation. I deny it, and there are several reasons. I will give some from the Bible. There is plain teaching about it in the word of God. John 3:18:

"He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

My friend, Brother Oliphant, said on this proposition, that six times a certain thing is found here. I want to show you folks who really believe the Scriptures. I take the Scriptures on believing at face value as I do the others. He says he takes them. He reads a verse that says, "He

Scanned by TLC

that believeth on him is not condemned," and then in the next breath says that the man *is* condemned, too, if he isn't baptized, and that baptism is essential to his salvation! I want you to notice that treatment of the Scriptures. Any kind of debating—I don't know much about debating, I was never in such a debate before, but I do know this—any kind of debating that twists the Scriptures is bad. When a name is given, as Zechariah 6:11 mentions Joshua, the son of Josedech, the high priest who came back from Babylon in the book of Ezra, and when the debater leaves out that verse but takes the next verse and says that it refers to Christ, there is something crooked about that kind of debating. When Brother Oliphant takes a Scripture that mentions the time, the place, and the man, and tries to use it as if it referred to Christ, and to prove that Jesus is now reigning as a king, that is not honest debating. Brother Oliphant did that, and so it is with his treatment of these Scriptures that say the believer is not condemned but has everlasting life.

(Moderator: "You have three minutes.")

For a man just to say, "I believe in salvation by faith," but really when he says salvation by faith he means something else, that is not an honest use of language, nor an honest attitude toward the Scriptures.

What does the Bible say? Let me give you two or three Scriptures: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath everlasting life"—Let me look on, I had better read it, I might miss one word. The Scripture is clear and plenty is said about it.

"He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

What about the penitent believer we are talking about? He is not condemned the Scripture says. "But he that believeth not is condemned already." Why? "Because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." The penitent believer we are talking about is not

Scanned by TLC

condemned. He has not been baptized, but he is not condemned. The Bible did not say he was baptized.

I will get to some of the other Scriptures. I remind you I have another period yet.

Verse 36, same Chapter:

"He that believeth on the Son HATH everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

"He that believeth H A T H"—put it down—"He that believeth has everlasting life."

That is what it says and that is what it means. It says so in English and it says so in the Greek. The penitent believer has everlasting life, hath—has it now, he's got it now, he now *has* everlasting life and he is not condemned.

So in John 5:24:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

H-A-T-H. He has it right now. He has already gotten everlasting life. "Hath" means he has it right now. What, without baptism? Yes, he has already got it—he has it, everlasting life.

"Don't you believe in baptism?" you say? Yes, that is why I have baptized three hundred twenty-one in two and a half years in Dallas, but I believe in baptism for folks that already have everlasting life. Do not twist the Scriptures, brother. I don't care if you quote forty carloads, you will never find one Scripture that denies or contradicts this plain statement of the word of God. The Bible says this penitent believer has got everlasting life and is not condemned. But he is passed from death unto life if he is a penitent believer. There is much more in the Bible about that. The Bible makes clear about this plan of salvation. There are lots of Scriptures on this. Here in John 6:47, Jesus said:

Scanned by TLC

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

Brother Oliphant says, "He has not, and won't have until he is baptized." Brother Oliphant, I say Jesus is right about that. I take the Bible at face value. It means what it says. The penitent believer has everlasting life.

(Moderator: "The time is up".)

Thank you. I will talk to you again.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Fifth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 22, 1935.

THIRD PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to his Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."*

W. L. Oliphant, Affirmative;
John R. Rice, Negative.

(Second Affirmative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am not going to complain about the way my opponent debates; I want him to feel free to choose his own method, but I think he could have more profitably used his time in his last speech in replying to my arguments, than by going back to the propositions discussed last week and trying to patch up his defeat on those propositions. He, not only, leaves the proposition we are discussing and tries to "fix" his arguments on the propositions of last week, but he even jumps ahead and gets on the question we are to discuss on the last two days of this week! Doctor, I am satisfied with the discussion of the "return of the Jews" and the "millennium." If you are not satisfied with what you did on those questions, I shall try to accommodate you at some future date; and as for the apostacy question, I shall try to take care of that when we get to it. Let's debate the baptism question now.

I am in the affirmative; it is his business to follow me. It is the duty of the negative speaker to honestly consider the arguments made by the affirmative. Dr. Rice did not touch a single argument made in my first affirmative speech. He says he will answer my arguments in his next

Scanned by TLC

speech. We shall see. It seems to me that the fair thing for him to have done would have been to have noticed the arguments of my first speech in his first speech, so that I could have had an opportunity to have examined his replies tonight. There may be people here tonight who cannot be here tomorrow night. Incidentally, if the Doctor didn't have anything else to do, he might have answered my questions. The audience will remember that I asked those questions during the early part of my first speech and urged that he reply to them. They are simple questions. Any one of them can be answered in a single sentence. Possibly my opponent forgot them. He has a whole bunch of pencils; I don't know what he has them for; evidently not to write down my arguments, as he did not answer a single one of them. Maybe after writing them down, he decided the best policy would be to ignore them. Doctor, if you will not examine my arguments, you might use those pencils in writing down the questions I have asked you. I asked them deliberately and slowly so you could easily get them. I am going to keep bothering you with them until you do answer them, or until this audience sees that you *will not.* Please, Doctor, for the sake of this audience and for the sake of truth, give us your answers to these questions. Lest he may have failed to get them, I am going to give them to him again.

First: Is baptism a part of the gospel? Second: Does baptism belong to the righteousness of God or to the righteousness of man? Third: Does baptism belong to the law as given by Moses, or to the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ? Fourth: Do you believe that a person who knows that Jesus said "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," but refuses to be baptized will be saved?

Dr. Rice introduces John 3:18. "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Certainly, the believer is

Scanned by TLC

not condemned; but what kind of a believer is Jesus talking about? Read on to the 21st verse, which says: "But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." The believer who is not condemned is the believer "that doeth truth," not the believer who, like the cowardly rulers of the 12th chapter of John, refuses to obey the Lord.

My friend quotes John 3:36. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." The Revised version renders the latter clause of this verse: "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life." Saving faith and obedience to God are coextensive.

Instead of answering my arguments, my opponent spends his time reading passages which say the believer is saved. I believe all of these passages; in fact, I quoted in my first speech practically every Scripture my opponent has used. I anticipated my friend at this point. I knew he would use these Scriptures which say we are saved by faith. I wanted him to have time to answer my arguments on baptism; so I tried to save him the trouble of reading all of these passages on salvation by faith, by assuring him in advance that I am willing to take them just as they read. If my friend had paid any attention to my first speech, he could have known that there was no need of his reading all of these passages. The Doctor insists that we take the Bible at what it says. I take these passages on salvation by faith; I believe them just as they read. Will the Doctor take these passages at face value? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16). "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). "Baptism doth also now save us" (1 Peter 3:21). "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts 22:16).

Doctor, do you believe Ananias told the truth? I have

Scanned by TLC

a letter written by Dr. Rice to a man and his wife at Waxahachie, in which he intimates that Ananias may have been mistaken about it being necessary for Paul to be baptized in order to have his sins washed away. In explaining Acts 22:16 to these good people in Waxahachie, Dr. Rice wrote: "Even if Ananias had been mistaken about it, like men sometimes are, it would not change the plain teaching of God's word. If you want to see what the Lord told Ananias see Acts 9:10-19."

This is about the best reply to Acts 22:16 that a Baptist ever made! But it comes with poor grace from a man who so stoutly affirms his belief in the verbal inspiration of the Bible. Rice claims to believe that every word of the Bible was dictated by the Holy Spirit; but in this letter, which he did not know would ever be made public, he says the man whom God inspired to tell Saul how to be saved, may have been mistaken.

Mr. Rice, this audience would like to hear your explanation of this matter. If anyone doubts the authenticity of the letter, I shall be glad to show them the original. I have the letter, written by Dr. Rice, on his own stationery and signed with his own hand—I know his signature. We patiently await an explanation.

Why cannot my friend understand that faith is often a comprehensive term and includes an active acceptance of the will of God? The same is true of love. We are saved by love. But the love of God is perfected in obedience. "But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him" (1 John 2:5). To love God is to keep his commandments. "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous" (1 John 5:3). "And now I beseech thee, lady, not as though I wrote a new commandment unto thee, but that which we had from the beginning, that we love one another. And this is love, that we walk after his commandments" (2 John, verses 5 and 6). "He that saith, I know him, and

Scanned by TLC

keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth i not in him" (1 John 2:4). The love by which we ar saved is a comprehensive and active principle of life. I my opponent insists that a man is saved just as soon a he loves God, I ask which comes first, faith or love? I he says faith comes first we are saved the moment we be lieve, then it follows that we are saved before we love Goc If he says love comes first and we are saved at the momen we love, then it follows that we are saved before we hav faith. My opponent can understand that both faith an love are comprehensive terms and that the one can, an does in many instances, include the other. Why cannc he, likewise, understand that since baptism is a comman of the Lord, faith in him and love for him involve obedience to this command?

Paul tells us that Abraham was justified by faith, bu James explains that this faith involved obedience to Goc James 2:20-23: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, tha faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our fath er justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his so upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with hi works, and by works was faith made perfect? And th Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed Goc and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and h was called the Friend of God."

1 John 5:1 says, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is th Christ is born of God." But let us read some other stat ments in the same book. "He that loveth is born of Goc (1 John 4:7). "He that acknowledgeth the Son hath th Father also" (1 John 2:23). "Every spirit that confesset that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God" (1 Joh 4:3). "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son c God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God" (1 John 4:15 "He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, ar he in him." (1 John 3:24). "And hereby we do know tha we know him, if we keep his commandments. He tha saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments,

Scanned by TLC

a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 John 2:3, 4). Again: "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous" (1 John 3:7). All of these statements are found in one book. Shall we take only one of them, or shall we believe them all? Who is it that is saved or born of God? (1). The one who believes. (2). The one who loves. (3). The one who acknowledges or confesses Christ. (4). The one who keeps the commandments of God. (5). The one who does righteousness.

Doctor, the trouble with you is that you want to take John's statement about the believer being born of God, but are not willing to take all of these other statements made by the same apostle in the same book.

Of the people on the day of Pentecost, we read: "They that gladly received his word were baptized" (Acts 2:41). Philip preached the gospel at Samaria, and Luke says, "But *when they believed Philip* preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, *they were baptized,* both men and women" (Acts 8:12). The same is true today; those who gladly receive the Lord's word are baptized. When people believe the preaching of the gospel they are baptized.

From John 2:23-25, we read: "Now when Jesus was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." The word which is translated "commit" is the same word from which we get believe. This passage simply says there were man who believed in Jesus, but in whom Jesus did not believe. Why? Because, knowing their hearts, he knew that they would not obey him.

My opponent reads from Alexander Campbell. Campbell seems to be worrying him. I have not the time just now to examine his quotations from Campbell. I am de-

Scanned by TLC

bating a proposition which says, "The Scriptures Teach . . . . " During this debate, my opponent has circulated a tract written by my good friend, Vernon Wood. In this tract, Wood garbles his quotations from Campbell, even to the extent of stopping a quotation in the middle of a sentence, when to have quoted the rest of Campbell's sentence would have been to have refuted the position he quoted Campbell to sustain. I do not know whether my opponent has so treated Campbell in his quotations tonight; but I do know that Campbell taught baptism for the remission of sins and that any statement from him offered to teach the contrary does him an injustice.

My friend accuses me of being a Pharisee, because I do not call him "brother." His charge is false; I am not Pharisaical. I do not boast of my goodness. I am not expecting to go to heaven, because I am good enough to go there. I believe in "salvation by grace through faith" (Ephesians 2:8). The reason I do not call him "brother" is that I do not believe he has obeyed the gospel; and those who do not obey the gospel will bet lost (2 Thessalonians 1:7-9.) I believe that baptism for the remission of sins is a part of the gospel. My opponent refuses to accept it, hence I cannot believe that he has obeyed the gospel. He might clear this matter up some for us by answering my question, "Is baptism a part of the gospel?" I lay no claim to superior goodness and have no desire to compare or contrast my character with that of my opponent. I am trying to follow my Lord. His brethren are my brethren, and he tells us that his brethren are those "who hear the word of God, and do it" (Luke 8:21). I shall gladly recognize Dr. Rice as my brother when he is willing to hear the word of God and do it.

My friend introduces a Bible school quarterly published by the Gospel Advocate Company and insists that we are a denomination, because we have Bible school quarterlies. No church of Christ in the world is under any obligation to use any quarterly published by the Gospel Advocate, the

Scanned by TLC

Firm Foundation, or any other publishing house. These quarterlies are written and published by individual Christians. They are to be used by those who want them—and only those who want them—as helps in studying and in teaching the Bible. Dr. Rice has written a number of tracts. He has some of them here tonight. Did he write them to teach anything? Most of his tracts do not teach the truth, but I give him credit for thinking that they do. If Dr. Rice can write and publish a pamphlet to be used in studying the Bible, why cannot the Gospel Advocate publish a quarterly for the same purpose? The only difference I see between the pamphlets published by Rice and the ones published by the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation is that his perverts the teaching of the Bible, while theirs are true to the Book. No, we have no denominational literature for the purpose of building and maintaining a denomination. All of our labors—preaching from the pulpit, preaching over the radio, publishing gospel papers, books, tracts, and quarterlies—are for the purpose of helping men and women to understand, believe, and obey the teaching of God's holy word. But my friend's principal complaint about the Advocate quarterly is that it teaches that sinners have to be baptized in order to be saved and that Christians have to live the Christian life until death in order to go to heaven. Well, that sounds pretty much like Bible teaching. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). And to Christians Peter said: "And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; And to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather,

Scanned by TLC

brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" (2 Peter 1:5-11). Sounds very much like what the Gospel Advocate quarterly teaches, doesn't it?

Jesus makes the sinner's salvation dependent on his being baptized, and Peter predicates entrance into heaven upon the Christian's adding these Christian graces. The same apostle said: "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls" (1 Peter 1:9). Jesus promises: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" (Revelations 2:10).

We are asked to consider John 1:12: "But as many as received him, to them gave the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." This is not your passage, Doctor. Jesus says God gives the believer power *to become* a son of God, but you say the believer is already a son of God. If one is a son of God the moment he believes, he does not need power to become a son of God thereafter. Would it not be foolish for me to go over to Brother Showalter and say, "I will give you power to come into this building," when he is already in the building? Paul says the gospel is God's power to save the believer, (Romans 1:16). But according to my opponent, the believer is alredy saved—just another difference between my opponent and the writers of the Bible!
the remission of sins"? Why will you not tell the unsaved

I see no need for advance arguments; my opponent has not noticed the ones already given him. Allow me to call your attention to some of the work of the affirmative up to the present time. I have repeatedly asked the negative to tell us whether baptism is any part of the gospel. I have insisted that he tell us whether baptism belongs to the righteousness of God or to the righteousness of man, or whether it is righteousness at all. I have insisted that he

Scanned by TLC

tell us whether baptism belongs to the law or to grace and truth. I have asked him whether the man who refuses to be baptized, in the face of Jesus' plain command, will be saved. I have shown that to be baptized is to submit to the righteousness of God, and that every person who is scripturally baptized is baptized by the Lord through his agent.

We are saved by the blood of Christ. (Ephesians 1:7.) Christ shed his blood on his death. (John 19:34.) We are baptized into Christ's death. (Romans 6:3.) Therefore, it is through baptism that we have access to the blood of Christ, which atones for sin.

I have insisted that if the believer who is saved is a disobedient believer, my friend should explain such passages as these: Romans 1:5; "By whom we have received grace and apostleship, for *obedience to the faith* among all nations, for his name." Acts 6:7: "And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests *were obedient to the faith.*" Hebrews 5:9: "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation *unto all them that obey him.*" Again, faith comes by hearing the word of God (Romans 10:17). Faith must, therefore, comprehend what the word of God teaches. The word of God teaches baptism for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38). Therefore, the faith that saves, comprehends baptism for the remission of sins. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but *faith which worketh by love*" (Galatians 5:6).

I have shown from Numbers 20:12 that when Moses disobeyed God, God called it unbelief. This whole question of salvation by faith can be settled if my opponent will answer this question: *Do you believe that the faith which saves is a living faith, or a dead faith?* I have shown that the commission under which the disciples labored in carrying the gospel to the world contains faith, repentance, and

Scanned by TLC

baptism as prerequisites of salvation (Matthew 28:18, 19; Mark 16:15, 16; Luke 24:46, 47); and that the disciples so understood the matter, as is evidenced by their teaching and practice recorded in Acts of the Apostles.

I want to direct your attention again to the first time the apostles applied the teaching of the Great Commission. It was in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Peter preached the gospel; sinners were pricked to their hearts and asked what to do. In his answer, Peter told them to, "repent and be baptized—for the remission of sins." We have in this sentence a compound predicate, the verbs of which are connected by the coördinate conjunction, "and". This predicate—both verbs—is modified by the prepositional phrase, "for the remission of sins." Any student of the English language knows that repentance and baptism are "for" the same purpose. The object of the phrase—"remission"—has the same relation to "repent" that it has to "be baptized." Acts 2:38 expresses the purpose of repentance and baptism. Peter says that purpose is, "the remission of sins." The remission of sins is the only thing in the book of God that baptism is said to be "for." If it is not for the remission of sins, what is it for?

Now to a few advance arguments. I want to talk to you about John the Baptist, since my friend claims to get his name from him. Incidentally, his divinely-given name was "John." (Luke 1:60-63.) He was called, "the Baptist," because he baptized; just as we call a man a preacher, because he preaches. It is also worthy of note that in the Bible, John is "the" Baptist. No other person in the Bible was ever called a Baptist.

But I want to talk to you about John's baptism. It was for the remission of sins. (Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3.) It was preceded by a confession of sins. "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judaea, and all the region round about Jordan, And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins" (Matthew 3:5, 6.) To accept John's baptism

Scanned by TLC

was to justify God. "And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John" (Luke 7:29). To refuse John's baptism was to reject the counsel of God. "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him" (Luke 7:30).

There were three classes who came to John for baptism. (1). Those who knew and were willing to confess that they were sinners. These, John baptized without question, since his baptism was for the remission of sins. (Mark 1:5; Matthew 3:6.) (2). Some came for baptism who claimed they were children of Abraham, that is, were already saved. These, John refused to baptize. "But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: 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" (Matthew 3:7-9). John, knowing that his baptism was for the remission of sins, would not baptize those who thought they were already saved. To have baptized them would have been to have denied the divine purpose of baptism—the very thing my opponent is doing in this discussion! (3). The third class coming to John for baptism consisted of but one person; that is Jesus. "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbid him, saying, I have neeed to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him" (Matthew 3:13-15). Because John's baptism was for the remission of sins and because he knew that Jesus had no sins, he refused to baptize Jesus. "I have need to be baptized of thee," insisted John. But Jesus said, "Suffer it to be so now." The term "suffer" suggests per-

Scanned by TLC

mitting that which, under the rules, would not be allowed. The idea is that of making an exception to general practice. In our every-day language, Jesus said to John: "I understand that your baptism is for the remission of sins, and that, I , having no sin, do not need it, but we must make this one exception, since it is becoming that I do that which I shall command others to do." Then John "suffered him"; that is, made the one exception. This is the only instance in all the Bible of anyone's being baptized for any purpose other than the remission of sins; and it was done, according to our Lord, himself; as an exception to the divine rule. I challenge my opponent to find another person in all the New Testament who received baptism which was not for the remission of sins.

Let us state the matter again. John baptized those who realized they were sinners and wanted to be saved. He refused to baptize those who thought they were already saved. He refused to baptize Jesus until Jesus had explained to him that, in this case, it would be permissible to baptize for some purpose other than the remission of sins. Although my friend names his church after John, his practice is not in harmony with that of John.

In Acts 11:21, we read: "A great number believed, and turned to the Lord." Note, that it was after they believed that they turned to the Lord. Baptists say that one is saved at the point of faith. But these people turned to the Lord after believing. The "turning" cannot be repentance, according to Baptist doctrine; since Baptists say repentance precedes faith. Paul said he preached that men "should repent and turn to God" (Acts 26:20). Then turning to God follows repentance. If baptism is not the act which follows faith and repentance, and is called "turning to God," let my opponent tell us what that act is. In Acts 3:19, we read: "Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out." Acts 2:38: "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." Are not these parallel

Scanned by TLC

passages? Is not "repent and turn" equivalent to "repent and be baptized"? The result is the same—sins blotted out, or remitted.

The Bible says baptism is for the remission of sins; that it saves us; that we are baptized into Christ; that in baptism we put on Christ. Now, Doctor, don't tell us that these are figurative statements. You have said too much about taking the Bible literally. Remember the Bible, "says what it means and means what it says!" Are you willing to stand by your own rule? And don't forget that in the six passages where baptism and salvation are mentioned together, baptism comes first and salvation afterward. Do these passages mean what they say and say what they mean? I believe the Bible; do you? My opponent says it took him a long time to get me to accept what the Bible says about the thousand years. Oh, no, Doctor, as soon as you read the only passage in the Bible which mentions it, I told you that I was ready to accept it just as it reads. Will you do the same with these plain Bible statements about baptism? If so, we can close the discussion of this question now. The Bible commands: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." No man has the right to present as the truth of God, anything save that which God has said—"Thy word is truth." Dr. Rice, one day you and I shall stand before the Judge of all the earth, and account to him for the way we have handled his holy word tonight, and for the way we have dealt with this great audience of imperishable souls. Are you satisfied with your refusal to recognize and accept many of the plain statements of His word? Can you explain to your God why you have denied that one of the holy commands given by the Holy Spirit to inquiring sinners, is necessary? That the Holy Spirit told anxious, unsaved people of Jerusalem to "repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ *for the* remission of sins?" Why will you not tell the unsaved people of this audience to do the same thing? "He that be-

Scanned by TLC

lieveth and is baptized shall be saved . . ." is the language of Him before whom Dr. Rice and I must stand in judgment Dare we fail to preach it to this audience? Can we safely change our Lord's language to mean, "He that believeth is saved, and may then be baptized?" That is exactly the thing my Friend Rice is doing. Does he think God will hold him guiltless, who thus perverts the Great Commission of the world's Savior?

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Fifth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 22, 1935.

THIRD PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach That Baptism to the Penitent Believer Is Essential to His Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

(Second Negative Address by John R. Rice)

Brother Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and Christian Friends:

I am glad to come again to discuss this important question. I told Brother Oliphant (I talked to him before about it) that I wished we had forty-five minutes each for the speeches on this question, or that we could use the entire week on the discussion of this question, and take some time next week on the question of apostasy. It will probably not be possible on account of the publication of the book and some other matters, but I wish it were.

The fact of the business is, I am sure in mind and heart, that many of you will come more and more to see, as the debate goes on, that the Bible clearly tells the state of the penitent believer, that he is born of God, that he has everlasting life, that he cannot come into condemnation, and that he is passed from death unto life and is justified from all things. The Bible is very clear on the state of the believer.

Brother Oliphant did not like the way I replied. He said to himself, "Well, if I can't get that guy off his trail, he'll get to some Scripture that will be hard to answer."

Scanned by TLC

I don't blame you, Brother Oliphant, this thing is going to come right down to brass tacks on what the Bible says about this penitent believer that Brother Oliphant is talking about. The Bible tells exactly his state. Brother Oliphant, it means what it says. Take the Bible at face value. He asks, "Will he take these Scriptures at face value?" Watch me, Brother Oliphant, and you will see that I do. Brother Oliphant said that he was "satisfied with the millennium question." I thought he would be. He does not want to hear about it any more! He is going to be the same way about this, I am sure. He changed his position about the millennium. I hope he will on this.

He said Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3 connected baptism and salvation. Notice what the Lord says:

"And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (Luke 3:3).

I want you to see the way they ought to be handled, and the way Brother Oliphant handles the Scriptures to settle this question, so watch very carefully. If you have your Bibles, look on. Note two different methods of handling the Word of God. It will help you if you will notice the two different ways of handling the Bible. Notice the way Brother Oliphant read this verse (Luke 3:3), "And he came preaching baptism for the remission of sins." Is that what it says in your Bible? You had better look again and see. It says, *"Preaching the baptism of repentance."*

What do you do with the penitent believer? What do you do with folks that repent? What do you preach to them? I preach baptism to folks who have repented, that is what I preach, Brother, and that is what John preached. Repentance for what? Repentance for the remission of sins, not baptism for the remission of sins. Yes, that is what the Bible says.

Brother Oliphant says that John the Baptist preached baptism for the remission of sins, but he misquoted the plain Scripture when he said it. Now that is not in that

Scanned by TLC

verse. You can look on and see. Fine, look on for yourself. Now read it and see.

"And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

Repentance is the way to have the remission of sins. Matthew 3:7-9 says:

"But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

"Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance:

"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."

My friend wants to put the emphasis on baptism, but John the Baptist puts it on repentance. Well, John the Baptist did not baptize the Pharisees just because they were the children of Abraham. They already claimed to be all right without a change of heart. But you look back and see why John the Baptist did not baptize them. No, they were not claiming to have trusted in Christ; they were not penitent believers, and that is exactly the reason he didn't baptize them. John says, "You have no evidence of repentance," and he said,

"O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

"Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance" (Matt. 3:7, 8).

You look and see if that is not what he said.

If you note carefully the way the Scriptures are used, it will help to clear the matter. Now my friends, wisecracks will help to entertain people, but if you look on the Bible you will go right. Brother Oliphant said the same thing about Mark 1:4. It is "baptism of repentance," not "baptism for the remission of sins." What is repentance for? Repentance is "for the remission of sins" in the exact words of the Scripture. Why do you say, "Well,

Scanned by TLC

there is repentance in that verse, but let us jump over it, leave it out, and get 'baptism for the remission of sins'," when the Bible says it is *"the baptism of repentance"* and that the repentance is for the remission of sins?

All right, let's go a little further. Brother Oliphant says there is no power in water to wash away sins. Brother Oliphant, you are right, and you are so seldom right, I want you to get credit for this. Remember now, there is no power in water to wash away sins. You are dead right. Now, Brother Oliphant, was there any power in the water when Ananias said in Acts 22:16: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins"? Did he literally mean that water will wash away sins, or not? I am going to ask Brother Oliphant that. We agree to take it literally. We will find that the Scriptures expressly tell when Paul was saved. It was not at the time he was baptized, but it was on the road to Damascus, and I will show you. That is a fair question. I will see if Brother Oliphant thinks that water will wash away sins.

My Brother Oliphant is sorry I did not take the same attitude toward the duty of the negative that he does. I think he makes the finest negative I ever saw. Remember he said the negative was not supposed to prove anything.

"You show me some evidence of repentance and I will baptize you," John the Baptist said to the Pharisees. They were not claiming to have been born again. They had not trusted in Christ. They had not repented. No, they hadn't. Then they were not penitent believers. The exact opposite was true. Brother Oliphant, the reason I would refuse, is for the same reason he did. Baptizing people—that isn't any kind of way to make a Christian. This crowd, they thought they already had eternal life. But John the Baptist turned them down because they had no fruits of repentance. They were not repentant. And John the Baptist said, "I want to baptize folks who have repented." You have to have evidence of repentance before you can have

Scanned by TLC

Scriptural baptism. If you will check your Bible yourself, it will help you.

Brother Oliphant, did water wash away Paul's sins? Did Paul wash away his sins in that water? Notice it did not say that God would wash them away. Did Paul wash away his sins in that water? We will see if Brother Oliphant will take it as he said it. The fact of the business is, the Bible can be taken at face value. On Paul's conversion, there is no room to misunderstand about it. The Scriptures tell us so definitely that there is no doubt when it happened. Turn to the 9th chapter of Acts, and we will read about Paul's conversion. Don't say, "I believe those Scriptures, but let's not talk about them." Let us go on there and find out what did happen when Paul was converted. Several things are clear about Paul's conversion in the 9th chapter of Acts, verses 4-6.

"And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?

"And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

"And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do."

He called this one Lord before he knew who he was. "Let me know what you want me to do, and I will do it," Saul said. Read further on about this matter. Saul arose and his eyes were opened, but he saw no man, but they led him into Damascus, and he was there three days without sight. Notice very carefully the Scriptures will tell us about this matter. The Scripture does not say he mourned. Brother Oliphant says he spent those days in anxious prayer. Where does it say that? He prayed, but it does not say he was anxious about salvation. He prayed like they prayed before Pentecost. He was anxious about

Scanned by TLC

getting Holy Spirit power. I will show you where he got the power, and that before he was baptized.

Read verse 17:

"And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost."

Ananias called that man what Brother Oliphant will not call me. Brother Oliphant, I have been baptized and you ought to call me "brother." I have been baptized, and I was a penitent believer when I was baptized, and I was baptized by immersion too, and yet you won't call me "brother." Here is a man who had not been baptized, but is a penitent believer, and Ananias called him "brother," and he was his "brother," too! Why? Because he met Jesus face to face and said, "Lord, what do you want me to do?" And that was when he was born again. Ananias called him "brother." We find a little later in the same chapter what happened when Ananias came to Saul, who was later called Paul. The Scriptures tell us why he came. Ananias did not come here that Saul might have his sins forgiven, but for another purpose, specifically mentioned. Verse 17 says: "And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, *that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost."*

We should take that literally to mean physical sight. Saul was physically blind, blinded by the light when he met Jesus on the Damascus road. What did Ananias come to him for? Not that he should be saved. No. Ananias said in effect, "You are saved, but the Lord wants you to preach. I am come that you may receive sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. And his eyesight, and filling of the Spirit came before he was baptized. He didn't come down

Scanned by TLC

to get this man saved. Saul was already a brother in Christ. He was already his brother, the Scriptures say so. Read on here if you will. Verse 26:

"And when Saul was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples: but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple."

When Saul came to Jerusalem they wouldn't listen to him. But Barnabas stood up for him, told the apostles that Saul had been converted, and that they ought to take him in. In proving to them that Saul was a Christian, Barnabas did not even mention that Saul had been baptized, but told how he had been saved on the road down to Damascus. The Damascus road experience was proof enough to Barnabas that Paul was saved, and also proof enough to the apostles. Read it in verse 27:

"But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus."

He met Jesus Christ. That proves he was saved. He did not say that Paul had been baptized. Paul had, but that was not when he was saved. Barnabas did not say Paul was saved because he was baptized. If he had meant that, he would have said it, but he did not mean it. Brother Hines, he did not say it. He met Jesus in the way and saw him. When did Paul see Jesus? On the road to Damascus. Now Brother, was he really saved then? Yes, and he was not only saved but born again, and he expressly says so under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

In 1 Corinthians 15:8 Paul says:

"And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."

Paul said, "Christ arose from the dead and here is proof of it." Verse 7 says he was seen of James. Verse 8 says, "He was seen of me also as one born out of due time." "I saw Jesus and when I saw him, I was like one born out of due time!" Paul said. Now why? Now why was

Scanned by TLC

that? What birth was that? Was that the first birth? Did his mother bear Paul according to the flesh a second time? No. No. Well, what kind of a birth was it? The second birth. How many births does a man have? The Bible does not talk about a third birth. I am like Brother Oliphant. I am going to ask you a question. How many births does that mean and what birth was it? He likes to ask questions more than to use the Bible. He had a whole lot rather I would answer the questions than for me to use the Bible. Was that a birth of the flesh, or was Paul born of the Spirit on the road to Damascus? He says, "Born out of due time." He was as one born out of due time—ahead of time. One day all Jews then living will be saved. Paul says, "I am a Jew born again ahead of time," the time when "So then all Israel shall be saved." He had a change of heart there. Where? Not when Ananias put his hands on him. Not when he was baptized. No, not when Ananias baptized him, but three days before, on the road to Damascus when he saw Jesus and called him Lord.

Notice one thing. You say, "When Ananias came, Paul was baptized and received his sight." No. He received his sight BEFORE he arose and was baptized. No, sir; no, sir; Paul got both physical and spiritual sight before baptism. And he was saved back there three days before that.

What did Ananias mean when he said, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins"? Let's see what Alexander Campbell said. Brother Oliphant said he did not like Alexander Campbell. I don't blame you, Brother Oliphant. If I had gotten that far from Alexander Campbell, I would say it, too. And he didn't know about this. Brother Oliphant said, "I don't know whether it is misstated or not." I am going to advise you to find out now. That is fair. He "didn't know whether I garbled that or not." Let's see about that. You can find out mighty soon. Let us look on Page 516; here is the quotation. I am reading from the Campbell-Rice Debate, a statement from Alexander Camp-

Scanned by TLC

bell from the McCalla Debate on page 135, quoted in the Campbell-Rice Debate, page 516. On the third page, after the quotation is acknowledged by Alexander Campbell, Campbell says,

"The water of baptism, then formally washes away our sins. The blood of Christ really washes away our sins. Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed; yet he had no solemn pledge of the fact, no formal acquittal, no formal purgation of his sins, until he washed them away in the water of baptism."

This is on page 516, Campbell-Rice Debate, and on the third page following, it is acknowledged by Alexander Campbell. I have this Campbell-Rice Debate before me. "The water of baptism then formally washes away our sins." Why, you would think that was I doing the preaching: "The blood of Christ really washes away our sins. Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed." That man has been reading his Bible, hasn't he? This is what Alexander Campbell really believed. Brother Oliphant says he does not know whether that was garbled or not. You can check up on it. You ask your friend, Brother Campbell, when Paul was saved. Paul tells you and Alexander Campbell will tell you, too. Alexander Campbell is wrong in many cases, but when he agrees with Paul, I take him on that.

Paul was born again on the road to Damascus. Let me give Campbell's words again: "Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed." Paul says, "On the way I saw Jesus and was born again!" His eyes were opened, and he saw Jesus and was born again. I ask this question again: What birth was that, was he born of the flesh or born of the Spirit then? That is a fair question, isn't it? Was he born again? What kind of a birth was that? Those are the only two kinds mentioned in the Bible, the birth of the flesh and the birth of the Spirit. That is what the Bible teaches on it. Which was his, Brother Oliphant? He wants some questions. That is a fair one, isn't it?

Scanned by TLC

What kind of a birth was it? That attends to Brother Paul, doesn't it? There are plenty more, but we will consider other Scriptures.

This Bible does not contradict itself. It does not say one thing and mean another. It means what it says and says what it means. What does the Bible say happened when Ananias came to Saul? It says,

"And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost" (Acts 9:17).

You can find that the Scriptures expressly teach what they mean, and you can take it at face value. We don't have to argue about it.

Well, here is some more about it. Brother Oliphant asked, "Did Paul have peace when he saw Jesus?" Yes, he had peace when he saw Jesus and when his sins were forgiven, when he was really pardoned, when he was born again. Then three days afterward Paul got what the other apostles had gotten at Pentecost. Paul was filled with the Holy Spirit at the time of his baptism. But that was not his conversion.

Here is some more. Romans 6:3:

"Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?"

That is fine: "Baptism *into* Jesus Christ and baptism *into* death." Let us understand the word *eis* here translated *into*. E-i-s is the English spelling. There will be more about it in this debate. The Greek word is *eis*—baptized into Christ.

Turn to 1 Corinthians 10:2:

"And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

Now Brother Oliphant, I will tell you this. I am sure you already know it and will not deny it. *Unto* here is the same Greek word *eis*. That is the Greek word for unto,

Scanned by TLC

and is the same as *into* in Romans 6:3. In the New Testament *eis* is sometimes *into, unto, toward, against, among* and several other ways. "Baptized eis Jesus," "Baptized eis Moses."

"Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?"

You go and read it and see. "Baptized into Christ" and "baptized into Moses."

If a man is literally baptized into Christ, then the Hebrew children were literally baptized into Moses. The Greek word says baptized into Moses, baptized *eis* Moses, just like baptized *eis* Jesus. Now what does that mean? (The words are the same exactly in the Greek Testament.) Literally *eis* is a word of reference, referring to, pointing to. It will do you a great deal of good to look up the meaning of the Greek word. About the Greek word *eis* there is a great deal of interest. *Eis* is translated *against* twenty-five times; *among* sixteen times; *at* twenty times; *in* ninety-one times; *into* and *on, toward, unto,* etc., hundreds of times. About sixteen hundred times *eis* is used in the Bible. Now the fact of the business is, does it mean "into Christ" or "unto Christ"? If it did in one case, why didn't it mean the same in the case of Moses? If it is literally baptized into Christ they were literally baptized into Moses. "Baptized *eis* Christ." "Baptized *eis* Moses."

It might have been translated *into, at, unto, against, among,* or baptized *in reference to* Christ. *Eis* is not one time translated *in order to* the remission of sins. It was not translated in that way. Why not? There is a good reason for that, too, and I will get to it further on in this debate. Actually of course, what was it? "Baptized into Christ." How? "Baptized toward Christ." That Greek word "eis" is interesting. We are baptized with reference to Christ just like the Jews were baptized with reference to Moses. If one gets into Christ in baptism, the Jews got into Moses in the Red Sea! Exactly the same word is used!

Scanned by TLC

Notice *eis* in Luke 11:5-7.

"And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say unto him, Friend, lend me three loaves;

"For a friend of mine in his journey is come to me, and I have nothing to set before him?

"And he from within shall answer and say, Trouble me not; the door is now shut, and my children are with me IN bed; I cannot rise and give thee."

The last English word *in* is the Greek word *eis*. What about it? He did not say, "My children are climbing into bed with me." No. "They are already with me in bed." It is the Greek word *eis*. It often refers to a state already attained! So one is baptized *eis* Christ, being already in Christ.

If it was into Christ—sure it was, how? The same passage says, "in the likeness of his death," and the fifth verse of the 6th chapter of Romans says:

"For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection:"

Brother Oliphant brought up the other day, "Why do you use symbolism or likeness?" Because the same passage in the Bible says "likeness"—that is taking it at face value, Brother Dickey. You don't have to explain nor look it up in another passage. God says baptism is a likeness. That is what it means about being baptized into Christ, or with reference to Christ. It points to Christ. It was pointing to Moses, and referring to Moses in leadership, in the sense of following him. All right, the same way we are baptized pointing to Christ, referring to his leadership.

Now, Brother Oliphant, I am going to ask this. Were the people physically baptized into Moses at the Red Sea? Was it physically into Moses? That is a good question, and I would answer that if I were you. You do not have much Scripture, so I would spend my time answering questions.

Scanned by TLC

"Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" (Rom. 6:3.)

Both are in the same passage, and the same usage. They are both talking about the same matter and the same teaching is involved in both of them. Those who were "baptized into Christ," were "baptized into his death." Brother Oliphant is in a peculiar position. If that means baptized into the death of Christ, if that points back to the past, to something that has already passed, the death of Christ that is already over, then Brother Oliphant, how are you going to make it point to the future? It is *toward, referring to, NOT in order to,* but *toward* the remission of sins. It points back in both cases. The penitent believer has repented of his sins, and already has everlasting life. "My children are with me in bed." *Eis,* translated *in,* points back in that case, to a fact already consummated. "Baptized into Christ," and baptized into the death of Christ, now Brother Oliphant, which was it? Was it backward or forward in this case? The fact of the business is, *eis* is a Greek word meaning, *referring to* or *in view of* and *in reference to* again and again. *Among, in, for* and many other ways it is translated, as I have told you.

Let us come and read further in the Bible. Here are some things that are mighty interesting about this matter. I want to show you. For instance, compare "for" or "unto" in Acts 2:38 with Matthew 13:22, which says:

"He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful."

"Among the thorns"; the same word is translated *among* and it is *eis,* twenty times so translated It is translated *with a view to, at, in,* and *into,* many times.

Matthew 12:18:

"Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, IN WHOM my soul is well pleased; I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles."

Scanned by TLC

Does that mean in (eis) whom my soul *will be* well pleased?

Now let's see. Does God say, "My Son in whom my soul IS already well pleased," or "In whom I am going to be well pleased"? Does it mean God was getting well pleased with Jesus? Does it mean, "I am going to be well pleased but am not well pleased with him now"? Certainly, Brother Oliphant would not say that. The word *eis* here is referring to an accomplished fact. So it does also in Acts 2:38 and many other places.

Brother Oliphant said that John the Baptist said, "Yes, I'll make an exception."

Jesus said in Matthew 3:15:

"And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him."

Where does the Bible say it is an exception? You say it did not take away his sins. You said it two or three times. Where does it say there is an exception? Why should it be an exception? Give one Scripture that says it is an exception! You say it did not take away his sins. No, and baptism never took away sins. No! Where is the exception? It was not an exception. Why should he do it? Yes, it is an act of righteousness, and Jesus said it becomes "us," him and us, to be baptized.

(Five minutes, Brother Rice.)

Thank you.

Put it down. The Savior is not an exception in the picture shown by his baptism. He himself is, but his baptism was not. It showed the same truth as mine. It pictures the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. It pictured the same thing when he was baptized. Why was he baptized? For an example, because we should do the same thing. He did it because it was the same thing he wanted us to do. And I ask Brother Oliphant who else that US in Matthew 3:15 includes besides Jesus. It includes someone else; it put the rest of us in the same class. No,

Scanned by TLC

baptism did not change Jesus, and it did not change me. Do you know why? I already had the change. I didn't need any change, and you didn't need any change if you had truly believed before you were baptized. The Bible said that I nad everlasting life when I believed in Christ and was already born again, and that I was not condemned. If I had believed and therefore was not condemned, what did baptism do? It pictured a likeness. Brother Oliphant, this is a very interesting matter here, isn't it? He will come back to this a little bit later. Let us see if he is interested still when he comes back.

Here he turns to 1 Peter, a very interesting place. I want you to take it, Brother Oliphant. I want to say again, I wish everybody would notice particularly the difference in OUR use of the Scriptures, his way and my way. He referred to the case in 1 Peter 3:20, 21, and I am glad he did. In this matter about Peter he said, "Baptism doth also now save us." He left out a word or two that was particularly important, for the Lord really said, *"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us."* Why did he begin in the middle of the sentence and leave out the words, *the like figure*? Was Noah saved by the flood? Not literally. He was saved by the Lord through faith. Now baptism is a *like figure,* the Scripture says. In figurative language, baptism saves us. Baptism does not work salvation. It pictures it as a figure of salvation. There it is; it is a figure of salvation. Why did he leave that out?

"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ"* (1 Peter 3:21).

Notice the words *filth of the flesh.* I would look up these words *filth of the flesh.* Does it mean the washing off the dirt on the body? No. It means the filth of the fleshly nature. No, I didn't put it in there. The Scripture plainly says the filthy nature is not changed in baptism and bap-

Scanned by TLC

tism does not do that. It is a figure of salvation. I did not write the word *figure* in there. I am taking it at face value when it says that though. God put it in there, I would just take it, Brother. Read on further.

. . . ."*(not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*"

What kind of a conscience? A good conscience. The Bible tells what we are to have our conscience purged from. A man who is to be baptized should have a conscience that is good. He should have a conscience that is good, one that does not condemn him. He should have peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ, and he is to be baptized as a figure of salvation, like back yonder in the ark. This is a figure—the Scripture says, he has already had salvation. It is the answer of a good conscience purged from dead works. He should be sure he was born again. The Scriptures are plain about that. The man baptized says, "I am showing folks that I have been born again."

Brother Oliphant does not like what Alexander Campbell said on some things. Well, it is between him and Campbell about that. I never did start out to follow Campbell and you folks did. All right, that does not especially mean anything to me.

I want to show you how these brothers twist and leave out parts of the Scriptures. The Scriptures tell the truth. We should get down to brass tacks. Of course, if you leave *the like figure* out, and leave out some other part, it doesn't always teach the truth.

John 1:12 teaches the truth. Here is what it teaches: "*But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.*"

But Brother Oliphant, this is important. It is not the end of the sentence. The rest of the sentence says (verse 13):

Scanned by TLC

"Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

(The time is up.)

Thank you.

Speech of Moderator, Brother J. B. Nelson:

Remember the discussion will be resumed tomorrow evening at 7:30. Quite a number were here before 7 o'clock. You come early and the time will be spent by those who have papers to sell, and we will spend some of the time in singing.

The same subject will be discussed tomorrow evening. Brother Oliphant will lead and John R. Rice will follow. W. L. Oliphant will speak thirty minutes, and then John R. Rice will speak thirty minutes. Dr. Oliphant will speak another thirty minutes, and Dr. Rice will close with a thirty minute address.

We want to sing tonight one stanza of some good old song after which Brother Showalter will dismiss us.

Tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock at Oak Cliff Church of Christ, Tenth and Van Buren, all visitors are invited to come and spend about two hours. We want every preacher to come and we will not discuss the debate. Lunch will be served at 12 o'clock. You come and be present at that service. We have other things that will be discussed. Come and be with us; come and visit with us. Come and be there at 10 o'clock, and we will serve lunch for visitors. Come and be with us.

Out-of-town visitors who haven't homes, should see Sister Oliphant. She has a list of homes and she is here at the front. Most anyone can point her out.

Brother Oliphant: "She is the best looking woman here."

Brother Nelson: "Except my wife."

Brother Rice: "My papers will be at the door; you may have them free if you have not already gotten them."

Song: "Sweet By and By."

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Sixth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 23, 1935.

THIRD PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to his Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

Introduction by the moderator for the affirmative, J. B. Nelson:

We are beginning a little late, and we will sing but one song. Brother T. F. Stovall, song leader for the Oak Cliff Church of Christ, will lead us.

(Song led by T. F. Stovall.) Brother Nelson continues:

We want to engage in prayer, and I am going to ask Dr. J. M. Jones, one of the elders of the Pearl and Bryan Church of Christ to step forward and lead us in prayer while we stand.

(Prayer by Dr. Jones.) Brother Nelson continues:

We will get started on the speeches in about half a minute. Tonight will close the discussion of this proposition. We have a new proposition for tomorrow night which I will announce at the close of the debate tonight. The proposition for tonight is:

"The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to his Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."

W. L. Oliphant affirms, and John R. Rice denies. For the benefit of those who were not here last night I offer this explanation. W. L. Oliphant affirmed on this proposition

Scanned by TLC

last evening and John R. Rice followed him. Tonight W. L. Oliphant leads again using whatever arguments he may choose. He will be followed by Dr. Rice. Brother Oliphant will now speak for thirty minutes.

(Third Affirmative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad to continue the affirmation of the proposition that has been read to you and which I affirmed on last evening. There is really no need of my offering any further argument, because the arguments I made last evening stand untouched, just as do my questions. You who were here last night, remember that in my first speech I asked my friendly opponent four questions. Before the evening was over I came to the point of begging him to answer those questions. He has ignored them completely. I am going to repeat them tonight. I am sure this audience would like to know his answers. I shall now read the questions which I asked Dr. Rice last evening.

(1) Is baptism a part of the gospel?

(2) Does baptism belong to the righteousness of man?

(3) Does baptism belong to the law as given by Moses or to the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ?

(4) Do you believe that a person who knows that Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," but refuses to be baptized will be saved?

Please remember that these questions were asked in my first speech on this proposition. He has been before you twice since then, but has failed even to mention them. I am now going to hand him a copy of the questions, and if he does not want to take time during his speeches to answer them, he may simply write his answers following the questions and hand them to me. [Hands questions to Rice.] Although my friend so much dislikes questions, I am going to give him a little advance work in this field. Here are some more questions.

Scanned by TLC

(1) *Do you know of a recognized translation of the New Testament which translates the Greek preposition "eis" used in Acts* 2:38, *"because of"?*

(2) *Do you know of a Standard Greek-English Lexicon which defines "eis" to mean "because of"?*

(3) *Is the blood of Christ literally applied to a human soul?*

(4) *Is the same Greek preposition "eis" used in both Matthew* 26:28 *and Acts* 2:38*?*

(5) *If so, what is the difference in its meaning in the two passages?*

(6) *Do you believe that "water" in John* 3:5 *means water?*

I shall hand my friend a copy of these questions, and I shall be very happy for him to answer them. [Hands questions to Rice.] I am using every means at my command to get him to answer these questions. There are many people here who would like to know what he has to say to these matters. If he refuses to answer, it will be obvious to all unbiased listeners that he knows that to answer them is to defeat his position on this question. If he ignores them until his last speech and then tries to answer them when I will have no reply, it is evident that he knows that his answers will not stand investigation. My friends, the truth has nothing to suffer at the hands of investigation. The man who teaches the truth does not mind answering questions. The questions I have asked are directly in point on the proposition under discussion, and I can see no reason why a fair disputant would refuse to give them his attention.

Now, he asked me three questions in his second speech last night. I jotted them down and I am going to be nicer to him than he is to me, and answer his questions.

The first was: Did water literally wash away Paul's sins? No. The passage I introduced does not say that water washed his sins away, but it does say that his sins were washed away when he was baptized. Notice the plain

Scanned by TLC

statement of Ananias. "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts 22:16). There was nothing in the water in which Saul was baptized to wash his sins away, but his being baptized was a condition essential to his sins being washed away—unless Ananias was mistaken, as my friend intimated in his letter from which I quoted last evening!

His second question was: Did Paul experience a birth of the flesh or a birth of the spirit on the road to Damascus? Answer: Neither one. My friend says Saul was saved on the road to Damascus, because he called Jesus "Lord." Let us examine the Bible record again. "And he fell to the earth and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." You will notice that he called Jesus "Lord" before he even knew who Jesus was. Was he saved then? If, when he later used the term "Lord" in addressing Jesus, it proves that he was saved, does it not also prove that he was saved when he first used the term? "That which proves too much proves nothing."

Dr. Rice says Jesus appeared to Saul on the road to Damascus to save him. There is a slight difference at this point between my friend and the Lord! In Acts 26:16, Paul quotes the Lord as saying, "But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for *I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness* both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee." Dr. Rice says the Lord appeared to Saul to save him. Jesus said he appeared to him to make him a minister and a witness. Such is the difference between my friend and the Lord. As much as I like my friend, Rice—when he contradicts the Lord, I shall have to believe what the Lord says! Dr. Rice quotes Paul as saying "he was born out of due time." No, Paul did not

Scanned by TLC

say that. The reference referred to is 1 Corinthians 15:8. Let us read it. "And last of all he was seen of me also, *as* of one born out of due time." It is contended that this refers to Paul's spiritual birth, to his becoming a Christian. Well, *my opponent says that the "due time" birth is by* faith alone. If Paul was born "out of due time," he must have been born some other way; and the Doctor loses Paul as an example of a spiritual birth before baptism. But his position on the passage is absurd. Paul had lived at the time of Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection, but he did not see Jesus between the time of his resurrection and ascension. The other apostles had seen the risen Christ, and hence were qualified to be "ministers and witnesses." Since Paul had failed to see Christ after his resurrection, Christ "last of all" appeared to him "*as* to one born out of due season" in order to make him "a minister and a witness" of the facts of the gospel. First Corinthians 15:8 says nothing whatever about when and how Paul was saved. The man who uses it in an effort to sustain a theory on the plan of salvation must be hard pressed for proof of his theory.

His third question: Were the Israelites baptized "into" (or "unto") Moses? Yes. "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea"(1 Corinthians 10:2). The Israelites were in the land of the Egyptians. They were fleeing; the Egyptians were pursuing them. In front of them was the Red sea; on either side was a mountain. They could not turn back; they could not turn to the right or the left; they could not go forward, but God prepared a way for them to cross the sea. Paul says they were "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." And Moses says: "Thus *the Lord saved Israel that day* out of the hands of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore" (Exodus 14:30). The Bible says the Israelites were saved when they were baptized. Will Dr. Rice agree? Or will he differ from Moses, as he did from the Lord? The baptism of Israel in the sea marked the

Scanned by TLC

dividing line between Israel's past in the bondage of Egypt and their future in the freedom of the Lord. So, the sinner's baptism is the dividing line between his past in the bondage of sin and his future in the freedom of Christ. "We are baptized into Christ" (Galatians 3:27). The type and the antitype fit perfectly.

When Jesus, before being baptized by John, said "For thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," my friend wants to know who the "us" meant. Why, John and Jesus, of course. If I were talking with Dr. Jones, and there was no one present but we two, and I should say "it becomes us" to do certain things, whom do you think I would be talking about? As I have shown, John's baptism was for the remission of sins. Knowing that Christ had no sins to be remitted, he refused to baptize Jesus; but Jesus insisted that they, he and John, make this one exception. "For thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Was the righteousness which Christ and John fulfilled the righteousness of man? I suspect that my friend will admit it was divine righteousness. I hardly think he would accuse Christ of engaging in the righteousness of man. Well, let us see what connection the righteousness of Christ has with remission of sins. Romans 3:25: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God."

1. Christ fulfilled all righteousness in being baptized.
2. Christ's righteousness was for the "remission of sins that are past."
3. Therefore baptism is for the "remission of sins that are past."

These scriptures sound very much like my proposition, do they not?

My friend made an effort to answer my argument on 1 Peter 3:21. He tried his hand at so few of them, possibly I should let his quibble on this passage pass without notice.

Scanned by TLC

But I do not want to let him get away with a single one. Let us notice the passage. We will begin with the 18th verse and read through the 21st. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Dr. Rice says baptism is a figure. A figure of what? Noah's salvation was a figure. If my friend is right, we have a figure of a figure—a shadow of a shadow. Who ever heard of a shadow making a shadow? It takes a substance to cast a shadow. Dr. Rice says the flood did not save Noah. Yes, it did. Noah was in the ante-diluvian world of sin. The flood was the dividing line between the old and the new—between the ante-diluvian world and the postdiluvian world. It was by means of the flood that Noah was saved from the ante-diluvian world. This salvation foreshadowed or prefigured our salvation through baptism. Baptism is the dividing line between the old world of sin and the newness in Christ. By means of it, the sinner is translated—carried over—from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of Christ. The flood, to the ante-diluvians, like the gospel to us, was a "savor of life unto life, or of death unto death." Those who obeyed God were saved by it. Those who disobeyed were destroyed. I did not leave out "the like figure," in my quotation of this passage, as my friend charged. He should listen more closely! The American Standard gives us "after a true likeness," instead of "the like figure," and has a marginal rendering, "in the anti-type." Noah's salvation through the

Scanned by TLC

waters of the flood is "a true likeness" of our salvation through baptism. Noah's salvation is the type, our salvation the antitype. It still remains true that the Bible says, "Baptism saves us." Will my friend believe it? Do not forget that he has insisted that the Bible means what it says and says what it means.

But Rice says "filth of the flesh" (in 1 Peter 3:21) means sins of the old nature. Last night he introduced Young's Analytical Concordance. Let us see if he will accept his own authority. Dr. Young says the Greek term here ("rupus") means "dirt." In the parenthetical clause of 1 Peter 3:21, Peter is merely explaining that baptism is not for the purpose of washing the dirt from the body—that it is not merely a bath—but has an inward or spiritual significance. Again, Dr. Rice says if baptism is the answer of a good conscience, it must come after salvation. The Revised Version translates it, "the interrogation of a good conscience" and gives as alternate renderings, "inquiry" or "appeal." But let baptism be "the answer," "inquiry," or "appeal" of a good conscience—it is too closely connected with the matter of a good conscience to suit my friend's contention that it is a non-essential. And don't forget, the Bible still says, "baptism saves us." Will my opponent still insist that the Bible means what it says?

We are told that when the Bible says, "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (Mark 1:4, Luke 3:3), it means that repentance, and not baptism, is for the "remission of sins." Let me give you a few parallel statements. "The blood of Christ was shed." Was it the blood, or Christ, that was shed? "The walls of Jericho fell." Was it the walls, or Jericho, that fell? "The baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Is it the baptism, or repentance, that is for the remission of sins? To ask the question is to answer it. My friend tells us that he is a college graduate. He should review his English. But he has learned something about these passages since he wrote the letter to his friends in Waxahachie.

Scanned by TLC

Here is what he said in that letter: "You mentioned Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3. Those scriptures teach exactly the same thing as all the other scriptures teach. There was never but one plan of salvation, as you see from Acts 10:43. In Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3, just remember that the word 'for' very, very often in the Bible and in every day language, too, means 'because of.' One is arrested 'for' stealing. One is grateful 'for' a favor. A girl marries 'for' love. One is praised 'for' bravery. And one is paid 'for' his work. 'For' in these cases means 'because of.' That is exactly why I baptize people, for the salvation which God has given them, or because their sins are remitted. That is the reason John the Baptist rebuked those Pharisees in Matthew 3:7. They evidently had no change of heart, so did not have a right to be baptized."

Ladies and gentlemen, you can see that Dr. Rice told Mr. and Mrs. Whittaker, in a private letter, that "for the remission of sins" in these scriptures applies to baptism and means "because of the remission of sins." Now, while in public debate, he says that "for the remission of sins" applies only to repentance, and has no reference to baptism. It is impossible to harmonize his two statements. What do you think of a man who says the scriptures mean one thing when he writes a personal letter, and that they mean something exactly opposite, when he is debating before a large audience? But I am inclined to be charitable, and place the best construction possible on my opponent's conduct. I shall, therefore, believe that he was honest when he wrote this letter and that he has learned something since that time. He now knows that "for" (eis) in Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3 means, "in order to." He is learning the truth. I am thankful for his progress. The same word is used in Acts 2:38. If he has learned that it means "in order to" in Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3, he should also know that it means "in order to" in Acts 2:38.

Doctor, why not be absolutely honest about the matter and

Scanned by TLC

tell these people that you have been wrong about the meaning of this word and that you now know that the Bible teaches baptism "in order to the remission of sins?"

I read from the Doctor's letter last night where he charged Ananias with being "mistaken" when he told Saul to be baptized and wash away his sins. I had hoped for some explanation, but none has been given. We are forced to the conclusion that he does not believe Ananias told the truth, but that he does not have the nerve to deny the truthfulness of the word of God before this audience.

Dr. Rice says I put salvation "at the wrong end of baptism." Well, I put it at the same end that the Lord put it! Again, I inform my friend that every time the Bible mentions the two together, baptism is placed before salvation. If I am wrong, I am in good company. The Holy Spirit puts them in that order!

My friend did an amusing thing last night. This audience will remember that since the beginning of this debate, he has constantly made such statements as these: "The Bible is a plain book, and plain people can understand it." "The Bible means what it says and says what it means." "You do not have to go to school to understand the Bible." Last night he confessed that one who doesn't know the Greek cannot find his position on this question in the Bible. In his attempt to save his false contention that baptism is not for the remission of sins, he leaves "the plain man's Bible," and rushes into the Greek, which cannot be understood except by scholars. I want it to be forever remembered that Dr. Rice—the man who places so much stress on the Bible's being a plain book for the plain man—is the man who introduced the Greek into this discussion. I have been content to use our English version of the Bible, since I know that few people in this audience can read or understand the Greek language, and since the position I take is clearly taught in our common English Bible. But if my opponent thinks he can get any consolation out of

Scanned by TLC

the Greek, let him go there, and I shall be glad to follow him. The Bible in Greek, Bohemian, Dutch, or any other language does not teach his position.

It is the contention of my opponent that "for" in Acts 2:38, means "because of." I challenge him to find a recognized translation of the New Testament, which so translates the word. The American Standard translates the term "unto," making both repentance and baptism "unto" the remission of sins. While it is true that "for" sometimes means "because of," "unto" never does; nor does "eis" ever mean "because of." The scholars of the world are unanimous in saying that "eis" always has a prospective, and never a retrospective meaning. There is not a Standard Greek-English Lexicon in the world which gives "because of" as a definition of "eis." We might quote Thayer, Liddell & Scott, Robinson, Green, and many other Greek scholars; but since my friend has introduced Young's Analytical Concordance, we shall see what Dr. Young says about the matter. Young lists more than seventy-five passages in the New Testament where "eis" is used, (including Acts 2:38), and says that it means "with a view to" in every instance. Dr. Rice is the man who introduced Young as an authority on the Greek. Will he accept Young's rendition of "eis"? True, "eis" is sometimes rendered otherwise than by the English, "unto;" but it is never rendered by a word with a retrospective meaning. It is never translated, "because of." Rice finally gave it the meaning "toward" in Galatians 3:27. All right, if baptism is "toward Christ," has one reached Christ before he is baptized? But regardless of the meaning of "eis" in Acts 2:38, repentance and baptism are both for the same thing. "Repent" and "be baptized" are connected by the coördinate conjunction "and." The prepositional phrase, "for (eis) the remission of sins," modifies both "repent" and "be baptized." If baptism is "because of" remission of sins, so is repentance. If repentance is essential to remission of sins, so is baptism. Again I ask my friend to review his English!

Scanned by TLC

Let's notice the circumstances under which the language of Acts 2:38 was spoken. The occasion was the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The disciples had been given the world-wide commission, in which they were told to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature and that "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But Jesus told them not to begin the execution of this commission at once. "Tarry ye," said he, "in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." They remained in Jerusalem until the day of Pentecost, when they received "the power from on high." After the Holy Spirit came upon them, Peter preached to the great audience assembled in Jerusalem. The Holy Spirit, through the apostle Peter, convicted many of their sins and caused them to believe that the Jesus whom they had crucified was the Christ, and that he had been exalted to the right hand of God. With this conviction, they were "pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (Acts 2:37.) It is apparent that these people wanted to know what to do to be saved, or to receive remission of their sins. Did Peter answer their question? If he did, then both repentance and baptism are essential to the remission of sins.

For the benefit of those who were not here last evening, I call attention to the fact that in my opening speech I showed that I believe in salvation by faith. I introduced such passages as John 3:16, John 3:18, John 6:47, Luke 7:50, and John 5:24, all of which say the believer is saved. But what kind of a believer is contemplated in these passages? Is it the impenitent believer who is saved? My opponent and the whole religious world will answer, "No." We all understand that the believer who is said to be saved is a penitent believer. It is my contention that he is also an obedient believer.

Since Luke 7:30 tells us that those who were not baptized by John "rejected the counsel of God against themselves,"

Scanned by TLC

these believers, about whom Jesus spoke in his personal ministry, had either been baptized, or they had "rejected the counsel of God against themselves." My opponent says that "to believe" is often used in a comprehensive sense, meaning "coming to Christ," "accepting Christ," etc.—to which I heartily agree. The New Testament writers frequently use the words "believer" and "belief," when they mean a baptized believer, or belief in the comprehensive sense, of obedient belief or faith. Titus was commanded to teach those who "believed in God to maintain good works" (Titus 3:8). But Titus was instructing church members, and church members are baptized believers. Paul told Timothy: "Be thou an example of the believers" (1 Timothy 4:12). No one thinks "believers" here means unbaptized believers. Crispus believed on the Lord (Acts 18:8). But Crispus was a baptized believer. Paul tells us that he, himself, baptized Crispus (1 Corinthians 1:14). So we know that when Luke said Crispus believed, he did not mean that he was an unbaptized believer. Paul imprisoned believers (Acts 22:19). He did evil to the saints (Acts 9:13). Were believers and saints two different classes of people persecuted by Paul? No one will say that they were. "Believer" and "saint" are used interchangeably. Paul had authority to bind all that called on the name of the Lord (Acts 9:14). This is but another way of designating the same people who were called "believers" and "saints." "Paul breathed out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord" (Acts 9:1). He persecuted "any of this way" (Acts 9:2). "Paul made havoc of the church" (Acts 8:3).

Here we have six different designations for the same group. They were believers; they were saints; they were those who called on the name of the Lord; they were the disciples of the Lord; they were "any of this way"; they were the church. Paul persecuted believers, but he was persecuting the church. All agree that the church was a

Scanned by TLC

body of baptized believers; therefore, the believers Paul imprisoned were baptized believers. How does my opponent know that the believers who are said to be saved are not baptized believers? His obligation is to prove that the believer in any or all of the passages he uses is an unbaptized believer. This, he cannot do. Besides, the statements made by Jesus during his personal ministry, about believers being saved, were made before he had said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"; before his will or testament went into force. "For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth" (Hebrews 9:17).

I want to refer now to what my friend said about the teaching of Alexander Campbell on this question. Frankly, I regret to have to waste time in talking about what Alexander Campbell taught; I am not following Campbell. He is not the author of my faith. Friend Rice's charge, that we started out to follow Campbell is false—just as false as his man-made theory on the plan of salvation. I am not attempting to prove my proposition by Campbell. My proposition reads: "The Scriptures Teach . . . . " But I do not want to see Alexander Campbell misrepresented. In the very debate from which my opponent quoted, Mr. Campbell affirmed: "Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins." In his second address he said, "I go for baptismal purification through faith: he goes for it without faith . . . . According to my views, a person believes, repents, and is baptized, in order to purification." (Campbell-Rice Debate, Page 458.)

But how about the quotations Dr. Rice made from Campbell last night? His first was a quotation of Campbell's language made by his opponent in the Campbell-Rice debate. My opponent reads what Rice said that Campbell said. In Mr. Campbell's reply to Rice's speech, from which my opponent quoted, he says, "In the beginning he gave a wrong view of my statements as written and published." Why did

Scanned by TLC

not my opponent quote directly from Campbell? Why did he not notice Campbell's repudiation of Rice's purported representation of him?

But I believe he did give one direct quotation from Campbell, in which Campbell denied that he made baptism essential to salvation "in all cases." But Campbell also said: "We do not hold faith, repentance, or baptism essential to salvation, in all cases" (Campbell-Rice Debate, page 459). Nor do I. Infants, idiots, or other irresponsible persons are not required to believe, repent, or be baptized. I know of no better way to reply to my opponent's misrepresentations of Campbell's teachings on this subject than to let Campbell, himself, reply.

In the Millennial Harbinger, New Series, Volume 6, 1842, page 128, Mr. Campbell says: "But if anyone so interprets my views or statements alluded to, as to make baptism not for the remission of sins, but because sins are remitted before, such are not to be reasoned with by you or me." My opponent comes in this class. Campbell says he is "not to be reasoned with." I do not care to reason with him further about what Campbell taught on the proposition. He is the man who introduced Campbell into the discussion of a proposition which is supposed to be determined by what the Scriptures teach.

I, again, want to call your attention to the fact that every time the Bible mentions baptism and salvation together, baptism comes first and salvation afterward. These passages are: Mark 1:4, Luke 3:3, Mark 16:16, Acts 2:38, Acts 22:16, and 1 Peter 3:21. I press this fact upon my opponent. He refuses to offer any reply. He contends that salvation always precedes baptism. Why, then, did the Holy Spirit make a mistake every time he mentioned the two together?

My opponent has insisted that we take all of the Bible, and that we take it just as it reads. I heartily join him in this request. When the Bible says faith saves, let's believe that. When it says repentance saves, let's believe

Scanned by TLC

that, too. When it says love saves, that is also true. When it says we are saved by hope, it again speaks the truth. And I shall continue to urge that when the Bible says we are saved by baptism, that, too, is true.

Suppose a fisherman is seen walking down a street with a string of fish. Someone asks: "How did you catch those fish?" He answers, "With a hook." Another asks the same question, and he answers: "With a line." The question is repeated by still another, and this time the fisherman answers: "With a rod." Would it not be foolish for each of the three to contend that his answer is the whole truth? Men of ordinary intelligence would know enough to put all the answers together and say that the fish were caught with a hook, a line, and a rod. Why can't we exercise the same degree of intelligence in the study of the word of God? I believe we are saved by everything by which the Bible says we are saved. I beg my friend—the man who boasts of being a Fundamentalist and of taking the whole Bible at its face value—to base his faith, not upon a certain group of scriptures, but to take all that God says.

He would do well to accept all the teaching of God's word, instead of building a theory around a certain set of scriptures, and completely ignoring all other passages. When he is ready to accept all the Bible says, he and I can shake hands in agreement. I believe every passage he has read about the believer. I believe faith saves. I have read from the Bible that baptism saves. Will he believe this divine truth? If so, we can agree.

His charge that I leave out parts of various verses of scripture, wrest scriptures from their context, etc., in order to defend a creed, is as false as it is possible for falsehood to be. I believe this audience had rather hear you attempt to answer the many arguments I have presented, than to listen to your baseless charges. Or, Doctor, you might use that time in answering some of those questions I have asked. He has spent enough time complaining about my ask-

Scanned by TLC

ing questions to have answered every question I have asked. However, lack of time is not my friend's reason for not answering those questions! I beg him to come up to the issue, and try, as the negative disputant, to refute the arguments made by the affirmative, or admit—as an honest man should—that they are the truth. I plead with him to be big enough to answer my questions, or to admit that he fears to do so. I believe this audience will much more appreciate either of these courses, than the one my friend has chosen. Advocacy of truth never causes a man to dodge an issue, ignore an argument or refuse to answer a question!

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Sixth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 23, 1935.

THIRD PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach That Baptism to the Penitent Believer Is Essential to His Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

(Third negative address by John R. Rice)

Mr. Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and my Brothers and Sisters and Friends:

Brother Oliphant gave me some questions. I am glad he did. He does not feel good about the only one that I answered, and doesn't feel good that I didn't spend the time on the rest of them instead of on the Scriptures. Now Brother Oliphant will not feel as good about this one as about the others. It is easier to ask questions than it is to find Scriptures that prove baptism is essential to salvation. I am going to ask you some questions, too, Brother Oliphant. These are on the heart of this discussion, too.

Here is one: 1. Does the penitent believer have everlasting life? Many Scriptures say he does.

Here is another one: 2. Can the penitent believer come into condemnation? John 5:24 says he cannot, shall not.

Here is another: 3. Is the penitent believer born of God? Is the penitent believer already born of God? 1 John 5:1 says he is.

Here is another: These are on the Scriptures. These are on the question, too. 4. Is the penitent believer justified? Now, Paul the Apostle, preaching to the people at Antioch of Pisidia in Acts 13:38, 39 said so.

Scanned by TLC

Here is another one: 5. Was Paul born again when he saw Jesus? He said he was.

Incidentally, I am going to give you more Greek, too, if you are interested in it. I would be worried, too, if I were you. But you will be worried with the English before you are through. Look up the word *ektroma,* the word Paul said, "As one born out of due time," and you will find out it is the idiomatic use for *abortion* or *premature birth.* Paul was "born before the time." He was called to be an apostle later on. The Bible nowhere says anything about the idea that when an apostle was called it was a birth. The Scripture never even mentioned such a thing. Birth is used again and again about conversion. Paul used that term about his conversion. The term is not as one born too late, but as one born too soon. The idiomatic use shows it clearly which you can find out. Then there is some Greek, Doctor Oliphant, which you can find out, and you can look it up.

"And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time" (1 Cor. 15:8).

Look up that Greek word *ektroma.* "And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time." Was Paul born again when he saw Jesus?

Here is another question: 6. Was the woman mentioned in Luke 7:37-50, saved when she believed, before she was baptized? Now was she?

Here is another: 7. Was the publican in the temple (in Luke 18) saved? Did he go to his house already justified, before he was baptized? Jesus said he did.

You want some questions? Here are some on the debate, right along where the debate is. These are not trick questions, they are all on the proposition. They get down to the honest truth of the matter.

Here is another: 8. Was the palsied man, mentioned in Mark 2, saved when Jesus said, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," when he saw his faith?

Here is another: 9. Do you believe in a supernatural change of heart? I think this is a very fair question. Do

Scanned by TLC

you believe in a supernatural change of heart? If you want to call it that; a miraculous change of heart? That is a fair question.

Now we get down to this proposition. Here is another. 10. Have you yourself ever had a supernatural change of heart and nature? That is no joke, as God is my witness. This is down right where this question ought to be settled. I thank God, in my heart I looked to Jesus, and in my heart by faith I gave him my heart, and I have the certainty that he forgave my sins. And I have the witness in my heart, the witness of God, the witness of the Spirit, and a certainty from the Scriptures that I have been born again. I expressly ask Brother Oliphant that question and it is fair.

Brother Oliphant, there are some questions. I had them written out for you. (Hands opponent the list of questions.)

Let us get down and see really what this proposition is talking about. Now, my friends, we come down to the question of really how are people saved. From the beginning of mankind, there have been two plans of salvation—God's way and man's way. Cain had a way—his own way—the way of good works. The Pharisee in the temple had his way—the way of good works. The Masonic Lodge and other lodges have their way. That is one reason I say frankly, Christians ought not to be yoked up with unbelievers in lodges. The lodges everywhere have a false plan of salvation—a plan of salvation by good works. My friends, Brother Oliphant has his way of salvation—by way of good works. We will go further into that matter. Say what you want to about it, to say, "I believe a Scripture," and then turn around and make it mean something that it does not say, is not believing that Scripture. And that is not honest Bible teaching. We will see more about that later.

Now let's see about these believers that I called attention to the other night. I noticed my friend was awfully busy—he was busy asking questions. He was entirely too busy

Scanned by TLC

last night to deal with this matter where the Savior said in John 3:18: "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." He that believeth on him is not condemned. He is a believer. Now the man we are talking about is already a believer. He is a penitent believer. He has already repented, already believed. Brother Oliphant has already admitted he is a penitent believer. But he says the man is not saved until he is baptized. Here is a man who is a penitent believer, but who has not been baptized. Brother Oliphant says you are not saved until you are baptized. The Bible says he is not condemned when he believes. Brother Oliphant says he is condemned. The Bible says he is not condemned. I will take the Bible. I will take Jesus Christ on it. That is on the question. A lot of the Scriptures he mentioned did not refer to baptism. They didn't refer to the question under discussion, but this one does, Brother Oliphant.

In John 3:36:

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

"HATH," present tense. Has! Now, then, here is a Scripture which says: "He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." The Bible plainly says this penitent believer we are talking about, already has, H-A-S everlasting life. How could baptism be essential to his salvation if he has already got it? "And he just now believed?" you ask. Yes, the Scripture says, "Believeth." "He that believeth." Brother Oliphant wants to read in there what it does not say. He wants to make it say he is not condemned if he has believed and has been baptized. But it does not say that, and I maintain that it does not mean that. There is not a hint that it means it. No, sir! No, sir! Brother Oliphant says, "But

Scanned by TLC

in the American Standard, it reads, using the same verse, John 3:36: *'He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him'.*" Even that version says the believer *HATH* eternal life, has it before baptism.

"He that obeyeth not the Son." Brother Oliphant, I remind you that you yourself used the Scripture that says that. Some people asked Jesus, "What work shall I do to have everlasting life?" And the Savior said, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."

"Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?

"Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John 6:28, 29).

And that is the command to sinners everywhere. He that believeth on the Son already has everlasting life, already is not condemned.

Here is another. Turn to John 5:24. There is much of that.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

HATH—the penitent believer already has everlasting life. It does not say he *shall have* it after being baptized, *shall have* it if he comes down to the end and has kept "every thought, feeling, purpose, word and deed, until the hour of death." No, sir, it doesn't say that. He knows it does not say that. The Bible says, "He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, *HATH* (he's got it right now, present tense, right now he has) everlasting life," Brother Oliphant. Brother Oliphant says he has not; Jesus says he has. I do, too, Brother Oliphant. What is the difference between Brother Oliphant and Jesus? Brother Oliphant says he has not; Jesus says he has.

Scanned by TLC

Brother Oliphant says, "I want to baptize him." But let's believe what the Bible says about it before we baptize him. That is fair, isn't it? You can philosophise and make wisecracks, or say what you want to, but you cannot get away from the plain statement of the Bible where Jesus said in John 5:24:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

That is the more familiar reading perhaps, but you like better the American Revised version. There the Lord says:

"Verily verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life."

This believer we have been talking about, this penitent believer, what about him? The Savior said here that he has everlasting life. Brother Oliphant says, "Wait, he isn't baptized!" Well, he is going to be baptized. I believe in baptizing, Brother Oliphant, and I am glad you believe in baptizing, too. But you just put this matter of salvation at the wrong end of baptism. I have baptized as many as Brother Oliphant, I trust, and I have been baptized myself, and I think you ought to be glad to call me "brother." I have been baptized, and I was a penitent believer, too. Ananias called Paul "Brother" and he was filled with the Spirit before he was baptized. That is another question for Brother Oliphant. Brother Oliphant, didn't Ananias call Paul "Brother" before he was baptized? Didn't he? Yes, sir! I maintain that according to Brother Oliphant, I am in better shape to be called "brother" than Paul was. I have been baptized, and he hadn't. There must be a negro in the woodpile. There is some narrow, sectarian spirit in that. I have been baptized. Paul had not been baptized, yet Ananias called him "brother." Yes, there is something behind that attitude.

Scanned by TLC

Read on further. Jesus said, "I am telling you," "Verily, verily," that is, "Truly, truly," I say to you. Jesus said, "I say it is true, this penitent believer we are talking about has everlasting life and is not going to come into condemnation." Brother Oliphant says, "He sure will if he doesn't get baptized." Jesus says, "He has already passed from death unto life, and has everlasting life." It does not take a long drawn out argument to settle what Jesus plainly said. He said this penitent believer already has everlasting life.

Here are plenty more, Brother. John 6:47,

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

It did not say, "He shall have when he gets baptized," but says that he "hath everlasting life." He has got it now. Who? The believer. Who are we talking about in this debate? The penitent believer. Jesus says he has already got everlasting life.

Brother Oliphant says, "No, now Jesus, I would rather go back and ask a lot of questions and try to convince you that you do not mean that." But Jesus says he has it now. But Brother Oliphant says, "I have a creed to maintain here, and I am going to insist that if he isn't baptized he doesn't have it." But Jesus says, "He does have it. He now has everlasting life." Yes, sir.

I say again there is a false system of religion as old as man is. And that false religion puts in a lot of acts of righteousness. Brother Oliphant has not only contended for baptism as essential to salvation, but is contending for a whole lifetime of good works, and says you will not get in if you do not do them. Actually, it is a plan of salvation by works. Because of this old, old man-made plan of salvation, Jesus had it put down, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." He has it at present, *hath*—the same as *has,* (present tense) everlasting life, has it now!

Now, Brother Oliphant, I ask you, Does the penitent

Scanned by TLC

believer already have everlasting life? That is a good question, is it not? That is not just some wise-crack or trick question. It is on this question right here. Yes, sir!

Here is some more in 1 John 5:1. That is not the gospel of John. You may say that other is in the gospel of John. Yes, you are right. However, the gospel of John was written particularly for the very purpose of settling the question of the plan of salvation as you will see when you turn to chapter twenty, verses thirty and thirty-one (not first John).

I hope Brother Oliphant will come on and say the gospel of John was before Pentecost. Let us see if he will. I hope he does. Brother Oliphant, I wish you would bring that up!

Here is 1 John 5:1.

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him."

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God:" All right. Now Brother Oliphant, is that penitent believer born of God? The Bible says he is. You can say what you will, he is born of God. Say what you want to about it. Is that penitent believer born of God? The *Scripture* says he is! The Scripture says he is! Oh, but you say, "Now Lord, give me some time to make up some wise-cracks and ask questions about this, that and the other, and I will try to convince you that he is not." But Jesus says he is born of God.

Let us see a little further. Now 1 John 5:13 (how I wish you had your Bibles, looking on).

"These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God."

"That ye may *KNOW THAT YE HAVE ETERNAL LIFE.*" Who? You that believe on the name of the Son of God." Now to this penitent believer that this debate is

Scanned by TLC

about—to the penitent believer, to that fellow, that penitent believer, Brother Oliphant says baptism is essential to his salvation. He sort of backslid on that now and said we will leave out the babies. When did you see a baby saved? And you leave out the heathen. If Brother Oliphant keeps on, he will be leaving everybody else out of the proposition if he doesn't look out. Now your proposition does not say that to the penitent believer baptism is essential to his salvation except babies, and except heathen, and except some others. It doesn't say that. The fact of the business is that no matter what you say, Brother Oliphant, this penitent believer we are talking about is born of God, and he now has eternal life. "That ye may KNOW" —John says, "I have written this book." If you knew this book that John wrote like you ought to, you would know that the penitent believer has eternal life, too, that one has eternal life when he believes. This book is a letter of John, and is like the gospel of John about the plan of salvation. I am not making that up.

Here is some more. Acts 13:38 and 39:

"Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins."

"Forgiveness of sins." Now how? Now let's look on. Here it is.

"And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

Notice that it does not say, "By him all that believe *and are baptized* are justified from all things." No! Paul preached that one ought to be baptized, and I do too. But Brother Oliphant, Paul put salvation in there where it belongs. Salvation comes, justification comes, there is no doubt about that, when one believes. "By him all that believe ARE justified," not are going to be. Brother Oliphant says, "If you will wait until I can get them down into the water, and if nothing happens before that, they will be justified." This Scriptures does not say, "They will be,"

Scanned by TLC

it says, "They are." That is on this debate. I suggest that you answer this question whether this penitent believer is justified. If not, how will you reconcile that with what the Bible plainly says? The penitent believer IS justified. The Scripture says this penitent believer we are talking about is already justified. Brother Oliphant says, "No, baptism is essential to get him saved." The Scripture says he is already justified. It did not say just in some exceptional cases, but, "By him ALL that believe are justified," not just one or two in the ministry of Christ, not just in the Old Testament, not just before Pentecost, but also after Pentecost, not just in this place and nowhere else, but "By him ALL that believe are justified." That means not only you will have to leave out this case as an exception to your plan of salvation, Brother Oliphant, you would have to leave out *all* that believe. Brother, they are already justified.

Mark you, the only kind of a man I am talking about is the penitent believer. Brother Oliphant, I am not talking about baptizing a fellow that does not believe, are you? I am not talking about baptizing a fellow that does not believe, but about this penitent believer. And the Bible says all that believe are justified. I tell you, it will take more than wise-cracks and sniggers to get that away. Sure it will! It will take more than bringing up a sentence here, quoting here a little and there a little and taking a half of a sentence over there, etc. It will take more than jumping on Brother Wood in order to change what the Lord said here. "By him all that believe are justified." Not going to be, not will be if they are baptized, but all that believe, are justified. About that, the Bible is plain. I am glad Brother Oliphant is getting to believe that. I hope you will stay with that question, Brother Oliphant. That is right. It is plain, and common people, humble people, and unlearned people, can understand it and take it at face value if they will quit listening to you folks who are always

Scanned by TLC

putting in what is not there. And then they will put baptism where it belongs.

What about baptism? In John 3:18, it isn't there. John 3:16 does not mention nor refer to it. In John 5:24, baptism is not even hinted at. Poor, common people, unlearned people can understand the Scriptures if somebody doesn't come along and say, "You can't take the Bible for what it says, you have got to be baptized to be saved, whether the Bible says so or not." Jesus says the believer already has everlasting life; is not condemned; all are justified, every one that believes. "All are justified," he said. "By him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." The law of Moses couldn't do it, and baptism can't either. Brother Oliphant, works of righteousness can't do it either.

All right, here is some more about it, Brother Oliphant. Now let us turn to Romans the 4th chapter. You say you believe in Romans, 4th chapter. You will if you listen very carefully. Brother Oliphant said in the beginning of this debate that he is five years younger than I am. He is. Everybody will expect him to learn more as he gets older. My good friend, Brother Vernon Wood, is younger than I am, and he is younger in this business than I am. Notice this. Brother Oliphant will go and jump on him all he wants to, but he dare not say I misquoted a line! Last night he took the *Campbell-Rice Debate* and checked it over, and I challenge him to say that I did not read it exactly and accurately word for word. He won't deny it. And he can't deny that I gave the reference accurately, every word accurately, and did not misrepresent and did not give a false color to what I said about it, either. He can jump on Brother Wood—that is a good deal easier than answering what I said. All right about that.

Now let us turn to Romans the 4th chapter, verses 1-4. Brother Oliphant says he believes it. We will see if he believes it.

Scanned by TLC

"What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?

"For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God.

"For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.

"Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt."

"No," Brother Oliphant said, "he believed God, and the Lord said it was counted to him for righteousness, but I believe he had to get his righteousness by his works, too."

Now if Abraham had done works for salvation along with his faith, even that would have made it not of grace. He would have earned it if he had worked for it. But he did not, for the next verse, verse 5, says; (reading on, not just a half of a verse here and yonder).

"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his FAITH is counted for righteousness."

Brother Oliphant says, "Oh no. The fellow that believes the way the Bible is talking about will work." But the Bible says, "But to him that WORKETH not." The Bible *says* that, doesn't it? I am talking about a man who does *not* work—whether it is baptism, going to church, partaking of the Lord's Supper, giving to the preacher, or singing, or the rest of it. No, "BUT TO HIM THAT WORKETH NOT, BUT BELIEVETH." All right, believing does not include works then, does it? "But to him that *worketh not but believeth.*" They are not the same. The works are not included in the faith. The only work God wants for salvation is the work when the heart by faith trusts Christ, not doing this thing, that thing, and the other works. It is not the works that please God and earn salvation. No, "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his FAITH is counted for righteousness." Whom is he talking about being saved? I am talking about that penitent believer already saved yon-

Scanned by TLC

der. What about it? God justifies that ungodly man by faith without works, baptismal works or any other kind, whether you call baptism God's works or man's, salvation is obtained without good works. God justifies him.

Read on further, verses 5 and 6. What about other works? Let us read what it says:

"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

"Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works."

Brother Oliphant said, "It is with works, and is God's work, so let's put the works in there." But the Lord said. "Don't even put it in there. It is *without* works." Now I say to you again, frankly and kindly, that this is my friend and I don't mean that I think he is insincere about it. Things have been planted in him back yonder that have colored and biased his mind in the study of the Bible. He has gone on in a system, a Pharisaical system, a legalistic, ceremonial system instead of a simple faith in Christ. We all have a tendency to give man the credit instead of giving God credit. That was the way with the first man ever born. Good men, too, look to men and works of righteousness instead of to the blood of Christ alone. But the Lord said, "It is not by works of righteousness," and even says it is "without works," and that God justifies the ungodly. The man that believes and does not work, God justified that ungodly man, "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works."

That is the reason John 3:18 says:

"He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the onl ybegotten Son of God."

He is not condemned. He has not worked and has not been baptized nor gone to church, but he is not condemned.

Scanned by TLC

God imputed righteousness to him without works. The Scripture says that God counted his faith for righteousness. To him without works God said that! Simple, humble and common people can understand it, too, unless someone twists it and makes up a lot of stuff and puts in their minds that it is not there.

God's word is a holy thing and men ought to be careful. Men will have to give an account to God for the way they handle this word of God. I am just preaching the gospel like I preach it all the time. As God is my witness, I believe it with my whole soul. I do not have any reputation as a debater to maintain. This is the same thing I preach to sinners all the time. Everywhere I think sinners need to be warned against looking to their own righteousness, and their own goodness, and their own ceremonies.

Everywhere I go some want to depend on Rosaries and praying to "Holy Mary," etc. That will not save anybody. Someone will say, "I am a member of the church." That won't save anybody. Someone else says, "I am a good Mason, I keep my vows." That won't save anybody. And some say, "I have been baptized." That won't save anybody. Faith in Jesus Christ is the only remedy for every poor, lost sinner that ever walked on this earth. It surely is!

Here is another, Ephesians 2:8, 9. The Scripture has here a very plain, sweet word for us. Don't read in anything it does not say. Take it at face value. Read what it says, it is very clear.

(Moderator: You have five minutes, Brother Rice.)

Thank you.

Here is Ephesians, 2nd chapter, verses 6, 7, 8, and 9:

"And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:

"That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus,

Scanned by TLC

"For 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." (that no man should glory).

What are we going to talk about in heaven? We are going to talk about God's mercy and kindness, and not about how we earned it and got there. "For 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." Through faith it is the gift of God. Brother Oliphant says that it is a gift, too, but he says that if you don't work hard for it all your life you won't get it. And he says, "Yes, sure, I think it is a gift. I take the Bible at face value, but if you are not baptized and if you don't keep on working, working all your life, you will not get it." That is not taking it at face value. That is not what the Bible says and not what it means.

You ask some more questions, Brother Oliphant. You had better get down to some of these Scriptures.

Titus 3:5:

"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."

Not by baptism or other works! Now don't talk about answering, unless you deal with these Scriptures.

Brother Oliphant asked a question and does not like the way I answered it. I want him not to forget to answer whether the believer, born of God and having eternal life, in 1 John 5:1, is saved without baptism. We will see more about that later.

Here are two or three cases, a case in Luke the 18th chapter. What about that publican—that publican standing afar off?

"And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke 18:13).

Scanned by TLC

That baptism of Jesus by John, I will get to that in the rebuttal argument. If I have time, I can put that in later. What about the publican? Now let's see this sinner. He comes a penitent believer to Christ, and let's see what happens to him. Jesus said:

"I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (vs. 14).

He came up there a sinner and went down to his house saved and justified. Jesus said he was justified. Was he baptized?

Here is another case in Luke the 7th chapter. Oh, you say, "That was an unusual case." There are many here. This woman was a sinner in the 7th chapter of Luke, and the Scriptures say she came to Jesus in Simon's house and Simon said about her, "This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him: for she is a sinner." She was evidently a notorious sinner. Notice what Jesus said in Luke 7:47:

"Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little."

He did not say, "Her sins will be forgiven if she gets baptized." But he said, "Her sins, which are many, ARE forgiven."

"And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that forgiveth sins also?

"And he said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace" (vs. 49, 50).

Who is it, then, that forgives sins? Jesus. And he said to this woman, "Thy faith hath saved thee." He did not say, "I will save you if you will follow me and be baptized." But he said, "Your faith has saved you now."

Now, Mark, 2nd chapter, verse 5, says:

Scanned by TLC

"When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee."

Jesus said to the man: "Thy sins be forgiven thee." The Scribes that were sitting there said in their hearts, "Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God only?" Jesus said, "I will heal you as a sign that I have forgiven your sins." And the man went home healed. If that healing was a sign of anything, it was a sign that he got his sins forgiven. He was saved before he was baptized!

My friends, you ask: "Was he baptized later"? He probably was. I think he should have been later on, but he certainly wasn't while lying there on that pallet. Yes, sir, this penitent believer was saved while lying there on the pallet. This penitent believer is saved without baptism.

Here is more about it in the 10th chapter of Acts, verses 43 to 47. It is the case of Cornelius and his household when Peter went and preached to them.

"To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

Notice, all prophets, Old and New Testaments, agree to salvation by simple faith: Read on,

"While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.

"And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost.

"For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter,

"Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"

I challenged Brother Oliphant's statement the other night. Here is a man who is clearly saved and his whole house-

Scanned by TLC

hold, and it is clearly this side of Pentecost, and he was saved and filled with the Holy Ghost, and then later on baptized in water. See verses 47 and 48. When Peter told the story in the 11th chapter of Acts and told the other apostles how the Holy Ghost came upon the Gentiles, "as on us at the beginning," "When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Put it down, people can be saved and are saved before baptism. The penitent believer is saved.

The time is up.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Sixth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 23, 1935.

THIRD PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach that Baptism to the Penitent Believer is Essential to his Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

(Fourth Affirmative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My questions, though submitted to my opponent in writing, remain unanswered. He evidently knows that he could not answer them and at the same time maintain his position on this subject. I give him credit for having sense enough to know this. I wish I could give him credit for being honest enough to tell you why he does not answer them. Four of these questions were asked in my first speech last night. He has been before you three times, speaking for an hour and a half on this proposition. He has not accorded my questions the courtesy of so much as a mention. If he attempts to answer them in his last speech, it will be when I have no opportunity to review his replies. Every question I have asked is germane to the proposition under discussion. They are plain, simple questions.

(1) Is baptism a part of the gospel? Why could not my opponent have answered with a simple "yes" or "no"? I challenge him to say that baptism is no part of the gospel. He preaches and practices baptism. If it is no part of the gospel, he brings upon himself the anathema of

Scanned by TLC

heaven (Galatians 1:8). If it is a part of the gospel, it has something to do with salvation. The gospel is God's power to save (Romans 1:16). We are saved by the gospel (1 Corinthians 15:1, 2).

(2) Does baptism belong to the righteousness of God or to the righteousness of man? Certainly Dr. Rice will not charge Jesus with teaching man's righteousness. Jesus taught that baptism is righteousness (Matthew 3:13-15). Baptism is a command of God, and all of God's commandments are righteousness (Psalms 119:172).

(3) Does baptism belong to the law as given by Moses, or to the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ? My opponent will not say it belonged to the law of Moses. If it belongs to grace, we are saved by it. "For by grace are ye saved" (Ephesians 2:8). If it belongs to the truth, we are made free by it. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32).

The fourth question I asked: Do you believe that a person who knows that Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," but refuses to be baptized will be saved? I do not believe my opponent has the nerve to stand before this intelligent and God-respecting audience and say that man can knowingly, wilfully, and rebelliously disregard a plain command of the Lord Jesus Christ and still be saved.

In my first speech this evening, I asked six more questions. These have been treated with that same lack of respect and consideration shown those asked last evening.

(1) Do you know of a recognized translation of the New Testament which translates the preposition "eis" used in Acts 2:38 "because of"? Why didn't Mr. Rice just frankly admit that he knows of no such translation? He is the man who introduced the Greek into this discussion. I have no objection to discussing the Greek of any passage involved in the debate. I have, however, called upon him for an explanation of this conduct. From the very beginning of the debate he has insisted that the Bible is a plain

Scanned by TLC

man's book and that any one can understand it. I agree with this sentiment. Since he and I agree that our English Bible reveals the whole truth plainly and clearly, why does he bring in the Greek? The answer is easy: He knows that the honest student of the Bible will not see his doctrine on the subject of baptism taught in any English version of the Scriptures. I have examined some twenty-five English translations of Acts 2:38. They translate "eis": "for," "unto," "toward," "with a view to," etc. Not one of them translates it "because of." There is not an English version of the New Testament in existence which translates it "because of." Yet my friend says that is what it means. Is it not strange that the combined scholarship of the world has never translated this little Greek preposition correctly?

I have asked him: Do you know a standard Greek-English Lexicon which defines "eis" to mean "because of"? He will not answer, so I answer for him. He does not. There is no such lexicon in the world. The fact is, "eis" never means "because of." It never has a retrospective meaning, but it always prospective.

I have asked him if the Greek preposition "eis" used in Acts 2:38 is the one used in Matthew 26:28. It is. In Matthew 26:28 we are told that Jesus shed his blood "For (eis) the remission of sins." Acts 2:38 says baptism is "For (eis) the remission of sins." If baptism is because of the remission of sins, and people are baptized because they are saved instead of in order to be saved, then Christ shed his blood, not to save the world, but because the world had already been saved.

Although Dr. Rice finds *eis* translated, "in"—as in Luke 11:7 and Matthew 12:18, and "among"—as in Mark 13:22; these sentences are not comparable to Acts 2:38, either in construction or in the nature of the verb used. Dr. Henry Thayer (author of the best New Testament Greek-English Lexicon in existence), is my authority for saying that, when "eis" is used in connection with verbs of motion, it always expresses "direction toward," and is correctly rendered,

Scanned by TLC

"unto" or "into." "Repent" and "be baptized" point toward that which "eis" introduces—"the remission of sins." Its use in Acts 2:38 and Matthew 26:28 is identical. In each of these sentences, "eis" has as its object, "the remission of sins." Christ's blood was shed *"eis* the remission of sins." Believers are commanded to repent and be baptized *"eis* the remission of sins." If the shedding of Christ's blood pointed forward to the remission of sins; then, repenting and being baptized point forward to remission of sins. Will Dr. Rice say Christ shed his blood "because" of sins having been remitted?

The last in my list of questions was: Do you believe that water in John 3:5 means "water"? Dr. Rice has boasted long and loud that he believes in taking the Bible literally. "It says what it means and means what it says." Will he take Jesus' language literally? "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." The scholarship of the world affirms that "born of water" means baptism. In no other way is water connected with the Christian religion. If water means water—and certainly my friend will not go back on his oft-repeated statements about taking the Bible literally—let him tell us what John 3:5 means.

He asks ten questions in the beginning of his first speech tonight. Nearly all these questions have to do with the "penitent believer," while not one of the passages he cites says anything about a "penitent" believer. In fact, I had answered every question he has asked before he asked it. I showed in my first speech what kind of a believer is saved. How does he know that the believer addressed by Christ during his personal ministry had not been baptized by John? They had either been baptized or had rejected the counsel of God. "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him" (Luke 7:30).

No, John 5:24, John 3:18, Luke 7:45, Acts 13:39, 1 John

Scanned by TLC

5:1, or any other passage in the Bible does not say the penitent believer is saved. None of the passages he has introduced say anything about a penitent believer. His Scriptures mention the believer, without saying what kind of a believer. Dr. Rice adds "penitent." He and I agree that the believer who is said to be saved is a penitent believer. Now, why can't we also agree that they are baptized believers? If he can put "penitent" into these passages, I can put "baptized" in at the same hole. Now, Doctor, that is not a wise-crack, but a simple truth. You have made plenty of cracks—I can't say so much for the wisdom in them!

No one questions the fact that the Bible says the believer is saved. I have shown that "believers," saints," "those who called on the name of the Lord," "disciples" are used synonymously in the word of God; and that they are used as designations for members of the church. He has never so much as mentioned my arguments along this line.

I have insisted that he tell us whether the faith that saves is a living faith, or a dead faith. If it is a living faith, it leads to obedience to the commands of the Lord. Baptism is one of these commands. Hence, it is not hard to see how the term "believer," in its comprehensive sense, means the obedient believer. This is the believer who is saved, has everlasting life, shall not come into condemnation, etc. But so far as my opponent is concerned, there is no need of discussing these matters. He wholly ignores everything I say, as well as the many Scriptures I have quoted. It is not debating, to pay no attention to the answers made to your arguments, but quote again and again the same Scriptures which have been examined and shown not to teach what you introduced them to prove. This answers numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 of his questions. His fifth; "Was Paul born again when he saw Jesus? He said he was." Answer: Paul said nothing of the kind! I answered that question in a former speech, and showed

Scanned by TLC

what Paul said in 1 Cor. 15:8. I also allowed Paul to tell the Doctor why the Lord appeared to him (Acts 26:16). But our friend is still not in agreement with the apostle!

Jesus does not say the publican was saved without baptism. First, he does not say he had never been baptized. Second, he does not say that he was saved. In the parable of Luke 18:10-14, the attitudes of the Pharisee and publican are contrasted. Jesus commends the humility of the publican and condemns the haughtiness of the Pharisee. In contrasting the two, he says the publican left the temple "justified *rather* than the other (Pharisee)." That is, his attitude was preferable to that of the Pharisee. Anyway, the publican was not an alien sinner. He was an Israelite. He went to the temple to pray, and only the circumcised were allowed in the temple (Ezekiel 44:7). He was an erring child of God. This answers my friend's question No. 7.

Acts 10:43 has been introduced: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Will you please notice that the believer receives remission of sins "through his name"? Read on down to the 48th verse: "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Why? Because it was through the name of the Lord they were to receive remission of sins. I believe Acts 10:43, and I also believe Acts 10:48. If I can get my opponent to accept both verses, there will be no dispute over the matter. "Baptism in the name of the Lord" is for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38). Therefore, Cornelius was commanded to be baptized for the remission of sins.

Let us have a look at John 20:30, 31: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." The believer has life "through his name." In Exodus 20:24 God said, "In all places where I record my name I will

Scanned by TLC

come unto thee, and I will bless thee." In the Christian dispensation, God has recorded his name in baptism (Matthew 28:19). Baptism is the only institution in the New Testament with which the solemn names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are expressly connected. It is in baptism, where God has recorded his name, that the believer receives life "through his name."

Dr. Rice says he is glad I am leaving the babies and heathen out. I am leaving out no more than my proposition leaves out. My affirmation concerns the "penitent believer." The baby is not a believer of any kind. Only believers are commanded to be baptized.

The Greek word, "ektroma," means an "untimely birth" —without reference to whether it is too early or too late. Young's Analytical Concordance, which I have before me, so defines it. But Paul does not say he was "born out of due time." Read the passage again: "And last of all he was seen of me also *as* of one born out of due time." Doctor, can you see that little word "as"? As I have shown, Paul says that his fellow-apostles, and others, saw Christ before his ascension; but that he (Paul), "*as* of one born out of due time," did not see Christ until the appearance on the Damascus road. There is nothing whatever in the passage about when Paul was saved. I have shown that Christ did not appear to Paul to save him, but to make him a minister and a witness (Acts 26:16). My opponent will not notice this scripture.

We are wondering if he still thinks Ananias may have been mistaken about the connection between baptism and the washing away of sins. He has had ample opportunity to explain or deny the statement I read from his letter. He chooses to say nothing about the matter. Let it be forever remembered, that this great "Fundamentalist"— the man who takes every word in the Bible at its "face value"—thinks the Lord may have made a mistake when he sent Ananias to poor, penitent, praying Saul of Tarsus. It seems that we are debating the wrong proposition. I

Scanned by TLC

shall be glad to affirm that Ananias, the chosen minister of God, told the truth. My opponent denies it in a personal letter. Will he publicly deny it?

In the Fort Worth debate, Dr. Norris denied the inspiration of Mark 16:16. Will Dr. Rice also say this is no part of God's word? Of course, it may help their false doctrine some, to get rid of Mark 16:16 and Acts 22:16; but there are many other scriptures that teach the same truth. Doctor, why not believe all the Bible? You can't consistently believe some of the word of God, and reject the rest of it. Isn't that splendid conduct for "Fundamentalists"! I do not boast the title, "Fundamentalist"—I prefer to be just a Christian—but I do not think any scripture should be taken from the Bible, or that any of God's ministers were "mistaken" about the plan of salvation.

I have already answered, in a former speech, my friend's questions about my conversion—even though they do not have anything to do with whether or not the Scriptures teach my proposition. I now answer the only one of his questions that remains. It has to do with the case of the palsied man, recorded in Mark 2 and Luke 5. This case does not help my opponent. "When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee" (Mark 2:5). Faith, in this case, was something that could be seen. Four men brought the palsied man to Jesus. When, because of the crowd, they could not get to him, they cut a hole in the roof of the house and let down the bed. This action was the "faith" that Jesus saw. That reminds me of the challenge I issued in my first speech, which challenge has not been noticed by Dr. Rice. I, again, ask him to find one instance of an individual's being blessed by faith, without his faith being expressed in some overt act. He seems to be unable to find such a case. The reason is easy: There is no such case. Why, my friends, in the case of the palsied man, forgiveness of sins was predicated—not on the faith of the man forgiven—but on the faith of those who brought

Scanned by TLC

him to Jesus. When Jesus saw "their faith"—that of the men who brought the palsied man to him—"he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." Will our friend contend that this is the plan of salvation? Does he believe one can be saved on the faith of others?

The truth of the matter is, this case is not germane to our question at all. It was before Jesus died; therefore, before his will or testament was in force. While living on the earth, he could save people on any condition whatsoever or without any condition, if he saw fit to do so. But since our Lord's death, since his will is in force, no man has the right to offer salvation to anybody upon any terms save those stipulated in his will. In his last will and testament, he has said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." No man has the right to expect salvation until he has complied with these terms of the will. Now, why does not my friend treat me as nice as I treat him—and answer my questions? But he *will not!*

He again refers to Abraham, and quotes from the 4th chapter of Romans. "Works" there mentioned are not the works of the gospel. The promise is to those "who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham" (Verse 12). The faith contemplated is one which expresses itself in obedience.

James offers a better explanation of the matter than I can give. James 2:21-24: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Do Paul and James contradict each other? My opponent cannot believe what James said, and at the same time take the position he does on Romans 4. Paul and James are not contradictory, but complimentary. Abraham was justified

Scanned by TLC

—not by the works of the law, or the works of man's righteousness—but by faith. James explains that the faith by which he was justified was a faith that worked. "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" Doctor, James asks you to see that. Can't you see it?

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God" (Ephesians 2:8). But this was written to baptized believers. The Ephesians were saved "by grace through faith." If we can learn what they did, we will know how people are saved by grace through faith. The Ephesians heard the gospel (Ephesians 1:13). They believed (Ephesians 1:13). They repented (Acts 20:21). They confessed (Acts 19:18). They were baptized (Acts 19:1-5; Ephesians 4:5). We need not guess about how people are saved by grace. The Ephesians were saved by grace; but they heard, believed, repented, confessed and were baptized. Therefore, in being saved by grace, one hears, believes, repents, confesses, and is baptized. There is no way to be saved except by grace; therefore all who are saved must hear, believe, repent, confess, and be baptized. What my opponent needs is a scripture which says the unbaptized believer is saved—and it must have been since Jesus gave the Great Commission. Until he finds such a statement in the New Testament, I shall continue to insist that the believer who is saved is the baptized believer.

Friend Rice asks if 1 John 5:1 does not teach that the penitent believer is born of God. Nothing is there said about the "penitent" believer. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." How does Rice know this means the penitent believer? It does not say so. As I have so often told you, he can find many scriptures that say the believer is saved. He says they mean the penitent believer. I think he is right; and on the basis of the same reasoning, I think they mean the baptized believer.

In connection with 1 John 5:1, I again ask him to con-

Scanned by TLC

sider some other statements in the same book. 1 John 4:7: "He that loveth is born of God." 1 John 2:23: "He that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also." 1 John 4:2: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God." 1 John 4:15: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he is God." 1 John 3:24: "And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him." 1 John 2:3, 4: "And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John 3:7: "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous." Does Dr. Rice believe the whole book of 1 John, or only the first verse of the 5th chapter? A part truth is the most dangerous lie. I heartily accept 1 John 5:1. Now, if we can get Dr. Rice to accept these other passages in the same book, there will be no need for further discussion.

Friend Rice, I appeal to you in the name of our God, and for the sake of some people in this great audience who may be deceived by your partisan handling of the word of God—I plead that you take all the Bible says. The fact that one scripture says we are saved by believing, does not prove that there is no other essential to salvation. The Bible says we are saved by the Blood of Christ. I believe it. It says we are saved by the life of Christ. I believe it. It says we are saved by faith. I believe it. It says we are saved by repentance. I believe it. It says we are saved by confession. I believe it. It says we are saved by baptism. I believe it. It says we are saved by love. I believe it. It says we are saved by doing the will of God. I believe it. There are other things by which the Bible says we are saved. I believe them too. If I wanted to handle the word of God as my opponent does, I might try to prove that only baptism is necessary to salvation. In Acts 22:16, Saul is commanded to be baptized and wash

Scanned by TLC

away his sins. Nothing is said about faith, repentance, confession, or any other condition of pardon. By ignoring every other requirement mentioned in Holy Writ and quoting Acts 22:16 over and over, I could make as good showing for baptism only, as Rice makes for faith only. But my friends, I do not believe in handling the word of God in that way.

Denominationalism, the greatest hindrance to the Christian religion on earth, grows out of such a use of God's word. One denomination takes a certain set of scriptures, ignoring all others. Another denomination takes another group—and on and on—until we have hundreds of dissenting sects, each one advocating a part truth. The plea of undenominational Christianity is for the whole truth. As members of the plain churches of Christ, we can teach and practice all of the truth held by Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and all other denominationalists; and in addition thereto, any other truth, which may not be advocated by any denomination. The whole truth for the whole world, is the only safe program.

In the few minutes I have left at my disposal, I want to give you a brief summary of the work I have done in the affirmation of the present proposition. I tried to pitch the debate upon a high plane and avoid unnecessary quibbling, showing what kind of a believer is saved, and what it means to be saved by faith. I sought to prevent the arraying of one scripture against another. The Bible does not contradict itself. Believers are saved—the Bible plainly says so. But not all believers are saved. The Bible just as plainly teaches this. Therefore, the believer who is saved is the one who does the other things made essential to salvation by the word of God. Practically everything I have said along this line, as well as the many scriptures I have introduced, have been entirely ignored by my opponent. Taking all the Bible says on the question, there is a beautiful harmony between John 3:16, John 3:18, John 3:36, John 5:24, Acts 10:43, Acts 16:31, 1 John 5:1, Romans

Scanned by TLC

5:1, Hebrews 11, Romans 1:5, Acts 6:7, Hebrews 5:9, Galatians 5:6, James 2:21-26, Mark 16:16, Acts 2:38, and all the other scriptures which deal with the plan of salvation. The course my opponent has followed can produce nothing but infidels.

Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). My opponent says: "He that believeth is saved and may be baptized if he so desires."

Peter said: "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). Rice says: "Repent for the remission of sins and be baptized, because your sins are remitted."

Ananias said: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins" (Acts 22:16). Rice says: "Have your sins washed away first, and then be baptized."

Peter said: "Baptism saves us" (1 Peter 3:21). Rice says: "Baptism does not save us."

Acts 11:21 says: "A great number believed and turned to the Lord." Rice says: "They could not have turned to the Lord after believing, because they were with him the moment they believed."

Acts 26:20 says: "Repent and turn to God." Rice says: "Those who have repented are already with God."

Paul said: "We are baptized into Christ" (Galatians 3:27). Rice says: "We are in Christ before baptism."

Paul said: "The gospel is God's power to save the believer" (Romans 1:16). Rice says: "The believer is already saved."

John 1:12 says: "Christ gives those who believe power to become sons of God." Rice says: "They are already sons of God."

Christ says: "Baptism is righteousness" (Matthew 3:15). My opponent puts baptism in the same class with the superstitious counting of beads by the Roman Catholics. Shame on the man! I want his people to remember that he has put one of the holy and blessed commands of our God in the same category with a heathen custom.

The Bible always puts baptism before salvation. My

Scanned by TLC

opponent always put it after. He charges me with putting salvation at the wrong end of baptism. Unfortunately for him, I put it at the same end that the Holy Spirit puts it.

In closing my last speech on this proposition, I refer this great audience to the ten straightforward, simple questions which I have repeatedly asked my opponent. Every one of these questions is directly in point on the question being discussed. He has not one time even attempted to answer a single one of them. He has not even tried to offer an explanation of his failure. Tonight these questions stand—not only as monument to the truthfulness of my proposition—but also as an eloquent declaration that Dr. Rice realizes their strength, and that for him to attempt to answer them would be to reveal the correctness of my position. I am, however, happy in the belief that this is an intelligent audience, and that even members of Dr. Rice's church—being unable to explain his silence on any other basis—will understand that the weakness and falsity of his doctrine will not allow him to meet the issues of this discussion in a fair and candid manner.

I want it understood that I have no special love for baptism. I would not exalt it above anything else commanded by my Lord. In the earnest defense of baptism which I have made during the last two evenings, I have not been prompted by a love of baptism, but by love for the Christ, who said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." A patient cannot accept the physician, and at the same time reject his prescription. Baptism is contained in the Great Physician's prescription for the world's most deadly disease, sin. Having faith in the Physician, I do not want to alter or mutilate his prescription. As an humble servant of the Lord, I plead with a sin-sick world to apply to their hearts and lives the remedy offered by the only Physician who can cure this hideous malady. I present to you the remedy of the one who has never lost a case that was submitted to him in faith and governed by his

Scanned by TLC

directions. God grant that we may be willing to take "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth."

I thank you for your excellent attention and the earnest consideration you seem to be giving to the messages presented in this discussion. I ask only an unbiased examination of everything said by both speakers and an honest weighing of every argument in the scales of eternal truth.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Sixth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 23, 1935.

THIRD PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach That Baptism to the Penitent Believer Is Essential to His Salvation from Past or Alien Sins."*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

(Fourth negative address by John R. Rice)

Mr. Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am sorry that Brother Oliphant does not have another speech tonight. It is hurting him so badly. Brother Oliphant, I thought you knew all along that tonight I would have the last speech. Did you not have the last speech every night last week? And yet if he has referred to it one time, he has referred fifteen times to the sad and remarkable fact that he will have no chance to speak after I do tonight! I thought you had been debating long enough to know that it is customary that somebody will have to speak last, and usually not the same one all the time! I don't blame you, I would feel the same if I were as badly hit as you are. I suggest that you take some time out tomorrow night to catch up. I tried to get Brother Oliphant to take more time on this question. I should have liked for him to do so. I would have liked to have him spend a couple of nights more on this. Yet he seems hurt so badly about it. He is lamenting the fact that I have the last speech. That is too bad. The reason is, he knows that if I do as much damage in this speech as I have in the

Scanned by TLC

one before, he will need more time. Brother Oliphant, you should have thought about that before you signed your name. Didn't you put down your name to this and agree that I would speak last tonight?

Now, then, for some questions. Brother Oliphant, I had some questions. Yes, Brother Oliphant, I had some questions, but did you notice Friends, that he did not answer them? He would rather talk about why I did not answer him and to quibble about this, that and the other than answer plain questions I had written down. To show you that I want to be fair, I will be glad to give him a chance to take time out and answer them tomorrow night. For my part, I am enjoying this debate and believe it is doing great good. Since he is so much afraid of what I may say to them, I think he had better answer them tomorrow night. And I would like for him to answer those questions anyway. They are on this debate, and are talking about this believer, too.

Incidentally, Brother Oliphant said, and I say, too, that the baptized believer is saved. I say so, too. Fine, I say so, too! I can shake hands with you on that and call you "brother." Why don't you call me "brother"? I was baptized, and I am a believer. Why, sure!

Now when was Paul born again? Did you notice my friend, Brother Oliphant, read the definition of this Greek word *ektroma* and the authority he mentioned does expressly say that the Greek word *ektroma* does mean *an abortion,* or *one born out of due time.* Both of those fit together. He does not deny that. Now answer me, when a child is born out of due time, tell me this, is it born ahead of time or after? Is not an abortion always before the time? Now this Greek word is very clear on that, and the authority he mentioned himself said so. Paul says here that he was born again and his birth was a salvation ahead of the time when all the Jews are going to be saved. That Scripture does not refer to one called to the apostleship *after* the time. He was born again, saved on the road

Scanned by TLC

to Damascus, saved ahead of the nation who will be saved.

Well, here is some more. "Thus it becometh us" to be baptized, Jesus said. Brother Oliphant said it becomes us, and said that *us* meant Jesus and John. All right, Brother Oliphant, then that righteousness was half Jesus' and half John's. And that kind of righteousness won't save anybody. No sir, it is not by works of righteousness that we are saved. Brother Oliphant, Jesus said baptism is a work of righteousness.

Brother Oliphant asked me about 1 Peter 3:21, and this time he actually read it. I am glad he read that verse, but he tried to leave out part of the same sentence again, and again he said baptism saves us. He left out part of what the Savior put in there—"*THE LIKE FIGURE* whereunto even baptism doth also now save us. ." That is the reason I say baptism is a figure. Now my Brother Oliphant asks, "If baptism isn't to get your sins remitted, what is it for?" 1 Peter 3:21 tells. It is a figure of how people are saved. Romans 6:5 says also that it is a "LIKENESS of his death," and a "LIKENESS of his resurrection!" That is what the Bible says baptism is for, Brother Oliphant.

You say it is the baptism for remission of sins. Yes, if you mean by it what the Bible means by it, I will take that too. Sure. My friend Brother Oliphant, said on that matter, "I have examined twenty-five translations of the Bible." I am glad he did. He gave us what two translations give about the word *eis* in Acts 2:38. He said in that case not one of them say *because of*. Now, Brother Oliphant, not one of them said, *in order to*. Not one said, "In order to!" "Baptized unto the remission of sins." What does that mean? Would that not mean *pointing to, with reference to, with a view to, looking toward?*

While we are on that, "baptized unto the remission of sins," let me remind you that actually the Greek word *eis* is translated twenty-five times *against*. *Against* remission not in order to obtain remission. Baptized *among*. *Eis* is translated sixteen times *among*. Baptized *among* the remis-

Scanned by TLC

sion of your sins. That is the way I was baptized. I already had remission of sins. Another twenty times in the New Testament the Greek word *eis* is translated *at*. Baptized *at* the remission of sins. That is the way I was baptized. I already had my sins remitted. 131 times that Greek word is translated *in*. Baptized *in* the remission of sins. In that remission I was baptized. In that happy state with sins blotted out, I was baptized. Here is another one. Fifty-seven times that Greek word is translated *on*. "Baptism *on* the remission of sins"—that was the way I was baptized. My sins already remitted, I was baptized *on* that remission of sins. This is not just a joke or a wisecrack. Here is some more. There is a lot of it. Notice this, twenty-five times in the New Testament the Greek word *eis* is translated *upon*. "Be baptized *upon* the remission of sins," then, we might translate Acts 2:38! That is the way I was baptized, *upon* the remission of my sins.

Now, Brother Oliphant, in all of these words into which the Greek word *eis* is translated, show me one time in any of the twenty-five versions that you say you examined, where it says, "Baptized *in order to* the remission of sins." It does not say it! Brother Oliphant himself bearing witness, it does not say it, and it does not mean it, neither in English nor Bohemian, Brother Oliphant, nor in the original Greek. No, it does not!

Here is some more. Brother Oliphant indicated that in 1 Peter 3:21 the Lord meant that a good conscience came after baptism. No, No, read it and see.

"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Brother Oliphant, the one Scripturally baptized must already have a good conscience—a conscience purged from dead works, the Scripture says. That good conscience only comes when God cleanses and forgives the sinner. One who already has a good conscience, answers to God by baptism.

Scanned by TLC

That verse says nothing about a good conscience after baptism. And then that one is baptized as the answer of that good conscience. That is the reason baptism is a picture of salvation. One must have a good conscience before he can answer Scripturally by baptism.

Brother Oliphant said the flood did save Noah. Brother Oliphant is even talking about the literal saving of his life. Well, I had always thought the ark was the way he was saved. If you mean that literally and are taking that physical part of it, then if the flood saved, everybody in the world was saved, because they were all in the flood. No, the flood did not save Noah. The eight souls were not saved by water except in a figure of speech. No more does baptism save us except in a like figure. That is the reason the Lord said in 1 Peter 3:21: "*The like figure* whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Baptism is a figure or picture of salvation, but does not really put away the filth of the fleshly nature. Instead, this verse says it is the answer of a conscience already cleansed from this filth of the fleshly nature. Baptism pictures a salvation already obtained.

Here is another of Brother Oliphant's statements. He said, "Baptism for remission of sins." He said, "Let me use one like it." "The walls of Jericho fell down." Where is that like it? Huh? Where is that like it? Huh? Yes, sir, and Jim climbed a tree, too, but that is not like this. That is not like this question here of baptism of repentance. He said here (hand me that Concordance, please. Thank you, Dr. Oliphant). He said everywhere the word *eis* is used, every passage where it is found, it is translated a certain way, etc., but he gave you only one of the some fifteen different ways it is translated. He ought to look a little further. It tells about that here in Young's Analytical Concordance. If you look over in the back, page 67 of the Index-Lexicon you will find where the original Greek word

Scanned by TLC

eis is given and you can find how many times it is translated as other words. Find those other uses also, Brother Oliphant, and you will not make that mistake again.

He talked about our Roman Catholic friends praying and made fun of them, because I said if you rely on baptism for salvation, that was like the Roman Catholics praying and counting beads, and relying on that for salvation. I have a lot of Roman Catholic friends, but I know counting beads will not save them. Their doctrine is wrong. They think you cannot be saved without baptism. They think that one is saved in the act of baptism. My friend here thinks the same thing. They do not believe that baptism saves alone, nor does he. They do not believe that the water literally washes away sins, nor does he. But you are both wrong to believe that salvation comes in the act of baptism or any other external form to cure the sickness of the soul. My friends, listen; I respect the Roman Catholics and I say many a sincere Roman Catholic thinks he is doing the will of God when he counts his beads. There is more said in the Bible about praying than there is about being baptized. But neither saves without faith in Christ. God saves by faith in Christ, whether one consciously prays or is baptized or not.

Here is another. Brother Oliphant says baptism is mentioned first in six verses of Scripture, and salvation is mentioned second. I can show you passage after passage where baptism and Jesus are mentioned together and baptism comes first. Does that mean that baptism comes before Jesus? Is baptism more important than Christ? It is with a lot of people, but that is a mighty poor way to prove anything by the Bible! The fact of the business is, when the Bible mentions, "Baptized into Christ," that does not mean that baptism comes before Christ. It does not mean baptism comes first. "Baptized into his death" does not mean baptized into the death of Christ before Christ died. That is a mighty poor way of handling the Scriptures. My brother, like Job, multiplies words without knowledge!

Scanned by TLC

He said the publican was already a child of God, because he was circumcised. All right, Brother Oliphant, if that were true, everyone of those Pharisees that crucified Jesus Christ were circumcised. Therefore they were Christians. You do not believe that, and you ought not to have said that. That is not an honest handling of the Scriptures. No, my Brother Oliphant does not believe that everybody that is circumcised is saved, and he ought not to have said that. I say again that that is not an honest handling of the Scriptures. There is not one shadow or color in the Scriptures that would indicate that the publican was already saved. That publican was not saved. Jesus did not say that he was. That Pharisee standing there beside him who knew him did not indicate it. And he himself said that he was a sinner. The Pharisee said, "I am glad I am not a sinner like this man is." But you say this publican was saved because he was circumcised. He said of the publican, "I know he was saved because he was circumcised. The reason I know he was circumcised is that the only people who came in the temple were those that had been circumcised." Therefore, you call him a child of God. Nowhere in the Bible does it say people are saved by circumcision, or are children of God by circumcision. People never were saved by circumcision. My Brother does not believe that either. That is not an honest handling of the Scriptures. The fact of the business is, Brother Oliphant is between a rock and a hard place. Because a man came in a sinner and went down to his house justified, Brother Oliphant said to himself, "What will I do? I am in a hard place. That guy is not even baptized; I will have to make him already saved somewhere else back yonder." That is poor ground for Bible believers to found a doctrine on!

Notice another thing. He did not refer to that woman in the 7th chapter of Luke to whom Jesus said, "Thy faith hath saved thee." A woman came in a lost sinner, an openly shameful sinner, but she went home saved. Jesus said she was saved! He said it was her faith that saved

Scanned by TLC

her! Brother Oliphant did not even mention or refer to it. Why didn't he refer to that case? He could not unless he admitted it, and he did not want to admit it.

He got around and mentioned about Cornelius, and read Acts 10:43; where Peter preached to them about Jesus, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." All the prophets agree that one can be saved only by faith! Brother Oliphant said they were baptized and he did not refer to the fact that the Scriptures teach they were converted and that the Holy Ghost came on them as it did on the apostles at Pentecost. They were saved before baptism! They got the same gift of the Spirit that Peter got, and that was all the evidence Peter needed. Later on, Peter commanded them to be baptized. Baptism followed. That is fine. It did with me, too. That is what it ought to do, too. It did in that case. You are wrong, Brother Oliphant, when you say there is not a case in the Bible where it shows clearly that people were saved before baptism. They were in this case and it is this side of Pentecost, too. Cornelius was saved first and then baptized.

Brother Oliphant said when Jesus saw their faith in Mark 2nd chapter, that he saw some outward act, because you can't see faith in the heart. Brother Oliphant is in another hard place. That is one reason he has been aching so. He doesn't like it because I am speaking last. I knew last week that he would speak last. I never complained about it. I knew that he would when he signed up for it. He spoke last all last week and I am to speak last this week. That is all right. It wouldn't matter, if he wants to change it around some other way to get some advantage in the matter, I will be glad to do it. I am not afraid of the truth in the matter. He feels mighty bad about it. But here is the trouble. In Mark 2nd chapter, "Jesus saw their faith." Brother Oliphant said, "Can you see faith in the heart?" No. I can't. And I can't forgive sins either, but Jesus can and he can heal. Jesus can do both. Do you deny that?

Scanned by TLC

Jesus knows the hearts of all men. The second chapter of John says: (John 2:25)

"And needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man."

Of course Jesus saw their faith. Of course he did! Well, now listen, Brother Oliphant said Jesus saw some outward act. Did he see them baptized? That is what you are trying to prove. Was that the way Jesus did it, and therefore knew their sins were forgiven? The Scriptures say nothing about it. There is not a hint of that there. The fact of the business is, here is a case he can't get around, and my brother is in a hard place, and that is the reason he is skipping here and yonder, waving his hands around and sweating. God bless him, I don't want to make fun of him. I don't mean it that way, but that is the reason it is hurting him about me having the last speech. This man in Mark 2 was saved without baptism. Jesus plainly tells us that he was saved, and he was not baptized at the time. No.

Here is another. Brother Oliphant said, "Faith without works is dead." All right, Brother Oliphant, why don't you go back and see exactly what that Scripture says. Read James 2:14-26 in detail. Why don't you go and see what it says? James 2:18 says we are justified in the sight of men by works. But Galatians 3:11 and Romans 3:20 plainly say that we are not justified "in the sight of God" by works. I read it in detail and hoped you would take it up. I knew you wouldn't mention it if you could help it. I did not have much hope for it. I knew you would miss it if you could. The case in Romans 4th chapter, I read in detail where the inspired apostle Paul plainly says: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth." That was faith without works. Now Brother Oliphant, I did not put that in there. "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Romans 4:5). "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of (pronounces blessing upon) the man,

Scanned by TLC

unto whom God imputeth (reckoneth) righteousness without (apart from) works" (Romans 4:6). That did not say works were included in it. And Paul goes on to say that justification without works was not only so about Abraham but about all the rest of us, not only of the circumcision, but the uncircumcision, too.

Romans 4:9:

"Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness."

And verse 11 says:

"And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also."

If any one is ever saved, it will be on the same basis as Abraham, "to him that believeth." Did Abraham work for salvation? He believed to be sure, and he did many good works, sure. But his faith was counted to him for righteousness (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:3). I believe in doing good works, but not for salvation. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. 4:5). The only righteousness I have, or my brother has, is that he trusted in Jesus who justifies the ungodly. We are all ungodly as far as our old nature is concerned. God imputes to us the righteousness of Christ when we worked not, but believed on him who justifies the ungodly. Brother Oliphant did not refer to that at all, that the man who puts his faith in Christ, his faith is counted to him for righteousness, without works. Without works! That is on the debate, too. In men's eyes we are justified or counted righteous by works, but in the sight of God, it is purely of faith.

Well, my friends, here is another thing. I have charged in every speech I have made that this whole system which

Scanned by TLC

Brother Oliphant has is a good works plan of salvation, of works, not grace; of man, not of God. From the first speech, I have repeated it every time I have spoken. Brother Oliphant did not refer to it or deny it. He can't deny it. I am sure he would not deny it since he is an honest man. But he has stayed off of it. If I were as badly scared as he, I bet I would, too. I charged that from the beginning. The fact of the business is, this statement of his plainly says baptism is essential to salvation from past or alien sins, and it expressly implies, at least, that there are a lot of other things essential beyond baptism for other sins. I charged that, and he did not deny it, and I read from their own official publication such statements. I refer to the publication of the Gospel Advocate, the quarterly taught in their Sunday Schools. He defended it; said it was all right; said they were teaching the Bible in that quarterly, which says, if you don't live a life conformed to the will of Christ until the hour of death, and goes on and says in every thought and word and act and feeling and deed, until the hour of death, then he says you will be lost. I maintain and I have in every speech, and he hasn't denied it, that the whole system is a system of salvation by works. And Brother Oliphant does not believe that baptism settles it, unless you keep knocking along working, working, working until the hour of death. The whole business he has been teaching here is a business of salvation by works, taking the glory from Jesus and putting it on man!

His proposition is the same as it was yonder with Cain and Abel. Abel, by faith, looked to the blood, and Cain, without faith, brought things of his own toil. That was the same in the temple where the Pharisee would not call his brother "brother." Neither were saved, but were both Jews and the Pharisee should have called him "brother," at least. But instead, he said, "I am glad I am not as that other man is." He counted himself righteous. He had some ceremonies. He had the good works that this quarterly says about this proposition. But he was not saved. Here

Scanned by TLC

is the poor publican. He asked God to have mercy on him, and God saved him. If there was anything this publican did to merit it, it wasn't hinted at. No, baptism is not there! And he went down to his house justified without the rest of the things Brother Oliphant believes are necessary. I believe in doing good works, but not in order to get God to do what he said he would do free. Now I charge that Brother Oliphant's plan of salvation is like Cain's and like the Pharisee's; it is of works instead of grace.

Mark 16:16. Well, my friend, Brother Oliphant, is afraid of what I am going to say on that, too. And well he might be. There is so much here. I wish I had a chance to spend another night or two, as I wanted to. This Scripture will teach one thing. The more you go into it, the more you learn. A man that believes has everlasting life, is already born of God.

Mark 16:16, read it now:

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

You say, "Do you believe that?" Yes, I certainly do, and I take it at face value, too. It means what it says, and says what it means. Notice carefully, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." I believed and I have been baptized, and I am saved. That is what all of our people believe and that is what I have always preached. Why not? Notice the form here. Brother Oliphant, this Scripture does NOT say "He that believes and is baptized shall *then* be saved." It did not say that and did not meant that. It meant what it said. The Scripture did not say that, Brother Oliphant. It is in exact harmony with what is said in every other place in the Bible where a person is commanded to believe. When he believes, he is saved, says John 5:24, and so do many other Scriptures. When he is baptized he is still saved, says Mark 16:16.

You say, "Here is a man who asks, "What must I do to be saved?" in Acts 2:37. No, that is not the question that is there asked and is answered in Acts 2:38. There is only

Scanned by TLC

one time in the Scripture where the question is asked, "What must I do to be saved?" That is in Acts 16:30, and the very next verse gives the answer so plain no one can misunderstand it, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts 2:38 answers another question, not that one.

But notice an important point about the question, "What must I do to be saved?" *To* here certainly means *in order to*. But the Greek word for *in order to* or *to* in the question, "What must I do to be saved?" is *hina*, not *eis*. *Hina* means *in order to*. *Eis* does not mean *in order to*. That is the way the Holy Spirit himself used it. If God had meant, "Be baptized *in order to* the remission of sins," he would have used the Greek word *hina* as he did in Acts 16:30, talking about "What must I do *TO* BE SAVED!" *Eis* does not mean *in order to*. If he had wanted *eis* to mean *in order to* in Acts 2:38, some of the translators would have translated it so in some of those twenty-five versions examined by Brother Oliphant. But they didn't. In the case in Acts 16:30 this is *in order to*, God said, but the Greek word is not *eis* but *hina*, another word of design or purpose. "In order to be saved, what must I do?" God did not use that in Acts 2:38. He did not mean that to be *in order to* but *to point to* or *refer to* or *look toward* remission of sins already obtained. Look in Acts 16:30, you find the term there *to be saved*, and the Greek word is *hina*, a word of design and purpose, and is not *eis* at all. God could have used *hina* in Acts 2:38 had he meant *in order to*, and there would have been no doubt, no argument at all about what it meant. *Hina* would prove that he meant, "Be baptized *in order to* be saved," but the Lord did not use that. He used *eis, referring to* remission, not *hina, in order to* remission.

Some of my Methodist friends say, "I believe that baptism could mean sprinkling and pouring." And I say to my Methodist friends, "If God had meant sprinkle, he had a

Scanned by TLC

word for sprinkling, didn't he? He could have used it. But he didn't, he used *baptizo* meaning primarily to dip, to plunge, to immerse. I say the same thing to you, brother. God had a word meaning *in order to* and he could have used it if he had meant that. But he did not use it, Brother Hines. He did not use it, Brother Pullias. God had a word he could have used there, and there would not have been any mistake about it if that were what he meant. When God means *in order to be saved,* he did use *hina* elsewhere in the Bible. Again and again and again many times, hundreds of times in the Bible he used *hina,* meaning *in order to.* And in this case he could have satisfied you folks and proved your point, but God did not do that. The reason he did not do it was because he did not mean that.

But back here in Mark 16:16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." That is given in the Great Commission. In that commission the Lord commanded Christians to go into all the world and preach the gospel. That preaching was still future, and "he that believeth" was still future. "He that is baptized" was still future. It is future all the way through. Nobody would deny that of course. The Lord plainly says that in the future you are going to see folks trust the Lord and be baptized. Those folks will be saved and that isn't all, some will go on living for the Lord. That is still future. Sure. They will in the future go to church, and some will in the future partake of the Lord's supper, and pay their debts, etc., and they will still be saved. Why, certainly, I believe that. Take it at face value and do not try to make it contradict John 5:24 and what Paul said to the jailor in Acts 16:31. If you want to know what to do to be saved, Jesus said in the gospel of John, "He that believeth on the Son has it." In Acts 13:39, the Bible says, "All that believeth are justified." That is when salvation is settled. Brother Oliphant will come along and say the jailor was baptized. Yes—but he was still saved when he was baptized though. He was saved when

Scanned by TLC

he believed, and he was still saved when he was baptized too. Brother Oliphant, that is on the matter of his eternal security. We will get more of that tomorrow night.

(Moderator: You have five minutes).

(Dr. Rice: Thank you).

No, sir, No, sir! Mark 16:16 is no new plan of salvation! It is not any different from that which Paul gave the jailor, and what Jesus gave in John 3:16. Here is a simple statement. You say, "Brother Rice, do you believe "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved?" Sure. That is a simple future statement, and I say frankly that I believe a man who believes and is baptized shall be saved. I preach it all the time. But you say, "Brother Rice, will you allow us to put a word or two in there? 'He that believeth and is baptized shall THEN be saved?'" No, I will not allow you to put that in there. God would have said that himself if he had meant that. But he did not say it and he did not say it anywhere else, he did not mean it anywhere else either. He meant just what he said. He meant the same as Paul told the jailor, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." He meant as in John 3:16 when he said:

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

He meant the same as in John 3:18.

"He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

He meant the same as in John 5:24.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

To be sure, it is the same plan of salvation everywhere.

Well, my friend said that the Lord commanded, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." And he says

Scanned by TLC

Paul's sins were washed away in baptism. The Bible does not say anything of the kind! What it does say is that *Paul* said that *Ananias* said, "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." He didn't say they would be washed away in the act of baptism. It does not say that, and it does not mean that. Paul was born when he saw the Lord. The Scripture says so. The divinely inspired Scripture says so. Ananias called him "Brother" before he was baptized. "Brother Saul," "Brother Saul." Ananias came "that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost" (Acts 9:17), that is all. He was already saved, but not baptized. Barnabas told the apostles at Jerusalem (Acts 9:27) that Paul was saved on the road to Damascus.

You need not be fraid to take what the Scripture says! You say, "How do you know he was saved?" He saw the Lord on the way to Damascus! He was saved when he saw the Lord. I want to tell you this, my friend. I do not care how much water you have been through, if you did not see Jesus Christ, you are lost. Oh, my friends, may God help you to get Jesus in your hearts.

I accepted this proposition to debate these subjects because I wanted to preach the gospel by blood and faith—not by water and works. I am glad to debate them. I am glad to defend this doctrine of salvation through faith, not of works. This is not a new thing for me to press this thing openly and boldly. It is new for me to have a public debate of this kind. There are some advantages and some disadvantages. But I welcome the opportunity to say to you, as I have said all these years, that I know you can understand what the Bible teaches. And the Bible teaches that salvation is "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us." Baptism is a work of righteousness, for Jesus said, "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." The "us" meant more than one, more than Jesus, and must include some human righteousness in baptism, and that cannot save us

Scanned by TLC

nor help save us. We are not saved by the righteousness of both John and Jesus, not by the works of preachers that baptize us, nor by our righteousness in being baptized. People are not saved by works of righteousness. John was a human being, and salvation was not by John's righteousness, not by the righteousness of the candidate and the preacher nor of either one. No, Titus 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."

So I beg people to turn to God and trust Him for salvation on the basis of his righteousness alone.

The other day, about a week before this debate began, a young woman was in my home, and I said to her, "Do you love the Lord?"

She said, "Sure." But she was cut to the heart, and went on home.

I asked this question honestly, and I asked Brother Oliphant if he has trusted Christ and been saved. But my brother, what I am asking is this: Brother Oliphant, won't you tell us whether you have had a supernatural change of heart? I don't care who you are, there will be many who will come one day and say, "Lord, Lord open to us," but Jesus will answer: "I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." If you have not been born again, if God has not made a change in your heart, Brother, water won't help, and nothing else will. If you have not one day met Jesus Christ, if you have not been born of the Spirit and he has not made you a partaker of the divine nature, you are a lost sinner!

And that young woman (I suppose she is here tonight) who was cut to the heart, said to herself, "I have been baptized, and I have been trying to live right," but she knew she had not been made a new creature. She got down her Bible and read and prayed, and after a couple of hours of investigation, she settled the matter and got peace. I think she is here tonight.

Scanned by TLC

I have met this kind again and again, and there are many people here tonight, members of the "Church of Christ," and members of Christian churches, and they are honest, good people like many of you. They take the Lord's supper, but many of them do not know that they have a personal acquaintance with the Savior. They do not know that he has changed their hearts by supernatural conversion.

Again and again people tell me, "How happy I am since I know that my salvation is settled. I had been baptized, but was not saved until I heard your plain teaching and trusted Christ alone." Mrs. Hardesty said it again and again, and that dear girl, Ina Bell, said so too.

Is Ina Bell here tonight?

(Miss Ina Bell Crosswhite stands).

(Turning to Miss Crosswhite) "That is true, isn't it?"

Miss Crosswhite: "Yes, Sir."

God bless you.

Many former "Church of Christ" people say that God has changed their hearts by supernatural conversion after they learned this truth, and again and again they tell me so.

Moderator: "Your time is up."

Moderator J. B. Nelson:

The proposition to be discussed tomorrow evening will be: "The Scriptures Teach that a Child of God, One Who Has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ, Can so Sin as to Be Finally Lost."

W. L. Oliphant leads, and John R. Rice denies.

Two evenings will be given to this proposition, and that will close the discussion. This discussion is to be published in book form. You can order from Dr. Rice or from Brother G. H. P. Showalter. You can order the books from either of them. Come, and be with us tomorrow evening.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Seventh Session: 7:30 p. m., January 24, 1935.

FOURTH PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach that a Child of God Who has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ Can So Sin as to be Finally Lost.*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

Opening remarks by the moderator for the affirmative, J. B. Nelson:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Before we have the prayer service and while we are getting ready for the discussion tonight, I want us to take up a collection to bear the expenses brought about by this discussion. This is an extraordinarily large tabernacle, and it has cost a considerable amount to light and heat it. These disputants will agree that there has been a considerable amount of gas used during this discussion. We want to pay for the artificial gas! I want to say to the members of the church of Christ that we are not expecting the Baptist people to bear this expense. If the debate had been held in our building, Dr. Rice and his people would have been glad, I am sure, to have helped us bear the expense. It is not a question of supporting any doctrine; it is a matter of taking care of the incidental expense. I am going to ask you people to help pay for the lights and gas furnished by the Public Utilities; Rice and Oliphant agree that you can have the other gas free!

At this time Brother Roy E. Cogdill, of Sears & Summitt

Scanned by TLC

church of Christ, will lead the prayer while we stand, if you will.

(After the prayer Brother Nelson continues.)

We are, indeed, thankful and grateful for another excellent audience. The attendance, even during the severe weather, has been wonderful. I doubt if there has been less than eighteen hundred people here at any service—probably twenty-five hundred at some of the services. Tomorrow evening will close the discussion. Two evenings will be devoted to the subject now before us.

"The Scriptures Teach that a Child of God Who has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ Can so Sin as to be Finally Lost." W. L. Oliphant affirms; John R. Rice denies. In two thirty-minute speeches each, they will speak tonight upon this subject and in the same manner tomorrow night, at which time the discussion will come to a close. W. L. Oliphant will now take the floor for a thirty-minute speech.

(First Affirmative Speech by W. L. Oliphant.)

Brother Chairman, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you to make the opening speech on the proposition that was read in your hearing a few minutes ago. I do not think it necessary that I spend a great deal of time in defining the terms of the proposition. They are very clear and plain within themselves. By "scriptures," I mean the word of God. "By teach," I mean to directly state or logically point to such conclusion. By "child of God," I mean, as is stated in the proposition, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ. I do not know how to make the term plainer. "Can sin." Please notice the proposition does not say that the child of God will sin, does sin, or must sin, but that he can sin: that is, it is possible for him to sin. By "sin," I mean to transgress the law of God, to be guilty of unrighteousness. By "finally lost," I mean eternally lost in hell. That it is possible for a child of God to sin to that extent that he will be lost in

Scanned by TLC

hell, is my proposition. Before entering into my affirmative argument, I want to give my friend a few more questions—since he likes questions so well!

In the opening of my affirmation on the baptism question, I asked him several questions. I repeated them in every speech I made and finally reduced them to writing and handed them to him, but they were never answered or even mentioned by my opponent. I hope he will treat me nicer tonight, and at least try to answer my questions.

The Doctor thinks I complained because he has the last speech. No, I understood when the propositions were signed that he would have the last speech. What I do urge is that it is not fair for him to leave arguments made in my first speech until his last speech and then attempt to answer them, when I can have no opportunity to examine his replies. I hope he will not act that way in the discussion of this question.

Now, Doctor, these questions I am going to ask you are not mere trick questions. He complains that I ask him trick questions. Well, he boasted early in the debate that he had pulled a trick on me. The thing that worries my friend is that his trick didn't work. These are simple straightforward questions, and I know he can answer them correctly. I can answer any question in the world correctly; I may have to say "I don't know," but that will be correct! So, Friend Rice, you can answer these questions in some manner. Most of them can be answered with a simple "yes," "no," or "I don't know."

(1) Can a child of God call his brother a fool?
(2) Can a child of God get drunk?
(3) If so, can he die while drunk?
(4) Can one be saved away from the grace of God?
(5) Can one be saved without faith?
(6) Is the child or God a free moral agent?
(7) Is the righteousness revealed in the gospel man's righteousness or God's righteousness?

Scanned by TLC

I patiently await an answer.

Since much of this discussion will probably hinge upon the question of when the child of God receives eternal life, I want to get before you the Bible teaching on that question in the very beginning. It is not my purpose to array scripture against scripture. I do not believe the word of God contradicts itself. I believe everything the Bible teaches. It will do you no good for me to quote a set of scriptures and my friend come along and quote another set of scriptures which seem to conflict with the ones I quote. This would please no one but infidels.

Now the Bible teaches that the child of God will be given eternal life in the world to come. Let me read you some scriptures on this point.

(1) In hope of eternal life. "Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect . . . in hope of eternal life which God promised before times eternal" (Titus 1:1, 2). Note: we do not hope for things we possess. "But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it" (Romans 8:25). (2) Eternal life in the end. "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life" (Romans 6:22). (3) Lay hold on eternal life. "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou also art called" (1 Timothy 6:12). (4) Renders eternal life: "Who will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life" (Romans 2:6, 7). (5) In the world to come. "Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life" (Mark

Scanned by TLC

10:29, 30). (6) Final reward. Of the final judgment it is said: "And these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal" (Matthew 25:46).

In these scriptures we are told that Christians hope for eternal life. There must be some sense in which we do not now possess it. We are told that eternal life comes at the "end." A young preacher is urged to lay hold on the life eternal. We are told that God will render eternal life at the judgment; that the righteous will go into life eternal at the judgment; that eternal life is to be given in the world to come. It is made very clear that the Christian enters into eternal life after he has served the Lord to the end of earth's way. I hope my friend will try to harmonize these scriptures with his position or give up his position.

I know there are a number of statements in the Bible which seem to indicate that the child of God already has eternal life; for instance, John 5:24, John 3:16, and others which might be cited. Now I am sure these two groups of scriptures do not contradict each other. Since it is plainly taught that we do not receive eternal life until we reach the world to come, let us see if we can find what these passages mean. I think we can find the explanation in 1 John 1:1-3; let us read it. "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes; that which we beheld and our hands handled concerning the Word of life; (For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and *show unto you that eternal life*, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;) That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and wnth his Son Jesus Christ." Here Christ is called eternal life. "He that hath the Son hath life" (1 John 5:12). Christ dwells in the Christian (Colossians 1:27). The Christian is said to have eternal life, because he dwells

Scanned by TLC

in Christ—who is eternal life. But dwelling in Christ is conditional. "Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father" (1 John 2:24). Thus we see why the next verse calls eternal life a promise. "And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life" (1 John 2:25).

There is a sense in which every Christian has eternal life. Christ is eternal life; the Christian abides in Christ and Christ in him. But since the Christian's abiding in Christ is conditional, eternal life is also conditional and is spoken of as a promise. The Christian does not have eternal life independently and unconditionally until he reaches "the world to come" (Mark 10:30). So eternal life in the actual sense, possessed by an individual in his own right, is a promise to be fulfilled in the world to come. I want to make this matter as clear as possible in the very beginning, and I hope that my friend will deal with these arguments instead of merely quoting those scriptures which speak of eternal life in the present tense.

Furthermore, I explained, in affirming on baptism, that I do not believe that the sinner is saved by his own righteousness, and now I want it understood that I do not contend that the Christian is saved by his own righteousness —self-righteousness.

Let us distinguish between the righteousness of God and the righteousness of man. Psalms 119:172: "My tongue shall speak of thy word: for all thy commandments are righteousness." In keeping the commandments of God, I am not depending upon my own righteousness, but upon the righteousness of God. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every man that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For *therein* is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall

Scanned by TLC

live by faith" (Romans 1:16, 17). Now the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel; so when one does the things commanded in the gospel, he is doing the righteousness of God. I hope my friend will not waste time by reading the scriptures which teach that Christians do not receive eternal life on the basis of their own righteousness. I readily accept this fact. The question is, can we be saved if we depart from God's righteousness?

I think it will be admitted that we cannot be saved apart from Christ. "Without me ye can do nothing," said Jesus (John 15:5). But in John 6:66, we read: "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him." Some of Christ's disciples departed from him. For how long did they cease to walk with him? Answer: They walked "no more with him." (1) One cannot be saved without Christ. (2) Some of Christ's disciples forever separated themselves from him. (3) Therefore, some of Christ's disciples were eternally lost. Again, "Christ is become of no effect unto you" (R. V. "Ye are severed from Christ."), "whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Galatians 5:4). Christians may be severed from Christ, therefore lost. They may fall from grace. We cannot be saved except by grace. Therefor those who fall away from grace are lost.

We all believe in salvation by faith. Let us see some of the things which can happen to the Christian's faith. (1) Overthrown. "Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some" (2 Timothy 2:18). (2) Cast off. "Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith" (1 Timothy 5:12). (3) Depart from. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils" (1 Timothy 4:1). (4) Made shipwreck. "Holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck"

Scanned by TLC

(1 Timothy 1:19). The child of God is saved by his faith, but his faith may be overthrown, lost, cast off, departed from, or made shipwreck; therefore, he may be lost. Faith is the only vessel which can carry the child of God from earth to heaven. If that vessel is wrecked, he can never reach the haven. No other vessel travels that way. Paul plainly says that the individual who casts off his faith has damnation. I need not introduce another passage of scripture; my proposition is proved.

In explaining the parable of the sower, Jesus said the seed is the word of God; the soil is human hearts. Of one type of soil he said, "They on the rock are they, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away" (Luke 8:13). These people, first, received the word with joy. Second, they believed. My opponent cannot say they were not saved—especially since he contends that sinners are saved the moment they believe; but these people, after believing and being saved, quit believing and "fell away." What happened to them? If they continued to be saved, it was without faith.

I want us to notice the description of some people given by Peter in the second chapter of his Second Epistle. (1) They were purchased by the Lord (Verse 1). (2) They had escaped the pollutions of the world (Verse 20). (3) After having been purchased by the Lord and having escaped the pollutions of the world, they forsook the right way and went astray, loved the ways of unrighteousness. (Verse 15). (4) They became cursed children, presumptuous, self-willed, despisers of government, like beasts, rioters, spots and blemishes, deceivers, adulterers, wells without water, clouds carried with the tempest, worse than they were at the beginning, and so bad that it had been better for them to have never known the way of righteousness. (5) They are to be finally lost: "And shall receive the reward of unrighteousness" (Verse 13). "Bring upon

Scanned by TLC

themselves swift destruction" (Verse 1). It would be hard to imagine a plainer case of apostasy than this. That these were children of God cannot be reasonably denied, and that they were finally lost is plainly stated.

I invite your attention to Luke 12:43-47: "Blessed is *that servant, whom* his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath. But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; The lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers. And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes." The Lord's own servant is the one under consideration. The Lord suggests two possibilities. First, if the servant obeys his Lord, he will be made ruler. Second, "But and if that servant"—What servant? The same servant who might have become ruler—if that servant says in his heart, "My Lord deelayeth his coming," and goes into sin, what will happen to him when the Lord comes again? Answer: " . . . Will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with unbelievers." One is not appointed to that which he already has. The unbeliever is already condemned (John 3:18). But here is one of the Lord's own servants who goes into sin and is appointed a place with the unbeliever. The place of the unbeliever is a place of damnation. "He that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16). But our Lord tells us that the unfaithful servant will be appointed a place with the unbeliever; that is a place of damnation. If this passage does not teach that a child of God may be lost, I want my friend to tell us what it does teach.

I next introduce the parable of the talents (Matthew

Scanned by TLC

25:14-30). The parable begins: "For the kingdom of heaven is as a man traveling into a far country, who called his *own* servants, and delivered unto them his goods." Those under consideration are the Lord's own servants, those to whom he entrusts his goods. At his second coming, the Lord reckons with these servants. One of them has proved unprofitable. What happens to him? Answer: "And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." (1) Those reckoned with are the Lord's own servants. (2) One of these servants was finally lost. (3) Therefore, a servant of the Lord may so sin as to be finally lost.

In the 15th chapter of John, verses 1-10, Jesus gives us another very striking lesson along this line. "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and ever branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you. Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." Let us look at the passage. (1) Jesus is the vine. (2) The Father is the husbandman. (3) The branches are children of God. (4) The branches are in Christ. (5) The branches

Scanned by TLC

that bear fruit God purges. (6) The branches are clean. (7) The branches that bear no fruit are taken away by the Father. (8) They are gathered and burned. Certainly these branches represent saved people. They are in Christ, who is the vine. They must represent those who are saved by the blood of Christ—they are clean. But some of them are to be taken away by the Father and burned. Could anything be plainer? Is it possible for me to teach the possibility of apostasy plainer than Jesus here teaches it?

This is in harmony with Jesus' prophecy concerning the final judgment. "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; And shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew 13:41, 42).

(1) Only children of God are in the kingdom (John 3:3-5). (2) Some in the kingdom will be gathered out and cast into hell. (3) Therefore some children of God will be cast into hell.

Children of God are saved by grace. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God" (Ephesians 2:8). Now notice Galatians 5:4: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." (1) Christians are saved by grace. (2) They may fall away fro mgrace. (3) Therefore, they may be lost.

To Christians James gives an admonition: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him: Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins" (James 5:19, 20). James is writing to Christians, and it is "one of you" that may need to be converted from the "error of his way" and saved from death. The unbeliever is already dead (John 3:18). "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezekiel 18:20). It is

Scanned by TLC

the death of the soul from which James is admonishing us to save a brother . No one can save the body from death. If it is impossible for the soul of a child of God to be lost, the language of James is meaningless.

I next ask you to consider Paul's statement concerning himself: "But I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage: lest by any means after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected" (1 Cor. 9:27. R. V.). The word "rejected" comes from the Greek term which is translated "reprobate" in 2 Corinthians 13:5, 6, and means "rejected as spurious" (Thayer). Notice that it was after he had preached to others—a thing he did until the day of his death—that the apostle Paul might be rejected. (1) Paul was a child of God. (2) It was possible for Paul to be finally lost (rejected after his death). (3) Therefore, a child of God may be finally lost. If it was necessary for the great apostle Paul—the man who probably sacrificed more for the cause of Christ than any other man who has ever lived upon the earth—to buffet his body and bring it into bondage lest he be lost, certainly it behooves me to follow his advice.

My friends, I admonish you, for the sake of your own souls, that you do not depend upon the false doctrine advocated by my opponent; but that you walk in the footsteps of the great apostle to the Gentiles, always "taking heed lest you fall" (1 Corinthians 10:12).

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Seventh Session: 7:30 p. m., January 24, 1935

FOURTH PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach That a Child of God, One Who Has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ, Can so Sin as to Be Finally Lost.*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

(First Negative Address by John R. Rice.)

Mr. Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and this great congregation.

It is a great joy for me to be with you again, and may I say from my heart, I appreciate the very fine spirit that has been maintained in this debate on the whole. I appreciate my friend, Brother Oliphant. I learn he is going to leave town as soon as the debate is over. I don't think it is permanent. I don't think it permanent, and I don't take any credit for running him off! I think a lot of Brother Oliphant. I think he is a fine young man. That is the reason I am so patiently trying to teach him something! I think he is a promising young man, and I want to help him along. If I can help him out, I will. Now seriously, I greatly enjoy this debate. I enjoy being here with you and having you here with us. There are a great many happy things about this discussion. I want us to be prayerful that the dear Lord will open our hearts to his word, for his word is the way these things ought to be settled. You notice the proposition:

"The Scriptures teach that a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ, can so sin as to be finally

Scanned by TLC

lost." *The Scriptures teach.* Again I say that I believe the whole thing hinges on an honest acceptance of the Scriptures. That is true about tonight the same as other nights of this debate. May I briefly remind you, when you say, "The Scriptures teach," it does not mean that the publican was already saved because he had been circumcised when he was eight days old, as Brother Oliphant said, in order to get out of the dilemma, because the publican was not baptized before he was saved. That is not what I would say the Scriptures teach. The Scriptures certainly do not teach that anybody was ever saved in circumcision.

I say again, the heart of this question is whether the Bible means what it says, and can be taken at face value. I am coming to talk on that question. For instance, when the Scriptures say that when David went to his grave, Solomon should reign, and if he committed iniquity the Lord would chastise him, but would not cast him away, we should take what the Scriptures really teach. Matters ought not to be settled the way Brother Oliphant attempted to use those verses in 2nd Samuel 7:12-15. Brother Oliphant said that meant Jesus would have had to reign while David was in the grave. If he has no better proof than that that Jesus is reigning now, then certainly the Scriptures do not teach it. To take verses which obviously refer to Solomon, as you can see by the context, and say it means Jesus, and then use that as proof in a debate, is not following what "the Scriptures teach." Or when Brother Oliphant used Zechariah 6:12, 13, which mentions the Branch who shall be a priest upon his throne, and leaves out even part of the very same sentence in verse 11 which tells that God is speaking of "Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest," in the days of the return from captivity—when Dr. Oliphant takes out half of a sentence, says that means Christ, when the context plainly says it means another man, and then tries to prove by that that Jesus is now reigning during his high priesthood—that I say, is not an honest effort to come to what the Scriptures plainly teach. The reason

Scanned by TLC

I refer to that is, that I want you to be sure that the way these things are to be settled is by what *"the Scriptures TEACH,"* not by perverting nor twisting them.

As for Brother Oliphant, I feel very kindly toward him. I do not question his sincerity at all. None of us know until we get in a tight place like he did what we would do! Let us cast over him the mantle of charity. This is to be settled by what *the Scriptures teach!* Let's be prayerful about this tonight. The Bible can be taken at face value provided we take it that way, with humble hearts, and do not try to come with the wisdom of this world to make it fit in with our creeds.

The proposition says: "The Scriptures teach that a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ, can so sin as to be finally lost." We are talking about a child of God, one who has been born of God, a child of God, one who has had a definite experience of the new birth, not any particular kind of feeling, not particularly any process of tears and mourning, but one who has been made a new creature. I say this; that a sinner might well weep over his many sins, but his tears and mourning will not save him.

"Could my tears forever flow,
Could my zeal no languor know,
These for sin could not atone;
Thou must save, and thou alone."

God must do the saving, and he alone. And I believe that for the same reason that God does the saving it is true that a child of God, one bought by the blood of Christ, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ, as this affirmation says; that child of God can never be lost.

This is important. God must save, and God must keep. Notice the contradiction in the affirmation itself. My friend, Brother Oliphant, is not altogether accountable for that. He affirms this proposition, but I am sure he does not see the contradiction in the statement itself. Here we have a

Scanned by TLC

man for whom God does the saving and the man does the losing himself! Here is a man who turned himself over to God to save him, and God does it, and then the man beats God out of it! Notice this. This child of God was saved by the blood of Christ and then the man undoes it. Isn't that strange? So Brother Oliphant affirms. What a contradiction! Saved by grace and lost by works! Saved by God, and lost by man! Salvation that is to be settled on the basis of the blood cannot be undone on the basis of works. That confusion is the thing that was in the very heart of the last two nights debate. I said to friends, and I say again, if you get it settled on last night's subject you will be settled on this one. Intelligent, thoughtful people who see through the matter and read the Scriptures with an unbiased mind, must see that if salvation is by grace it lasts as long as the grace of God. If salvation is by man's works, it is as unstable and temporary as the works of sinful men always are. The trouble is that some people let others do their thinking for them, and some of our thinking runs in the channel of our accepted creed.

These things go together. If God does the saving, God will have to do the keeping. If we do the saving, naturally we would have to do the keeping. If salvation is by works, the keeping is by works. If we get salvation by the blood we are kept saved by the blood. Remember that that is the very heart of this question here tonight.

My friend mentions a great many questions. He begins to ask questions, and I am glad he has some questions. As far as I am concerned, I can well sympathize with Brother Oliphant's position. Brother Oliphant would rather have me answer these questions his way instead of showing what the Scriptures teach. And that is not all. All along in this debate he has been dissatisfied with the way I am doing it. I expected him to feel that way about it. He will feel worse than that before I get through with this proposition. I can ask Brother Oliphant some questions. These questions are interesting, Brother Oliphant. The questions

Scanned by TLC

I asked last night, some of them, perhaps all of them, still fit.

"Does the penitent believer have everlasting life?" That is a good one, but Brother Oliphant did not mention that. That question is still good. Not, "Is he *going* to have everlasting life?" The Savior says he HAS it.

"Can the penitent believer come into condemnation?" The Bible says he cannot.

"Is the penitent believer born of God?"

Here is another. "Was Paul born again when he saw Jesus?" The Bible says he was.

"Was the woman in Luke 7:45-50 saved when she believed?" The Bible says she was. Brother Oliphant never touched that question. He never did mention that at all. I don't blame him!

"Was the publican in the temple in Luke 18 justified or saved when he went down to his house?"

"Was the palsied man in Mark 2 saved when Jesus said, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee' when Jesus saw his faith?" Brother Oliphant said about that, "Well you can't see what is in the heart." I admit that. But Jesus can! Yes he can!

Here is another. "Do you believer in a supernatural, miraculous change of heart?" Now let me repeat that one with all my heart. This question is fitting and ought to be answered.

"Do you believe in a supernatural, or miraculous change of heart, whereby one becomes a partaker of the divine nature, and has a change of heart, referred to in the Bible as regeneration, God taking away the stony heart and giving one a heart of flesh, sometimes called circumcision of the heart?"

"Do you believe in a supernatural, (by supernatural I mean something man cannot do, something not according to laws of nature) a supernatural, or miraculous change of heart?" That is important.

Here is another. I ask these kindly with no ill will, mean-

Scanned by TLC

ing no reflection whatever. I am glad to give my own testimony concerning my own heart.

"Have you yourself ever had a supernatural change of heart and nature by faith in Jesus Christ?" Now that is important, and it is on this debate.

I am glad to have these questions also of Brother Oliphant's. I am sure he would very much like for me to come and follow his outline instead of following the Scriptures. Brother Oliphant, when we get to heaven you will know I was right. You went right on down the road and did not answer those questions. You do not quite understand them now, but when you get to heaven, you will give Christ the credit for saving you, not baptism *and* Christ. And you will give him the credit for keeping you, not your own good works.

I was glad we sang that song last night, "When We All Get to Heaven." I think Brother Oliphant is going to be there. I am quite sure I am. He does not deserve it, neither do I. He is going to say that the mercy of Christ carried him on through. I am sure Brother Oliphant and I both have done plenty to lose it all before now if it depended on our goodness. But this statement says, "Saved by the blood of Christ."

Let us get down to some things here that my friend Brother Oliphant teaches. I will read them to you. Get this thing clear. I will take a little time at the beginning to get it on your hearts straight.

Here on page 48 of this "Church of Christ" quarterly the plan of salvation Brother Oliphant defends, is shown to be a plan of salvation depending on baptism as well as many other things.

This plan of salvation, mark you, that he has been preaching, is a plan of salvation by works. Read these terms of admission which he believes are necessary to get to heaven. This "Church of Christ" quarterly names four terms, and you get accustomed to that if you read their literature.

Scanned by TLC

"The terms of admission into the kingdom of Christ are applicable to any member of any race on earth who is old enough and intelligent enough to be a gospel subject. These terms of admission are, first, a whole-hearted faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Savior of men, a genuine and thorough repentance from all known sin, a public and unequivocal confession of Jesus Christ in the presence of men as the Son of the living God, and baptism by the authority of Jesus Christ into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Compliance with these conditions brings to each one who complies with them the promise by the authority of Christ of the remission of all past sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit as an abiding and indwelling Guest and Comforter, and the promise of a home in heaven throughout the limitless ages of eternity to those who are faithful in the practice of all the Christian duties devolving upon the members of the church of Christ until the hour of death."

Now that is from this TEACHER'S GOSPEL QUARTERLY, published by Gospel Advocate Company, for October, November, December, 1930. Brother Oliphant defended it the other night. I charged in every speech the last two nights, four of them, that Brother Oliphant believed in a plan of salvation that depended on keeping every duty devolving upon the members of the "Church of Christ" until the hour of death. He has never denied it, and now that is what he practically affirms. Yes, sir! What is it? That is works salvation, that is, salvation that you earn. That is the same plan of salvation that men have tried to use from the time of Cain who would not bring a bloody lamb, to the time of the Pharisees who stood in the temple and boasted he was better than other men, and bragged about his giving, and bragged about the rest of his good deeds. That is the plan of salvation Brother Oliphant believes in.

Here is another passage in this TEACHER'S QUARTERLY. Turn to page 76, of this "Church of Christ" Quarter-

Scanned by TLC

ly, which Brother Oliphant endorses. This quarterly teaches salvation that you get by your works and must keep by your works.

"WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A CHRISTIAN"

"To be a Christian means that one has obeyed the gospel of Christ, which is the power of God unto salvation, to the point that he has reached the promise of Jesus that he is saved. The four steps included in this obedience are: First, that he must believe with all his heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God; second, that he must genuinely and truly repent of all past sins; thirdly, and he must confess with his mouth in the presence of men the faith that is in his heart; and, fourthly, and he must be buried in baptism by the command of Jesus Christ into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. One who has taken these four steps is a Christian. He has the promise of Jesus that he is saved from all past sins, and that these sins will never be remembered against him forever. HAVING BECOME A CHRISTIAN, TO BE A CHRISTIAN MEANS THAT HE MUST LIVE A LIFE CONFORMED IN THOUGHT, FEELING, PURPOSE, WORD, AND DEED TO THE WILL OF CHRIST AS EXPRESSED IN THE TEACHING OF GOD'S WORD. These Scriptures are sufficient to perfect him and to thoroughly furnish him unto all good works. These Scriptures teach him that THERE ARE FIVE ACTS OF PUBLIC WORSHIP WHICH HE MUST PAY REGULARLY TO THE LORD ON THE FIRST DAY OF EVERY WEEK. These five acts are: First, to attend upon the teaching or preaching of God's word either as a preacher, a teacher, or a hearer; second, that he must unite in teaching and admonishing himself and his fellow Christians by singing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in his heart to the Lord, singing and making melody in his heart to God; thirdly, he must unite in public prayer with his fellow Christians; fourthly, he must join with them in the observance of the Lord's supper; and, fifthly, he must make

Scanned by TLC

an offering, along with other saints, to the Lord according as the Lord has prospered him and as he purposes in his own heart. Besides these acts of public worship, he must give the remainder of the Lord's day to the service of that Lord to whom the day belongs. To be a Christian means that during the other six days of the week he will abstain from every form of evil, and that as he has opportunity he will do good unto all men; that whether he eats or drinks, or whatever he does, he will do it all to the glory of God; and that he will be faithful unto death in the discharge of all these Christian duties. This is a brief summary of what it means to be a Christian."

Notice this word *MUST*. The word *must* is mentioned eleven times in this short passage! This claims to tell what one *must* do in order to be a Christian, that means of course, that man must work in order to be saved. Eleven *musts* to get to heaven! It says:

"To be a Christian means that he must live a life conformed in thought, feeling, purpose, word, and deed to the will of Christ as expressed in the teaching of God's word."

In other words, for salvation, after baptism, every Christian must be perfect in thought, feeling, purpose, word, and deed! One thought wrong, one feeling wrong, one purpose wrong, one word wrong, one deed wrong, and you are a lost sinner again! So teaches Brother Oliphant. What is that? That is work salvation. Brother Oliphant, if that is true that you have to work like that to get it, naturally you would have to work like that to keep it. But that is not the kind of salvation the Bible teaches, the kind you affirm in this debate here tonight. Brother Oliphant is in a dilemma, he is in a terrible confusion of thought about this matter. He starts out to talk about "a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ," and ends up trying to tell us he is both saved and kept by his own works, or not at all! I lay no blame on the man's sincerity on that matter at all. It is the same thing man faces in every generation everywhere, the carnal, human, man-

Scanned by TLC

pleasing teaching of salvation by works. That is what is wrong with the lodges everywhere. They are teaching a salvation by good works. That is what is wrong with our Roman Catholic friends. They believe in the blood of Christ, and picture the five wounds of the Savior, but they teach a plan of salvation by good works. They pray, and I am sure many times are very earnest about it. But that does not change the fact that they have a system of salvation by good works. They believe in some blood, too. Brother Oliphant does, too, but he puts works in there. Some people sing the old song:

"Jesus paid it all,
All to Him I owe;
Sin had left a crimson stain,
He washed it white as snow."

Brother Oliphant would sing this, and I am satisfied he does in his heart though he wouldn't say the words audibly:

"Jesus paid a part,
And I a part you know;
Sin had left a crimson stain,
We washed it white as snow."

My friends, again I say to you, I am not going to argue about the question of the man who works his way in, whether that man will work his way out. I say frankly, if I had to save myself I would lose myself. If I had to keep myself I would not do it and could not do it. I cannot get myself in, and I cannot keep myself in. We are talking about a child of God, one who has been *born of God,* a child of God, one that is a partaker of the divine nature, one who has been regenerated, one to whom God has come and by miraculous power, has taken out a stony heart and put in a heart of flesh, one who has been circumcised in his heart. The Scripture makes clear about that. A real child of God

Scanned by TLC

is born of God, is a partaker of the divine nature, so 2 Peter 1:4 says. Literally and actually he becomes a child of God, has a new nature, and is called in 2 Corinthians 5:17 a new creature. Galatians 6:15 also calls him a new creature. That is the meaning of salvation by the blood, salvation that is a new birth. My friend, there is a good deal of difference in that and salvation by works of men.

You say, "What about this Scripture and that and the other?" I will try to get to all of them in a little bit. But what I want you to get now, my friends, is to get the plan of salvation very clear. Confusion on the plan of salvation is the reason my friend thinks the man will lose himself. He had the man save himself and that is the reason he thinks the man would lose himself—because he thinks that man has at least partially saved himself. But someone says, "I am afraid that man will lose his end of the load." You are right, if he is carrying one end of the load. I maintain that the Scriptures plainly teach this: that salvation is not that I carry half and the Lord carries half. The salvation I am telling about, the kind the Bible teaches, is that a man or woman, a person saved by the blood of Christ, and therefore a child of God, is born again and is passed from death unto life. He is out from under condemnation, and shall not come to judgment. All those things are said about a child of God. That is important, very important!

Brother Oliphant's position really has an underlying basis that he has not stated. There is a deep-seated, underlying basis for his idea about a child of God being lost. He is fundamentally wrong on conversion! Brother Oliphant, I have not meant to be unkind, I have no sensitive feeling in the world because you do not call me brother. I know it may be a matter of conscience though it is a sectarian spirit. You should call me brother, because I have been saved and baptized, but I have no sensitiveness about that. The reason I press that matter is this. The fact of the business is my friend, Brother Oliphant, does not believe what I believe, and what most of you believe, about the matter of

Scanned by TLC

salvation. Brother Oliphant's position about conversion —there is his trouble. Since he endorses this quarterly and since it is an official publication of the "Churches of Christ" I have a right to introduce it. I dare say if I wrong him and judge him wrongly he will correct me and I will acknowledge it. But here is his false position on conversion. Notice what this quarterly says here on page 77. Just after that plan of salvation, the same plan Brother Oliphant is preaching, is this statement:

"One of the first things to be gotten rid of is the old superstition that conversion is miraculous in its nature. This is the direct opposite of the truth as taught in the Scriptures. Conversion is a natural process carried on according to the laws of God. . ."

I have read every word carefully. Now notice this:

"One of the first things to be gotten rid of is the old superstition that conversion is miraculous in its nature. This is the direct opposite of the truth as taught in the Scriptures. Conversion is a natural process . . . " This official statement which Brother Oliphant endorses says that the idea that conversion is miraculous in its nature is nothing but superstition to be gotten rid of! And this blasphemous statement then goes on to say. "This is the direct opposite of the truth as taught in the Scriptures. Conversion is a natural process according to the law of God. . ."!

Yes, I say again, Brother Oliphant has this man wrong. He is still under natural law. He is talking about this man falling away, sinning, and being lost. The trouble with him is that he has never been anywhere but lost! One who has never been miraculously converted is not saved by the blood. He is simply trying to get to heaven by "a natural process." He is not saved. That is the trouble with what Brother Oliphant has been talking about.

I do not mean Brother Oliphant is lost. I think he has been born again. I trust he has. I will take his word for it if he will say so. I have asked him sincerely to give that as a clear testimony if he has. If he has not, I say

Scanned by TLC

to him what I say to you all, as I have said again and again in this debate, you had better today make sure of salvation and be born again, by simple, penitent faith. I have had it come to my heart to pray for my friend, Brother Oliphant. I do not have the assurance that he is supernaturally converted because he has not publicly said so. This is not a matter of joke. It is no smiling matter to me. This debate is not a matter to me of seeking some reputation as a debater. It is the same concern as I have when preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ in revivals. I have not dealt deceitfully with the Scriptures. I do not intend to. The point I make is this: I have prayed often for Brother Oliphant that God may lead him into further truth on the matter of salvation. It would help you to see his viewpoint, it would save argument in this debate, and it would be the fair, honest thing for him to plainly say whether or not he knows he has been born again, has definitely had a change of heart by faith in Christ. If he has had such a conversion and believes in it, he should say so frankly. I pray God that he has had and that he can give us that assurance. I have asked him to say, and I want you to know what he thinks about it.

I make my bold testimony, though an humble, unworthy sinner as I am, I know I met Jesus, and he forgave my sins, and I have the witness of the Spirit in my soul as well as the witness of the Scriptures. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16). And the word of God proves that I, having definitely trusted Christ to make me a child of God, have been born again. I would not be preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ if I had not a definite change of heart and the evidence of it.

I am not talking about whether I felt as light as a feather. I am not talking about a spasm of emotion. I have had many happy times, not only then but since. There came into my heart the deep, quiet, consciousness and confidence of peace with God when I gave him my heart. I

Scanned by TLC

have had it again and again, and I have it again tonight. And I know it is true, as much as I know I am here, that God, for Christ's sake, forgave my sins and made me his child, made me a new creature in Christ Jesus. I do not now love what I once loved. Though I am weak and sinful, I know there has been a change in my heart that God made. He took out the stony heart and put in a heart of flesh. I must say like Paul did, "When I would do good, evil is present with me." I must also say what he said in the same 7th chapter of Romans, "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." I have been born again. I have never deserved it. I did not deserve it then, nor a moment since, but I know that it has happened. I have the assurance, for the word of God promises that again and again to them that believe. I have the witness of the Spirit in my own heart. I have some fruits to bear witness to this also. Now then, I ask this question. It is a very important one. Brother Oliphant, do you believe in, and have you had, a supernatural conversion? Please answer.

A child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ—that is the kind of man we are talking about. We are not talking about a man that is depending on his goodness, but as 2 Peter 1:4 says, "That by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature." That is the point here. We speak here about a child of God, one who has been made a partaker of the divine nature.

Let me call your attention to some of these things. I will get further on with my argument a little later.

About this matter, there are two or three very interesting things. Brother Oliphant did mention some Scriptures about eternal life. He mentioned 1 Timothy 6:12.

"Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses."

Some of it is future. I am glad you mentioned that Brother Oliphant. I am glad to say that I will shake hands

Scanned by TLC

with you on that. The Scripture is clear about eternal life. My friend, the Scriptures are very clear about that and say again and again that a child of God, a believer, has everlasting life, has eternal life. The Scriptures do not at all contradict each other. I do believe frankly that all the Scriptures you read on that are on my side and not on yours. Every last one still said *eternal* life or *everlasting* life! The thing for you to do is not to bring the Scriptures that say we have everlasting life now, as John 5:24, John 6:47, and others do say that we have it now, nor that we will inherit it in the world to come. The thing for you to do is to get some Scriptures that say we will *lose it.* Then it will be talking on your side instead of on my side. These Scriptures you gave are not talking about *losing* eternal life, but are talking about *having* it! Those are the facts in the case. The Scriptures say the believer has eternal life, and has everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life. I take it, then, at face value. Other Scriptures speak of eternal life in the world to come. Everlasting life here, and more everlasting life hereafter. What does it mean? It means this. I thank God, some of this matter of eternal life I now have. In Romans 5, the Scriptures say, "We have now received the atonement." I have received it, thank God. I am now a child of God. "Beloved now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (1 John 3:2). What does that mean? There is glory yet to be revealed. This body has not yet been adopted or redeemed. This nose, broken in college football, is still crooked. There are frailties of our flesh and frailties of our sinful nature, but nevertheless one day they shall be changed.

They are both true. I now have everlasting life. There is coming a time when the rest of eternal life I will have, too. This body will be redeemed. I take at face value all of those. I believe them all. I now *have* it. I have now

Scanned by TLC

eternal life. I have the soul part now, and the part about the body and the rest of it, I will have that, too, one day. You said eternal life is in his Son. You are right about that. Brother Oliphant is right pretty often. I want to get him right on other things.

At first in this debate, he denied the literal thousand years, but before he was through with the question he got right. He finally got down and admitted frankly that he believed in a literal thousand years, a literal millennium! He is getting right on several things!

He is right about that. That life is in his Son. It is in the Son, and I have Christ in my heart. But one of these days I will see him as I have not seen him, I will know him as he knows me, and he will have the rest of me as he does not now have me. Certainly I have eternal life, now and then too. None of these Scriptures speak of losing eternal life, but all speak of having it. They are not on the side of his argument. They are not on his doctrine of temporary salvation. All are on my position of *eternal* salvation, salvation that is *everlasting*.

Now I charge Brother Oliphant again: (I am glad you brought all of those Scriptures up. You saved me a great deal of trouble again.) I ask you this question. Now my friend, show me one verse, just one verse, which mentions that one can lose eternal life. Then you will have one that is talking on your side of this debate. You have not found one yet. As you said, again and again and again and again and again, the Scriptures talk about having eternal life. You did not mention it, but actually forty-five times the Bible promises eternal life and everlasting life. I counted forty-five times where the Lord said everlasting life, and eternal life. The Bible uses many other terms in promises to Christians, such as "eternal redemption," and "eternal salvation" besides those forty-five times eternal life and everlasting life are mentioned. Yes, I have it here. Now if there are that many Scriptures that say we have everlasting life, there ought to be *one* that says this child of

Scanned by TLC

God can lose it, if he can. There ought to be one that says so, but there are not any. Now why? I will tell you why. God does not talk on two sides of a proposition. He can not talk on your side, because he has already talked on mine! Already God has said the believer has everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation.

Notice this. He said some more about it. He mentioned John 3:16 and 1 John 5:11, 12. Let's see here. Brother Oliphant said, "This matter of the righteousness of God depends on our acceptance and our *continuance* in his *commands.*" That unfortunate emphasis is by yourself, Brother Oliphant. I wrote it down word for word and underlined these two words here. You can say, "God's righteousness" and then say we are the ones to do it. And after all that twisting of words you did, however unintentionally, we can see you do not take the Bible language at face value. If it is God's righteousness, then God does it, not man. Brother Oliphant calls it God's, but says man must do it! My brother sincerely believes that in his heart. But the fact is, that is a high strung, theological theory and does not talk about what the Bible talks about. When the Bible talks about God's righteousness, it talks about what God does. When it talks about ours, it talks about what we do.

Here is another argument of Brother Oliphant's. In John the 6th chapter he read:

"From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him" (verse 66).

Brother Oliphant said they were disciples and therefore saved people. He said his disciples were always saved. Were John's disciples saved because they were John's disciples? Were his disciples always saved? I will ask you that question. When you answer that question, I will give you some more interesting information. The word *disciple* is many times used about saved people to be sure. The word *disciple* literally means *a learner.* It might mean a disciple of Jesus Christ, sometimes to be sure. But the

Scanned by TLC

term disciple is used in the Bible about disciples of Moses, of John the Baptist, is used about any kind of teacher and learner. In some cases it refers to a child of God and sometimes it does not. Were they saved? Perhaps they were. The Bible does not say. What it says is that they did not follow him over to the sea at this time as they had before, they did not go into the wilderness where he fed 5,000 as they did before. Does that mean that they are not saved now? Now they have gone away from a revival meeting and have gone back home, that does not prove they are saved or lost. Often disciples are children of God, but sometimes they are not. In any case, there is no proof that these people lost their souls, because they went back to their farms instead of following Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem and out yonder in the wilderness and from the mountain to the seaside, until Jesus had to feed them, or they would have starved in many cases.

Here is a very interesting thing. Brother Oliphant says that 1 Timothy 4:1 which says of some who "shall depart from the faith giving heed to seducing spirits," Brother Oliphant says that is talking about people losing their faith, losing saving faith. That particular verse particularly tells just exactly what it is talking about. "Shall depart from *THE FAITH,*" it says, taking up "the doctrines of devils." That speaks of those who are misled in doctrine, not of one who loses saving faith. Why not take it at face value, and not pervert the Scripture? It is bad to be wrong on doctrine, seduced by evil spirits. But that does not mean one is lost because he is not taught and perfect on every doctrine. Brother Oliphant, you never would have been saved if it depended on your doctrine! You have been wrong all the way along on doctrine! No, that is not what it says. The Scripture is not talking about a man getting right in doctrine in order to be saved. There is some doctrine a man must be right on in order to be saved. But I remind you, that Phillip was not right in one of the very fundamental doctrines. John 1:45 says, "Philip findeth Nathan-

Scanned by TLC

æl, and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." You do not believe Jesus is the son of Joseph. I know he is not the son of Joseph. But Philip was a saved man, though ignorant on some doctrines as Brother Oliphant is, but he was saved. No, 1 Timothy 4:1 does not speak of one losing salvation.

Brother Oliphant is hard up trying to find a single case —he couldn't find one any place where one who has everlasting life is said to lose it. With some forty-five places where eternal life, and everlasting life are promised, he can't find a single case where the Bible says anything about anybody losing everlasting life! He misses 1 Timothy 4:1 just as bad.

He says he will turn and read such a case and he turns to 1 Timothy 5:12 and reads part of a sentence. His is a foolish position. I sort of hold it against Brother Oliphant because he does not read all the sentence sometimes. He left out some important part, and did not read all the first of this. It really would make him look a little ridiculous if he read actually what the Lord did say. 1 Timothy 5:12:

"Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith."

Read before that, verses 9 and 10, and you will see that that is talking about widow women who are taken in to be supported by the church.

"Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man.

"Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work."

And then verse 11 says:

"But the younger widows refuse; for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry."

Brother Oliphant says that poor woman is going to hell

Scanned by TLC

because she married again! She has lost her faith, he said. Let me read on, verses 11 and 12:

"But the younger widows refuse; for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry."

"Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith."

Brother Oliphant, that word "damnation" does not say the damnation of her soul. It does not say that, and it does not mean that. But she is subject to condemnation because she came and was taken on by the church to support her, and she promises to give her time day and night to the service of the Lord. But later she says, "I am afraid they will not take care of me—here is a man, I will marry him. It is better to take him and depend on a husband." So she takes him instead of staying with the church. That woman did wrong, suppose we grant that. She will be talked about, have condemnation or damnation on her. You do not believe a woman goes to hell that marries because she has been married once before do you? That is not talking about a grass widow, either. You are pretty hard put to it to bring a verse like that to teach that "a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ, can so sin as to be finally lost"!

Now about the sower and the seed. Some seed fell on the rocks. He did not read one part in particular—the interpretation. Perhaps he did not know that the Savior interpreted that parable. The Savior told what it meant. He mentioned those seed that fell on the rock, and he said that they had no root in themselves. Jesus said they did not, in Matthew 13:21. Why say they did? You say that for a time they believed. You go back and read again and see if they ever believed in Christ for salvation. The devils also believe and tremble. The devil is not saved, is he? He believes there is a God, and he believes the gospel, that is true, but it takes more than that. One thing that I want to impress on your hearts all the way along is not just to get men to say, "I believe there is a Savior," but put your

Scanned by TLC

trust in him as your *own* Savior, *depend* on him for forgiveness and salvation, and then you will be saved. You must get the root in yourselves, a supernatural change of heart, a new birth. Those who received seed in stony ground did not have it. They were never saved!

I hope that one thing will get laid on your hearts tonight. Trust Christ as your own Savior, if you have not already done so. Be happy about it that your soul is in the keeping of God. Like Paul, I can say, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day" (2 Tim. 1:12). Here is another one.

(Is the time up?)

(You have one minute.)

Brother Oliphant read 2 Peter 2:1. I am sorry Brother Oliphant did not read all of that passage, though he read some good parts. He should read 2nd Peter 2, not only verse 1, but the whole chapter. Let's see about that again.

"But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies."

Does that say they were saved? No. They are false prophets to start with. The first thing the Lord said about these, he said they are false prophets. When they come to the judgment and say, "Lord, Lord, open to us," he will say to them, "Depart from me you that work iniquity, I never knew you."

That is true of this bunch here. You read a little further and you will see. Verse 22,

"But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire."

What is the matter with these folks? It is that they are dogs and sows instead of sheep, Brother Oliphant, and that is the trouble with the churches everywhere. There are too many baptized sows and dogs who have never had a supernatural change of heart to make them into God's sheep!

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Seventh Session: 7:30 p. m., January 24, 1935.

FOURTH PROPOSITION

Proposition: *"The Scriptures Teach that a Child of God Who has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ can so Sin as to be Finally Lost.*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

(Second Affirmative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Before continuing my affirmative arguments, I shall notice the few attempted replies made by my opponent. In closing his speech he referred to my argument on 2 Peter 2, but made no attempt to answer the argument I made on the passage. He contends that these false prophets were never saved. I showed that they had (1) "Escaped the pollutions of the world" (Verse 20). Has the unsaved man escaped the pollutions of the world? (2) They had "forsaken the right way and gone astray" (Verse 15). Can one forsake that which he never had? (3) They had been "bought" by the Lord (Verse 1). Saved people are purchased by the blood of Christ (Acts 20:28). These prophets, whom the Bible teaches and my friend admits, were lost had been purchased by the Lord. Since his blood was the purchase price, these people must have been purchased (saved) by the blood. This one passage establishes my proposition beyond all question. It shows that those saved by the blood of Christ may be lost. Peter distinctly says that they "bring upon themselves swift destruction" (Verse 1.) "And shall receive the reward of unrighteous-

Scanned by TLC

ness" (Verse 13). Peter does not say that these people were dogs or sows but merely quotes a proverb as an illustration: "The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and, The sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." The dog had left his vomit, or he could not have returned; and the sow had been "washed," and then returned to her "wallowing in the mire." The Apostle says that these prophets being washed in the blood of Christ and turning again to the filth of sin is comparable to the facts of the proverb.

Dr. Rice tries his hand on 1 Timothy 5:13, but his explanation fails to explain. He says the passage does not mean that these widows were lost. Verse 15 says, "For some are already turned aside after Satan." Will those who turn aside after Satan be saved? "They waxed wanton against Christ" (Verse 11). To wax wanton means "to revel unrestrainedly," "frolic at random," "to pass the time lustfully." This they did "against Christ." Will such characters be saved? They "cast off their first faith" (Verse 12). Were they saved without faith? No, I did not say that women would be lost, because they wanted to marry; but because "they waxed wanton against Christ," "turned aside after Satan," and "cast off their first faith." But why argue about the matter? The apostle plainly says they have "damnation" (Verse 12).

From Luke 8:13, I showed that there are some "who receive the word with joy . . . . for awhile believe, and in time of temptation fall away." But Rice says these people were never saved. Is it not strange that he should so quickly forget his contention of last evening, that the sinner is saved the moment he believes? The same Greek word here translated "believe" is used in all the passages which he used to show that the believer is saved. It is the same word that Jesus used in the preceding verse, when he said, "lest they should believe and be saved." Then they had the

Scanned by TLC

kind of belief that it takes to save; but they quit believing and fell away. This is a plain case of apostacy.

He says those who "depart from the faith" (1 Timothy 4:1) merely depart from the "right doctrine." Then they depart from the truth; and Jesus says, "The truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). The doctrine that the truth is not necessary to salvation is a slander of the Lord Jesus Christ, who declared himself to be "the truth." (John 14:6). John says: "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son" (2 John 9). To depart from the "right doctrine" is to depart from God. Can we be saved without God? (1) Christians may depart from the faith (the doctrine of Christ, according to Rice). (2) Those who depart from the faith (doctrine of Christ), depart from God. (3) Therefore, Christians may depart from God. The reference to Philip's calling Jesus the son of Joseph is not in point. This was before Jesus was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Romans 1:4).

In addition to departing from the faith, these children of God, we are told, "give heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." Will those who follow devils be saved? Jesus said a worship based on the commandments of men is vain (Matthew 15:9). If the commandments of men will not save, what about the doctrines of devils? My friend takes these devil followers to heaven in order to save his "once saved, always saved" theory. His position is that a child of God can commit fornication, murder, lie, steal, and follow the doctrines of devils—and still go to heaven. He puts a premium on sin. My Bible says "the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire

Scanned by TLC

and brimstone: which is the second death" (Revelations 21:8). The heaven my opponent contends for is the hell of the Bible. God is no respecter of persons: sin is sin, regardless of who commits it. Sin is as black in one person as it is in another.

My argument on John 6:66 stands. I am glad that my opponent has learned that a "disciple" is not necessarily a Christian. Away goes his position on the plan of salvation again! That is the trouble with trying to prove false doctrines: that which apparently proves one, disproves another. These were disciples who walked with the Lord. If it is only meant that they ceased to follow the Lord physically, that is, walk around after him on earth, why was Jesus so worried about the matter? "Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life" (Verses 67, 68). Peter thought to cease walking with Christ meant to go away from eternal life.

My friend is still worried because I do not call him "brother." I assure him that it is through no desire to be unfriendly that I do not recognize him as a brother in Christ. Jesus' brethren are those who "hear the word of God, and do it" (Luke 8:21). I do not believe my opponent comes in this class. He again refers to Ananias' calling Paul "brother" before he was baptized. Paul and Ananias were brother Jews, members of the same race. Paul called a murderous mob "brethren" (Acts 23:5). Did he mean they were saved?

Not being able to prove his doctrine by the Bible, Rice turns to a song, "JESUS PAID IT ALL." How about the second line, Doctor—*"All to him I owe"?* Man's side in the plan of salvation is expressed, even in this song. A friend of mine bought a hat for me and paid for it, but asked me to go to the store and get it. Could it not be said that he "paid it all"? Jesus paid it all; but we must accept the purchased salvation on the terms offered by him.

Scanned by TLC

He again criticizes the Gospel Advocate Quarterly. The quarterly merely says folks must obey the Lord and continue faithful to death in order to be saved. The Lord said, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matthew 7:21). Again, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" (Revelations 2:10). While I am under no obligation to defend the Advocate Quarterly, it talks pretty much like our Lord, don't you think? When the writer of the Advocate Quarterly said we are converted by the law of God, he agreed with Paul who said, "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Romans 8:2).

The Doctor just *will not* notice my questions. He says I do not like the way he answers them. I don't care how he answers them; I just want him to answer them some way. Now, ladies and gentlemen, you who were here last night remember that I asked him a number of plain, straightforward questions in my first speech. He went through the entire discussion of the baptism proposition without answering a single one of my questions. I suppose it is his privilege to ignore these questions. It is also our privilege to decide why he refuses to answer them. He complains that I did not answer his questions on the baptism proposition. His questions were all answered, in a general way—most of them before he asked them. I could not answer his questions asked in his last speech, because I did not have another speech on that proposition. His question about my personal experience is not germane. What John Rice or I feel, think, believe, or know has nothing whatever to do with the proposition. I am contending that the Scriptures teach my proposition. I do not care to argue about my personal experience.

He wants to know whether I have been born again and whether I am a partaker of the divine nature. Yes,

Scanned by TLC

Doctor Rice; but I do not depend on my feelings or my conscience to determine the matter. The Hindu mother who throws her child in the river, stands anxiously waiting for the crocodiles to devour it, and goes away rejoicing when they do, feels that she is right. She could, no doubt, relate a wonderful "experience." My opponent would not question her sincerity; but he will not say that she is right. Paul felt good and had a satisfied conscience while he persecuted the church (Acts 23:1). Will Rice say he was saved then? No, my friends, this question cannot be settled by my conscience or feelings, or by my opponent's experiences. Then why bring these matters into this discussion? This is not a personal matter, but depends entirely upon the teaching of God's word. Paul warns against "comparing ourselves with some that commend themselves" (2 Corinthians 10:12). So I am not going to spend any time measuring and comparing myself and my experiences with Rice and his experiences. However, I do not mind telling my friend that I have been born again, and that "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever" (1 Peter 1:23). And I am a partaker of the divine nature. Peter tells us how this comes about. "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these we might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust" (2 Peter 1:3, 4). The gospel is the divine power (Romans 1:16). In it we have all things "that pertain unto life and godliness." We do not have to rely on our feelings. It is through the "exceeding great and precious promises" of the gospel, and not through the imaginations of our hearts, that we become "partakers of the divine nature." God gives us a new heart, but we are not inactive in the matter. "Cast away from you all

Scanned by TLC

your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" (Ezekiel 18:31).

It is charged that my proposition is contradictory within itself. "If one is saved by the blood, he is also kept by the blood," says my opponent. Correct. Rice believes that being saved by the blood is dependent upon some action of ours. Is our being kept by the blood unconditional? What does the Bible say? "But *if* we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7). John is writing to Christians. The Christian's being cleansed or kept by the blood is contingent upon his walking in the light.

The Doctor is still not satisfied with what he did on the millennium question. I do not care to discuss the question further; I am satisfied with the Bible teaching that I introduced on that proposition. He complains that I used 2 Samuel 7:12 as referring to Christ on David's throne. The record will show that he is the man who introduced that passage. If it does not refer to that subject, why did he introduce it?

Dr. Rice charges me with saying that the publican was saved because he was circumcised. No, the Doctor misunderstood me. What I said was, that I know that he was one of the children of Israel, because he was in the temple, and only children of Israel—those who were circumcised—were allowed in the temple. God said to Israel, "Ye are the children of the Lord your God" (Deuteronomy 14:1). The publican was, therefore, a child of God.

Before introducing new argument, I want to again read my questions. I am going to keep them constantly before my opponent and this audience, so that if he continues to refuse to answer them, you will know that it is through no oversight on his part. (1) Can a child of God call his brother a fool? (2) Can a child of God get drunk? (3)

Scanned by TLC

If so, can he die while he is drunk? (4) Can one be saved away from the grace of God? (5) Can one be saved without faith? (6) Is the child of God a free moral agent? (7) Is the righteousness revealed in the gospel man's righteousness or God's righteousness? I plead with my opponent to answer these questions. All but one of them can be answered by a simple "yes" or "no." If he does not want to take time from his speech, I shall be glad to have him write the answers and hand them to me. My friends, can you see any legitimate reason for his refusing to answer these questions?

In my opening speech, I made a number of arguments which he did not touch. I showed from Titus 1:2, Romans 6:22, 1 Timothy 6:12, Romans 2:6, 7, Mark 10:29, 30, and Matthew 25:46 that the righteous receive eternal life in the world to come. It was not enough for my opponent to say that the righteous have eternal life now and will merely continue in it in the world to come. These passages teach that we hope for, lay hold on, receive and enter into eternal life in the world to come. I sought to save him the trouble of reading all the passages that speak of eternal life in the present tense by taking them up and harmonizing them with those that refer to it as a promise to be fulfilled in the world to come. I showed that the only sense in which we have eternal life now is that we are in Christ who is eternal life (1 John 1:1-3), and that our remaining in Christ is conditional (1 John 2:24). He prefers to ignore all this.

From 2 Timothy 2:18, we learn that faith may be overthrown. 1 Timothy 1:19 teaches that faith may be "made shipwreck." What explanation does my opponent offer? None.

I showed from Luke 12:43-47, that some of the Lord's servants will be "appointed a portion with the unbelievers." He makes no reply.

Scanned by TLC

No reply was made to my argument on the parable of the talents (Matthew 25:14-30).

The argument from the vine and the branches (John 15:1-10) was not touched.

My argument on Galatians 5:4 remains as I made it.

The Doctor says I am "a promising young man." Thanks. I can return the compliment. He keeps promising to answer my arguments.

Converting a brother from error saves his soul from death. James 5:19, 20: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." The unbeliever is already dead (John 3:18). Hence the ones whom James talks about Christians saving from death are believers. If my opponent had heard James say this, he would have said: "Why, James, don't you know that the believer is saved eternally and that he cannot die?" His position makes the language of James meaningless. This is another argument which has been ignored.

Now to some advance work.

A brother may be destroyed. Romans 14:15: "But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." The word "destroy" is translated from "appollumi" and is the same word used in Matthew 10:28. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Paul says a brother may be destroyed with that same kind of destruction that is received in hell.

A brother may perish. 1 Corinthians 8:11: " And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?" Will those who perish be saved? These scriptures are too plain to be misunderstood without help.

Scanned by TLC

Now to an argument on Hebrews 10:26-29: "For 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. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" Here is one who was sanctified by the blood—a child of God, like the one of my proposition. He sins wilfully, trods under foot the Son of God, counts the blood an unholy thing, does despite to the Spirit of grace. Will my friend say that he will be saved in heaven? Paul says nothing remains for him but "a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation." He will receive a "sorer punishment" than death without mercy. If this is not eternal punishment in hell, what is it?

In close proximity with this scripture, let us notice another along the same line. Hebrews 6:4-6: "For as touching those who are once enlightened, and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, And then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Let's have a good look at these people. They were (1) Once enlightened. (2) Tasted of the heavenly gift. (3) Made partakers of the Holy Spirit. (4) Tasted the good word of God. (5) Tasted powers of the world to come. Will my opponent deny that they were children of God? Where could you find a better description of children of God? Now what happened to them? (1) They fell away. (I quote from the Revised Version to save my friend the useless dodge on the "if" of the King James.) (2) They

Scanned by TLC

crucified to themselves the Son of God afresh. (3) They put Christ to an open shame. Are they still saved? I challenge my oppoent to say that those guilty of such crimes are in a saved condition. Can they ever be again saved? Answer: "It is impossible to renew them again unto repentance." Those who do not repent will be lost (Luke 13:3). (1) Children of God may so far fall away that it is impossible for them to repent. (2) Those who do not repent will be finally lost. (3) Therefore, it is possible for children of God to be finally lost.

I want to notice an individual case of apostacy. I call your attention to the case of Simon, the sorcerer (Acts 8:12-24). Simon believed; that made him a child of God according to my friend, Rice. He was also baptized, which made him a child of God according to the Lord (Mark 16:16). So Simon was a child of God—Rice, Oliphant, and the Lord all being witnesses. He "continued with Philip" —was active in the Lord's work. He sinned. "And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, Saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost. But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee. For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity." Here we have a child of God who committed a great sin. His heart was not right in the sight of God. He was in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity. Will Dr. Rice tell us he was saved?

Eternal life is to know God. John 17:3: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." Some of God's

Scanned by TLC

people have forgotten him. Jeremiah 2:32: "Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire? yet my people have forgotten me days without number." What is the destiny of those who forget God? Psalms 9:17: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." If eternal life is to know God, and if God's children can forget him, the child of God does not have eternal life in such a sense that he cannot be lost. Some of God's children have forgotten him. Those who forget God will be turned into hell.

Dr. Rice has insisted that he is a "partaker of the divine nature," and that those who partake of the divine nature are then and there eternally saved; that there is nothing further that they need to do. I call your attention again to the first chapter of 2 Peter. In the 3rd and 4th verses we read: "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust." The 5th verse begins, "And beside this." What? Something necessary beside partaking of the divine nature? Yes, the Apostle says that those who are partakers of the divine nature and have escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust, need something "beside this," in order to be eternally saved. Let us read on: "And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged

Scanned by TLC

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; For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (Verses 5:11). Christians—those who are partakers of the divine nature and who have escaped the corruption that is in the world—are required to "add" these Christian graces. "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." That is, the Christian's entrance into heaven is dependent upon his adding the Christian graces. "He that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins." We have seen that children of God can forget God. Now we learn that they can forget that they have been purged from their old sins. Are they still in a saved condition? Should we grant that Dr. Rice has been converted and has the divine nature, his final and eternal salvation is not yet sure? Peter urges Christians to make their calling and election sure by adding the Christian graces. My opponent would say. "Why, Peter, don't you know that as soon as one believes and becomes a partaker of the divine nature, he has eternal life and cannot possibly fall?" But Peter answers: "If ye do these things, ye shall never fall." Every positive has its negative. If the Christian does "these thing," he shall never fall. What is the negative? If he does not do them, he will fall!

The doing of those things commanded by the Lord is not self-righteousness—the kind of righteousness condemned in the word of God. The righteousness revealed in the word of God is the righteousness of God (Romans 1:16, 17). Can we be saved without God's righteousness? About two-thirds of the New Testament was written to tell Christians how to live in order to be saved eternally. And still we are told that it is impossible for a Christian to be lost!

Scanned by TLC

In the few minutes I have left, I want to call your attention to some of the warnings given children of God. (1) 2 Thessalonians 2:3: "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." My opponent says a falling away is impossible; hence the day of Christ's appearing can never come, according to his doctrine. (2) "Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God" (Hebrews 12:15). Had Paul believed Baptist doctrine, he would have known that this warning was unnecessary; but then Paul lived before any man ever preached Baptist doctrine. (3) 2 Peter 3:14: "Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless." According to my opponent's doctrine, diligence is entirely unnecessary. (4) 2 Peter 3:17: "Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness." My opponent tries to rob Christians of the knowledge of their danger which the word of God reveals. (5) James 5:19, 20: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." I made an argument on this passage in my first speech. The argument still stands. (6) 1 Timothy 5:15: "For some are already turned aside after Satan." My opponent's position makes this an impossibility. (7) 2 Peter 2:20, 21: "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them." It is possible for children

Scanned by TLC

of God to go so far into sin that their condition is worse than it was in the beginning. They were lost in the beginning. Are they still saved when their condition becomes worse? (8) 1 Peter 5:8: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." Why warn children of God against the devil, if they are in no danger? Let me suggest to you, my friend, that if the impossibility of apostasy is true and a child of God cannot be lost, the devil is the biggest fool in all creation. He has been trying for more than six thousand years to get some of them. If he has never succeeded in capturing a single one, he should have sense enough to give up; but even the devil knows that my friend's doctrine is not true. He is still on the job, "seeking whom he may devour." The Lord knows his doctrine is not true; therefore, he warns us over and over against the attacks of the devil.

I earnestly entreat you to listen to the warnings of Holy Writ, that you may be saved in heaven. Do not be deceived by false doctrine into thinking that you can live in sin and then enjoy eternal life in heaven. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Galatians 6:7).

I thank you.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Seventh Session: 7:30 p. m., January 24, 1935.

FOURTH PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach That a Child of God One Who Has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ Can so Sin as to Be Finally Lost.*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

(Second Negative Address by John R. Rice.)

Brother Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

Brother Oliphant did not like the fact that I told you I thank God I know that I have been born again. The Scripture plainly says we may know. Read 1 John 5:1 and see that the believer is born of God. And 1 John 3:14, 4:13 and 5:13 plainly say we can know. He keeps on asking what I believe, "Do you believe?" He did not like it because I said I believe what the Bible says. Now he has gotten to proving things by the devil! Brother Oliphant mentioned a lot of Scriptures and most of them he only mentioned.

Well, I will go on. He mentioned James 5:19, 20: as if it referred to one who had been saved, and then lost, because James calls them brethren.

"Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him;

"Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins."

Brother Oliphant, it would be good for you to go back and read James 1:1, and find that the book is to the Jews of the

Scanned by TLC

twelve tribes, brother Jews. I am glad you got to it and finally admitted that some of the Jews are our brethren. But all to whom the book of James was addressed were James' Jewish brethren, brethren by race and blood. I think you mentioned Jeremiah, but notice what James 1:1 says about that matter. This will help you to understand that statement here.

"James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting."

To whom is the book of James written? To the twelve tribes scattered abroad. The apostle said, "If you get any of these people saved, any brethren of the twelve tribes, you will save a soul from death." Fine, Brother Oliphant, we agree on that. Getting a Jew saved does not mean a child of God can be lost.

Brother Oliphant said, "Well, Ananias was a brother to a Jew, and the reason he called Saul "brother" was because Saul was a Jew, too." Brother Oliphant, are you and I not brother Gentiles? Why don't you call me "brother" then?

In Jeremiah 2:32 the Lord says, "My people have forgotten me." Now, Brother Oliphant, the fact of the business is, there are a number of such Scriptures. But Jews forsaking God are not Christians losing salvation! Brother Oliphant does pretty good. He makes up his mind he will take the Scriptures at what they say, and he takes some of my arguments, and when I put some highlife on him, he just touches the hot spots and moves on! He says, "My people have forsaken me." "My people have forsaken me." Then he jumps quickly before he says who the people are. He doesn't say that here in the same chapter the Bible says, "My people Israel!" *Israel! ISRAEL!* Oh yes, my friend, to be sure, Israel. Many of them forgot God. I am not agreeing with Brother Oliphant at all, that a circumcised Jew was always a child of God. He said anybody circumcised was saved, was a child of God. He said about that publican in these words, "He was an apostatized child of God," and I wrote it down. That is what he said about

Scanned by TLC

the publican. The reason he gave is, he was in the temple. He could not have been in the temple unless he was circumcised, therefore "he was an apostatized child of God!" The fact of the business is, being circumcised does not mean you are a child of God. It never saved anybody and never will. It did not save those back there that had forsaken God, and they were his people Israel. You are right; many of those people did forsake God. But many Jews were not saved, because it is only those with personal faith, who were saved. They were not saved except by individual regeneration by faith, like we must be. When God says, "My people Israel," he does not necessarily mean saved people.

Here is some more. 2 Peter 2:21. He just got on it when the bell rang. Brother Oliphant is interested in that. I am glad he is. He didn't answer this proposition.

"For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them."

And the 22nd verse:

"But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire."

Why to his *own* vomit? Why turn to it again? The dog is turned to his *own* vomit, because he got sick and vomited it up. That is the reason he turned to it again, because it is his own. Is that a Christian, a child of God? Anybody that gets that kind of religion is still a dog or is still a sow. Churches and denominations are full of them, not all of them, but many, many here and yonder and everywhere, sometimes in the pew and sometimes in the pulpit. Jesus says there will be many unsaved, to whom he will say, "I never knew you." And they will answer, "Lord we cast out devils in thy name."

My friend, I say, you just come along and show me a place in the Bible where the Bible calls God's children dogs and sows, and we will have some reason to believe he is talking about his own children here. He is not. The Scrip-

Scanned by TLC

ture does not say so, and it does not mean so. These were never saved. Verse 17 says:

"These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever."

That is not talking about these folks being saved people at all. And verse 12 says,

"But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption;"

What about it? Brother Oliphant, they are still going according to the process of nature like that quarterly stated instead of being born of God. According to the process of nature, they are natural persons instead of being born of God. They are natural brute beasts. The Scripture says about these folks that they are "wells without water, clouds carried with the tempest," and goes on to say these are like the dog that goes back to his own vomit and "the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." My friend what I am trying to tell you is that if you wash a sow and try to make her clean, that does not make her into a sheep.

My wife had a pet pig one time when she was a girl—where is my wife? (Laughter)—I have got to tell it anyway—She called it Limpsie. She would wash it and dry it and then take the pig into the house and tie a pink ribbon around its neck. It would get out the back door if you didn't keep the screens locked, and would go and get in the water and mud where the windmill dripped. Why? Because it was still a pig. It wasn't a sheep. It was a pig. It wasn't a sheep at all. That is the reason the Lord used that picture. The Bible uses many terms again and again for God's children, but it does not use "dogs" and "sows" for his children. Never! Show me one place in the Bible where the Lord referred to his own people as sows and dogs? If a man gets drunk, vomits, and when he gets sober says he is going to quit drinking, that does not make him a Christian or a child of God. That does not make him into

Scanned by TLC

a sheep. No, and it does not keep him from going back to it. The dog will go back to his vomit again. Yes, he will.

Here is some more of it. There is a very interesting thing in Hebrews the 10th chapter. My friend read it. Brother Oliphant, I am sorry you had not gone into this. You thought you would get in one part, but you said too much! This passage proves too much for you. In Hebrews the 10th chapter; I want to show you—look on carefully. Verses 26-39: "For if we sin wilfully—" who is that "we" in that? It is the book of Hebrews. The book was written for everybody else, but is particularly to the Hebrews, as you see.

"For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins."

Received what? "The knowledge of the truth." "Received Christ?" No, it did not say so. "Received salvation?" It did not say so. Received a new heart? It did not say so, but received "the knowledge of the truth." "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." There is no more sacrifice for sin. You Jews like sacrifices, but you turned Jesus down, crucified him, our Passover, and on the same day went out and killed the passover lamb! The veil of the temple was rent in twain. Other sacrifices will not do any good. There are not any more sacrifices. If you do not take Jesus, there are not any more. "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." And the Scripture goes on to say, "But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." Does that look like they accepted him? It did not say so. Read on:

"He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses:

"Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, where-

Scanned by TLC

with he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

Who are sanctified? Take that "he" literally there, it is masculine, third person. I used to be a college English teacher, but the Lord has forgiven me. But go back there a bit until you find the first masculine noun above. You find out *he* is *the Son of God.* What is it that made Jesus our Savior? The word sanctified does not mean, what our "Holy Roller" friends sometimes think it means, sinless perfection. It does not mean that and does not say that. Sanctification means to be "set apart by the Lord and set apart for his particular use and service," etc. Israel was a holy nation, but they were not sinless. The city Jerusalem is called the Holy City. That means the city is set apart, etc. What was it that set Jesus apart to the new covenant? His blood! Now listen:

"Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" (vs. 29).

Why read it to mean somebody else, when the same passage shows it could not logically refer to anybody else. "And hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace." As far as that is concerned, the Jews had lots of bloody sacrifices for their covenant, and they were sanctified as a holy nation, as a separate people. But at the same time it would not mean they were saved Jews. That isn't a logical reading of it. I one time thought so, but have learned better. All Jews were set apart by a blood covenant, but not saved except by personal faith. ". . . . counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace," does anything in that say that man was saved? No. Then why should we?

Scanned by TLC

If you will read the rest of the passage, you find that it particularly says he is not. Look at verse 39 just below. This one gives light if there is any doubt about it.

"But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul."

That is what I have been talking about, about folks who draw back unto perdition and have never believed. This says believers here were saved people who believe to the saving of the soul. That expression is very clear that some people do not believe to the saving of the soul. We are not of that crowd. We do believe. But this passage particularly says he is talking about those who had not believed. Brother Oliphant was saying that was about saved people. I am sure Brother Oliphant meant well. He should have looked further down there though before he said that. Brother Oliphant, the context often will help and keep you from making such mistakes.

Verse 39 is talking about believers who do not draw back to perdition but who believe to the saving of the soul. But the previous verse, speaking of those who despised Moses' law, those who trod under foot the Son of God, disregarded the blood and have done despite to the spirit of grace—that clearly speaks of those who draw back and do not believe and are never saved.

Likewise in the 6th chapter of Hebrews, Brother Oliphant made a similar mistake. Here is an interesting case. It expressly says in the same chapter whether it is speaking about a child of God falling away and being lost, or whether it is talking about an unsaved person committing the unpardonable sin. When there are so many Scriptures, Brother Oliphant, and in the same passage, other verses tell what they mean, we do not have to guess about this matter of the security of the believer. We just need to take the Bible at face value. For instance, there are so many verses that expressly say a child of God has everlasting life. John 5:24 states positively that the believer has everlasting life and is passed from death to life. Why do you look everywhere

Scanned by TLC

for something and seek for something to contradict the many plain statements of God's Word? You will find nothing in the Bible to contradict those plain statements, unless somebody twists and perverts the Scripture.

Let's see what the 6th chapter of Hebrews says about that. He read from the American Standard Version, but that does not make any difference here. What does it say in the 6th chapter? Read verses 1-4.

"Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God,

"Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.

"And this will we do, if God permit.

"For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost."

Does it say "saved"? No, it did not say he was "saved." Why do you say it meant that then? This is a lost man but enlightened. Can a lost man be enlightened? He would have to be before he could be saved. "Having tasted of the heavenly gift," he tasted of the heavenly gift. It did not say that he ate of it, but he tasted it. He was made a "partaker" of the Holy Ghost. That Greek word *metochous* means *one going along with.* Did the Holy Ghost ever go along with one before he was saved? He never would have been saved, if he had not. The Lord said to Saul on the road to Damascus, "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." I wonder how many here have been kicking against the pricks and going on and on. Check it up in the Greek. As far as that is concerned, in the English, you will not find anything contradictory to it. That is evidently the meaning of it.

"And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come" (vs. 5).

Why did the Lord say that again and again? They just

Scanned by TLC

stuck out their tongues and tasted it. Why did he not say they are full-fledged believers? Why didn't the Lord say that? Because he did not mean that. Later on in the same passage it says so. "It is impossible . . . . if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame" (Heb. 6:4, 6). "If they fall away." That does not say they had ever been saved, but crucified him afresh. ". . . Seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Here is the unpardonable sin. Jesus said there is only one unpardonable sin. This, then, is evidently that unpardonable sin. Why is that sin unpardonable? Because he cannot be brought back to the place of repentance, therefore he cannot be saved.

Brother Oliphant you are right ever once in a while, (I want to give him credit for that) and if you will look carefully I will show you some more on this and I hope you won't make that mistake any more. He said, "Here is a man who committed the unpardonable sin." Jesus said there is only one unpardonable sin that one can commit—and that is because you can't bring him back to repentance. Notice about this man. He crucified the Son of God afresh. Evidently he has been doing it all the time—not just one time. But he does it once too many times and is doomed, and he can never be saved—cannot be brought back to the place of repentance. I believe in the unpardonable sin. The Scriptures teach it. Now who is the man this Scripture speaks of? A Hebrew who has been greatly enlightened by the Holy Ghost, he has tasted the heavenly gift, and the Holy Ghost has been going along with him and pricking him and convicting him. Many a man has felt the pricking of his conscience by the Holy Spirit and has not been saved. He is in danger of committing the unpardonable sin. But we do not need to argue about whether this man was saved or not. Verse 9 just below it in the same 6th chapter of Hebrews, plainly tells us that the author is talking about

Scanned by TLC

unsaved people in the preceding verses and there turns to speak to Christians. The Scripture says about them in verse 9,

"But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak."

Paul said, "I am talking to you about the unpardonable sin, but I don't believe you have committed that. I believe things about you are the things that accompany salvation. I have not been talking about saved people in that verse." He says, "I am persuaded better things of you." Brother Oliphant ought to have read that. It is there. This is not talking about saved people becoming lost. This is talking about Hebrews who have had great enlightenment and have been convicted by the Holy Spirit, but they will not have Jesus, but are going on with their sacrifices. This passage says there are not any more sacrifices that will do you any good.

Then he says in the 10th chapter of the same book, verses 26, 27, and of the same people:

"For 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."

If a man comes to the full enlightenment and is convicted, and then falls away from that point of repentance and enlightenment, he can't be brought back again, "seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." "But I am persuaded better things of you," Paul said, "things that accompany salvation." These other things do not accompany salvation. The Scripture is very clear about that, and you ought to take it at face value. You ought not to try to rake up this, that, and the other to try to make people believe the Bible contradicts what it said over yonder. It does not do anything of the kind. It did not say this man was saved and then lost.

Scanned by TLC

If it had meant he was saved, it could have said so, but it did not say so. But it said, "I am persuaded better things of you." If it was something better, it wasn't the same. That man wasn't saved. These men had something better. They had salvation and that man did not, and he wasn't saved. You should take it at face value. I would not deceive anybody on that matter. The Scripture is very clear.

Now let us see here. 1 Corinthians 9:27:

"But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."

The meaning of *castaway* is clear, very clear. In Greek, it is the word *adokimos,* the Greek word saying literally *without a document,* or *without a certificate.* Paul said, "I am afraid I won't have a certificate,—that I will be a castaway, a preacher God can't approve, can not use. I've preached the gospel and preached it and I am afraid if I grow worldly and carnal God will lay me aside." That is what it says, literally, and that is what is meant. It did not say anything about being a lost sinner. He did not say anything about being afraid his soul would go to hell. He did not say that, so why put it in there? He told you what he meant, "After I have preached to others, I am afraid God will not use me any more—literally laid aside or castaway," he said. Why put it in there that he was afraid he would be lost? Paul did not put that in there. Why do you try to make that mean that he was afraid his soul would be lost? He could have said something like that if he had meant that, but he did not say it.

Over here in 2 Peter; 1st Chaper—here are some interesting things, too. My Brother asked me some questions on that. I am glad to have them. I want you to listen carefully. I wish you had your Bibles. I wish you would bring them, in every case you would learn something about it. 2 Peter 1:4, 5, 6 and 7.

"Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the di-

Scanned by TLC

vine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust."

They have escaped it. How did they escape it? By faith. They are already saved.

"And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge;

"And to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness;

"And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity."

What for? Why add these? To get saved? No. To stay saved? No. What for, then? He tells you right here. Why not take what the Lord said instead of what Brother Oliphant made up about it. It did not say it in here. Nevertheless, I wish you had your Bibles and could look on and you could see for yourself. Look at verse 8.

"For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Why add to your faith virtue and knowledge and these other things? To be fruitful, so you will not be barren. That is what the Lord Jesus said. He did not say to do it to keep from going to hell. Why should Brother Oliphant say it? The Lord plainly tells why you should add it. Add to your faith virtue, to be saved? No, Brother Oliphant, the Lord plainly tells why we ought to get out here and add to our faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, etc. He wants us to do that. Why, Brother Oliphant? So we won't be unfruitful Christians, so we will not be barren, but that we will abound. The Scripture puts that in there. Why did not Brother Oliphant put it in there instead of trying to show that this man is about to go to hell? It did not say that. Read on a little further.

"For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The Christian man sometimes forgets, sure. The Chris-

Scanned by TLC

tian man sometimes forgets and is led wrong, though on doctrine he may be right, and that has happened again and again. David went wrong. But he didn't say, "Lord, save me again." But he said, "Restore unto me the *joy* of thy salvation." Turn to the 51st Psalm and see what is the penalty? Does a Christian become lost? What does the Lord say? They are barren and unfruitful. What will happen to such a man? All we need is for the Bible to tell.

Turn to 1 Corinthians 3:15.

"If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

That is what the Bible says will happen to that man who is barren and unfruitful.

He went on to say on that matter that if a man had good works he would be rewarded for it, it doesn't say he will be saved for it. But the man whose works are burned up, what about him? He shall be saved.

"If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

Turn and read 1 Corinthians 3:11-15.

"For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

"Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble;

"Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.

"If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.

"If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

And here it is again in 2 Peter 1:10, God's reason why we should add to faith virtue, to virtue knowledge, etc.

"Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall."

"To make sure." You are right, Brother Oliphant, lis-

Scanned by TLC

ten, I say to you people and to my people, and I preach it to my own crowds everywhere, again and again, *Make sure about your salvation!* You are dead right, Brother Oliphant! You may not like it, but I have made sure, and I know I am God's child, I know I have been born again, and I have the assurance of God's Word, and the witness of the Spirit in my heart. Brother Oliphant, you are dead right when you tell the people to make sure. If you haven't, then as Peter said in his letter, we ought to make sure. Why? "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, *ye shall never fall.*" Fall into what? Into sin and barrenness, not into hell. Read on, verse 11,

"For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

What do you want? "An abundant entrance!" Not just saved, but much more, "an abundant entrance." What is the difference? Some are saved by fire; some get to rule over ten cities, some over five cities when the Savior comes back down here, as he said. Why, sure. Do you not know that Christian people will be rewarded according to their works? Rewarded—that is not salvation. Some people will have no reward coming. Some will be saved so as by fire in the words of the Scripture themselves. I want "an abundant entrance" and I am looking for an abundant entrance. I have a pay day coming. Sure, I have. That is not salvation. I already have that. I am going to have more of that, too. That is not eternal life, I have already got that now. I've already got it. You do not earn that. That is a free gift of God, eternal life. Thank God, I have it now and will have more later on, but I want some reward, too. I want treasures in heaven. Take the Bible at face value on this matter of a child of God being saved by the blood of Christ. "Now are we the sons of God." Is there anything in the Bible that says that? Yes, the Scripture says we are *born of God,* Brother Oliphant, and not born

Scanned by TLC

of baptism either. You say we get it in the water. Yes, but the water that has to do with this matter is the blood and water that flowed from the side of Jesus Christ.

Notice 2 Peter 1:4:

"Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust."

There is a real change in the nature, then, and that person becomes a new creature. 2 Corinthians and Galatians also tell of this new creature.

2 Corinthians 5:17:

"Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."

Galatians 6:15:

"For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."

A child cannot become unborn. The Bible says much about being born again. It doesn't say anything about a third birth, but it says a whole lot about being born again. Tell me where it talks about being unborn. Will you tell me that? It tells that one who trusts Christ for salvation is made a new creature. Tell me where the Bible says anything about that new creature being unmade. It does not say that. Why is it the Bible uses such terms as "everlasting life," "born of God," and "partakers of the divine nature?" It says we are in the family of God. We will go to heaven. Brother Oliphant, are there any of the family of God in hell? The Bible tells about that body and family and household of faith, etc., and the Bible tells that we are going to be caught up to meet Christ in the air. One body —his body is not going to be broken. The Bible does not say anything about the family of God in hell. Just let him bring a verse that shows any of the family of God in hell. There is no verse that says that, and you should not make the Scriptures mean what they do not mean and do not say,

Scanned by TLC

or to contradict some other Scriptures. These Scriptures are plain and can be taken at their face value as I have said again and again. A child cannot become unborn, but a child can get out of fellowship.

How can they be kept—how can a child of God be kept? Brother Oliphant called attention to 1 John 1:7, and said that God keeps us as we walk in the light. Turn and read it. How can they be kept?

"But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Why, Brother Oliphant, that did not say *keeps;* it said *cleanseth.* No, our keeping—God does that, and he does not do that in consideration of our walking in the light. The keeping is done through the power of God, through faith in him. God does it, and like Paul I can say, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." He did not say, "I am carrying my own soul along the road." No, he said, "I took it to him and turned it loose; I have committed it to him." He is going to keep it. Paul said in that verse *keep.* But cleansing is another matter, sure. Christians need to walk in the light. They need cleansing. My children need it, too. One of my children started to school yestereday and had to come back and wash her hands and face. But they are my children, and I am still God's child, though I need cleansing every day. Christians need to walk in the light every day. I need to. Every day Christians need to come to the Lord and say, "Forgive us our trespasses," and walk in the light and be cleansed. I am still God's child, although I need cleansing. Brother Oliphant, that did not say *keeps,* that said cleanseth. We walk in the light for cleansing. God does the keeping. He says so. The Bible means what it says—a child of God is saved by the blood of Christ, and God does the keeping. I did not twist that either.

Here is some more—Coming back to eternal life, Broth-

Scanned by TLC

er Oliphant says, "The Scriptures teach that a child of God one who has been saved by the blood of Christ can so sin as to be finally lost."

Romans 5:11 says:

"And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement."

"We have *now received* the atonement"!

In Acts 20:28; Paul said,

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Ephesians 1:7:

"In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace."

Colossians 1:14:

"In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins."

1 Peter 1:18, 19:

"Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers;

"But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot".

There are many more Scriptures like these I have been reading. Take the church, for instance. There are some lost people in the local churches. The blood was shed for them, but was never applied. But this is the church that he purchased with his own blood here. We who are saved have all been baptized into one body as 1 Corinthians 12:13 says. This is talking about saved people being baptized by one Spirit into one body, not by a preacher. And the body is not a denomination, but is the body of Christ. It is a building, it is that body that will be caught up in the air to meet the Lord. And the Scriptures say nothing about a man ever getting out of that body. Do not take a

Scanned by TLC

little of the Scripture here, one verse over there, and leave out some. Don't do that--take all of it. Take it at face value. Don't take one verse in the 6th chapter of Hebrews, talking about wicked, Christ-rejecting Jews, and say it means a child of God who has fallen away, when a little later in the same chapter we are told that, these are not the things that accompany salvation.

Why not just find what the Bible says? Find what the Bible says about one member of the body of Christ going to hell. Find a verse where it says God's people will go to hell, or one member of the family of God will go to hell, or one child of God spending an eternity in hell. Some of God's people, Israel, sure, as individuals may go to hell. Mark you, again and again there are many warnings to individuals that they would be cast off as far as the nation is concerned, if they never were saved. And many of them never were saved; they utterly perished. Many were never anything else in their hearts, never true children of Abraham by faith.

All right, here is another. God's child has a nature that cannot sin, can never have sin charged to it. A child of God cannot sin. That is why a child of God cannot be lost. This is what the Scripture says. In 1 John 3:8, 9, it is very clear.

"He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.

"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

Get that verse clear now. Take it at face value. Whatever else you want it to say, and there are a lot of things worth saying, that verse says a child of God cannot sin. But let's get that right. Here it is plainly: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

Scanned by TLC

That seems like a difficult passage unless you take the whole passage together in the light of all the Scripture.

(Moderator: Dr. Rice, you have five minutes.)

(Dr. Rice: Thank you.)

In Romans 7:15-25 Paul makes clear that a child of God has two natures, the new nature and the old nature, he said:

"For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.

"If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good.

"Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

"For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.

"For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.

"Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

"I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.

"For I delight in the law of God after the inward man:

"But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

"O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?

"I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin."

You say, "Is that true about you?" I am sorry to say it is. The same book that says, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin," says, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." I have sinned, but there is a part of me, the seed of God, that remains in me so that I cannot sin and will not sin. The Scriptures

Scanned by TLC

say exactly that in so many words, and I dare not make that mean something else.

"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God" (1 John 3:9).

That is the reason a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ, will not go to hell, because God himself would not. If he is saved, there is something in him that is born of God; there is something born of God and something in there of the divine nature which cannot sin and will not sin. That is the reason a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ, can never fall away and be lost.

Turn to Romans 4th chapter, and there the Lord says he will never charge sin up to him. Why? That does not mean God will not whip his children. God whips his children when they sin many times when he does not whip other folks. I do not encourage my children to sin when I tell them they are still my children. I may beat the socks off of them. When I tell them I will punish them, I do. They are my children, and I love them, but they ought to be punished. God teaches that we ought to whip children, the Bible says so repeatedly. There is nothing in that to encourage sin.

Brother Oliphant says, "Look here; that is dangerous doctrine." Brother Oliphant, don't be afraid of anything God says. It isn't dangerous doctrine. If so, God would not have taught it. Brother, why be afraid of anything God said?

A girl said to me in Waxahachie not long ago, "Brother Rice, I wish that wasn't in the Bible." That is the wrong way to feel about anything in the Bible. You don't know more than God does about it. This is not a dangerous doctrine. God said it again and again, and it is there.

So here it is in Romans the 4th chapter.

"Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.

Scanned by TLC

"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

"Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works" (Rom. 4:4-6).

"Without works." I have the righteousness of God, yet it is "without works." How would one get it without works? God charges it up to him. God gave to my account and gave to your account, and to others, righteousness we had not possessed and righteousness we did not earn. We get it without works. God then said,

"Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

"Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (vss. 7, 8).

Here is a man against whom God will not even charge sin. God will whip him for sin; he may lose fellowship by it. Sin does not pay anybody, sin never did pay. It does not pay a preacher. I wish preachers would quit smoking, gambling, and card playing. I wish preachers would quit their going to picture shows. Sin never did help any body and it does not pay. There is something that takes place when a man is born of God—God's seed remains in him so that he cannot sin. God doesn't charge it to him, for that matter is settled. God may whip me for my sins as his child, but he does not charge them to me. I will not come into jeopardy of my soul, for God said plainly, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." God won't charge sin to him. He is God's child, born of God and his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin. That man is not going to hell either. Now you want some questions. Suppose you give me a verse that shows somebody of the family of God is in hell, will you? I have counted forty-five times where it says one who believes has "everlasting life" or "eternal life."

Scanned by TLC

There ought to be one place where it says he will lose it. But it does not say it. You ought to quit making up a lot of things and twisting, and supposing, and saying it can be implied to mean this and that and the other, and contradicting the plain statements of God's word. A child of God, one born of God, cannot sin. His seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin. There is much more about it.

(How much time have I got?)

(Moderator: One and one-half minutes.)

Here is another: Romans 7:25:

"I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin."

Now then, John 3:16;

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Will one believing in him perish? That verse says he will not. Why add to or take from it? Just believe it and have everlasting life. How long is everlasting? You say that promise is conditional. Why didn't God write the conditions in there then? Jesus was talking to a sinner telling him the story of salvation, telling him salvation is free, and that by believing he may have everlasting life. But, according to Brother Oliphant's belief, he will find it like a watch made out of brass instead of gold, it doesn't last. God does not do that way. The Scripture said it is "everlasting," and said that he "shall not perish."

Here is John 5:24;

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

Got what? Life, yes, but he has got the everlasting, too. Both are in there. The believer is already blessed, has already got it. I have everlasting life. I will have more when I see Jesus. When this body will be changed, I will

Scanned by TLC

have the rest of it. But I have the life now, and I have the everlasting too. And the Lord has me too, and he put me in the body of Christ, buried me in there, and covered me up in there. God's family will all be called up to meet him one of these days, all that are in that body! A child of God, saved by the blood of Christ, cannot be lost!

Moderator: The time is up.

Thank you, and God bless you.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Eighth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 25, 1935.

FOURTH PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach That a Child of God, One Who Has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ Can so Sin as to Be Finally Lost.*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

Opening remarks by the moderator for the affirmative, J. B. Nelson:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We will now have the song service led by Brother Tolbert Stovall after which we want to engage in prayer. We are going to ask Brother C. E. Wooldridge of Fort Worth, who is here tonight with many other Fort Worth preachers, to lead us in prayer.

(After the songs and prayer, Brother Nelson continues.)

The proposition to be discussed this evening is the same that was discussed last evening. I will reread it: "The Scriptures Teach that a Child of God Who Has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ Can so Sin as to be Finally Lost." W. L. Oliphant affirms; John R. Rice denies. This brings us to the closing service of this wonderful debate. The behavior of all has been extraordinarily good. The attention and interest have been fine. The speakers have been genteel in every way, and they have my hearty commendation. We are glad to see this unusually large audience, and especially to have with us many, many people from many towns in Texas and some other states. Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and other states are represented.

Scanned by TLC

We welcome you. We hope you will enjoy this evening's discussion. Speaking in behalf of the disputants, I am sure I can say that we are glad for your presence. Brother Oliphant will now take the lead, affirming the proposition that has been read in your hearing. After thirty minutes, he will be followed by Dr. John R. Rice.

(Third Affirmative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies, and Gentlemen:

It is necessary that I review to some extent the things I said last evening, since we are discussing the same proposition and some of you were not here at that time. I again call attention to my questions. I know my good friend does not like these questions, but I intend to keep them before him. If he does not want to answer them, of course, I cannot make him do so, but I have a right to my conclusion as to why he does not. I think this audience knows why he refuses to answer these questions. He has one more chance to answer them so that I may notice his replies. Will he do it? Time will tell. (1) Can a child of God call his brother a fool? (2) Can a child of God get drunk? (3) If so, can he die while he is drunk? (4) Can one be saved away from the grace of God? (5) Can one be saved without faith? (6) Is the child of God a free moral agent? (7) Is the righteousness revealed in the gospel man's righteousness or God's righteousness?

He is still worried because I do not call him "brother." He wants to know if he and I are not both Gentiles and therefore "brother Gentiles." No, Doctor, I am in Christ, where there is "neither Jew nor Greek." I suppose he and I are cousins. He boasts of following John the Baptist. I follow Christ; Christ and John were cousins. I suppose that makes us second cousins! So I can conscientiously call him "Cousin John." If Dr. Rice will understand that I mean no more than that we are "Brother Gentiles," and that I am not endorsing his false doctrine, I shall be glad

Scanned by TLC

to call him "brother." I assure you that I do not dislike the Doctor. There is nothing personal about the matter. I should be very happy to recognize him as a brother in Christ, if I could believe that he has obeyed the gospel. But so long as he insists that a part of the gospel is not essential and flatly denies some of the things our Lord says, I cannot so recognize him. It is a matter of conscience with me.

When I showed that a "brother" may need to be "converted from the error of his way" in order to have his soul "saved from death" (James 5:19, 20), my opponent says this is not addressed to Christians. He quotes from the first verse of the first chapter: "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting." Had he read the next two verses he would have seen that the epistle is addressed to Christians among the twelve tribes: "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience." James wrote to those who had faith. If my opponent denies that they were saved, he goes back on his theory of salvation by faith alone. Those addressed by James had "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ" (James 2:1). They were people who could pray "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man" (James 5:16). Writing to his brethren, those who had the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ and who could pray the prayer of a righteous man, James said, "Some of 'you' may need to be converted from the error of your way in order to have your soul saved from death."

Rice admits that many Israelites forgot God. They could not have forgotten him if they had never known him. Jesus says that to know God is eternal life (John 17:3). Therefore, some of whom it was said that they had eternal life, were lost.

Under the Old Testament regime, the Jews were God's children (Deuteronomy 14:1). In the 10th chapter of 1 Corinthians, Paul makes an argument for the possibility

Scanned by TLC

of apostacy based on the history of Israel. Let us read: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. 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. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall" (Verses 1:12). My friends, can't you see that Paul makes an argument on my side of this question? Here are people who had come under the protection of the blood in Egypt, were under the cloud and passed through the sea, led by Jehovah. They were baptized unto Moses. They ate and drank of that spiritual Rock, Christ. If they were not children of God, it was not possible for anyone to be a child of God. Many of them became idolaters. They committed fornication; they murmured; they lusted after evil things; they tempted Christ. The result was that many of them were overthrown in the wilderness; twenty-three thousand fell in one day; many were destroyed of serpents; many were "destroyed of the destroyer." And Paul says "these things were our examples." "All these things hap-

Scanned by TLC

pened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition." And his conclusion is: "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." If a Christian cannot fall from grace and be lost, the 10th chapter of 1 Corinthians is meaningless, and the Apostle Paul's purpose in writing it was worthless. I do not know how to make a stronger argument for my proposition than that made by the Holy Spirit. Dr. Rice, I challenge you to answer the Apostle Paul's argument. Sir, it cannot be done!

From Hebrews 10:26-29, I showed that it is possible for Christians (those who have been sanctified by the blood) to "sin wilfully," "trod under foot the Son of God," "count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing" and to "do despite unto the Spirit of grace;" and that for such characters "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation." In trying to avoid the force of this plain scripture, my opponent tells us it is Christ who was sanctified by the blood of the covenant. Such an interpretation is ridiculous. Let us read the 29th verse: "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy . . . . ." (What "he"?) The "he" "who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith 'he' (the same he) was sanctified, an unholy thing, and (he) hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace." The same "he" who trods under foot the Son of God, and does despite to the Spirit of grace is the one who was sanctified by the blood of the covenant. Christ did not shed his blood to sanctify himself, but to sanctify the people. Hebrews 13:12: "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." Before his death, Jesus announced, "I sanctify myself" (John 17:19). He did not wait until his death to be sanctified.

We are told that the characters described in Hebrews 6

Scanned by TLC

were never saved. The Bible says they were: (1) Once enlightened; (2) Tasted of the heavenly gift; (3) Made partakers of the Holy Spirit; (4) Tasted the good word of God; (5) Tasted the powers of the world to come. Where could you find a better description of Christians? He makes a foolish quibble on the word "tasted." He says they did not really eat, but merely tasted—that is, just stuck out their tongues! Now isn't that great interpretation? Let's try the Doctor's interpretation of the word in some other passages. 1 Peter 2:2, 3: "As newborn babes desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: if so be ye have *tasted* that the Lord is gracious." These people merely "stuck out their tongues" to the Lord! Again, Hebrews 2:9: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should *taste* death for every man." According to the Doctor's interpretation, Jesus didn't really die, he merely "stuck out his tongue" at death! Isn't it tragic for a man to get so hopelessly enmeshed in a false doctrine that he will resort to such unreasonable and ridiculous things?

Dr. Rice says that since his children are those born into his family, they cannot cease to be his children—cannot be unborn. Correct. But he can disinherit his children, and they will not partake of the family heritage. God will disinherit some of his children. Numbers 14:12: "I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them."

I am challenged to find one child of God in hell. In view of the plain scriptures I have introduced, this is not necessary to the maintenance of my proposition, but I like to be obliging. Israelites were the children of God (Deuteronomy 14:1). The rich man of Luke 16:19-31 was an Israelite. How do I know? (1) Abraham was his father. (2) He had Moses and the prophets. Only Israelites had Moses and the prophets. Where does the Bible locate this man? "And in hell he lift up his eyes" (Verse 23).

Scanned by TLC

I am challenged to show how a child of God can get out of Christ. I shall again oblige my friend. Jesus said to the Laodiceans: "So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth" (Revelations 3:16). That's one way to get out, Doctor. True, children of God are in Christ, but abiding in Christ is conditional (1 John 2:24). The Christian is kept by the power of God, my friend insists. True, but the keeping is "through faith" (1 Peter 1:5). The gospel is God's power to save (Romans 1:16). Faith comes by hearing the gospel (Romans 10:17). God keeps his people by his power, through their faith. But faith may be shipwrecked (1 Timothy 1:19). When a child of God is lost, it is through no fault of God's power, but because of the individual's failure to retain his faith.

My friend says Paul was not afraid of being lost, but that he might lose his license to preach. I showed that the "rejection" which Paul feared, would come after he had preached to others. He preached to others until the day of his death. I don't imagine the Apostle was interested in a license to preach after he died! I showed that the word used in 1 Corinthians 9:27, translated "cast-away" in the King James Version and "rejected" in the Revised, is the word which is translated "reprobate" in 2 Corinthians 13:5,6. The Bible is its own best interpreter. Read the context if you want to know what Paul was talking about. Paul's efforts were to "receive the prize, to obtain an incorruptible crown"—not to save his position among the people or prevent the loss of his opportunity to preach. (See verses 24, 25). 1 Corinthians 3:15 is not pertinent to this question. The preacher's works which may be burned are those whom he has converted. The Corinthians were Paul's work. (1 Corinthians 4:15, 9:2; 2 Corinthians 3:2). He was afraid some of them would be lost; which would mean that he would suffer loss, but could still be saved.

In answer to my argument on 2 Peter 1:5-11, he says

Scanned by TLC

Christians are to add the graces therein commanded, that they may not be barren or unfruitful. Fine! Jesus said in John 15:2, "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away," and in the 6th verse, he says these unfruitful branches are "burned." (1) If children of God fail to add the Christian graces, they will be unfruitful—Rice. (2) Those who are unfruitful will be taken away and burned—Jesus. (3) Therefore, children of God who fail to add the Christian graces will be taken away and burned. The Doctor is helping me to prove my proposition. Thanks.

My opponent takes at least four distinctly different and contradictory positions in one speech. (1) From 1 John 3:9, he tries to prove that it is impossible for a child of God to sin. (2) He confesses that he sins, but argues from Romans 4:8 that God will not hold him responsible for his sin. (3) That he and other children of God are guilty of sin and the Lord punishes them here, but will not allow them to be eternally lost. (4) That it is only the body of the Christian that sins, and not his spirit. Which one of these positions does my friend expect us to think he believes? He cannot believe all of them. What a tangle! (1) Christians cannot sin. (2) Christians do sin. (3) God will not charge Christians' sins against them. (4) God whips Christians for their sins. (5) It is only the body of the Christian that sins.

It would have been more consistent in friend Rice to have taken one of these positions; but since he took them all, I now have the opportunity of exposing several false positions, instead of only one.

(1) Can the child of God sin? 1 John 3:9 tells why one born of God "doth not commit sin." It is "because his seed remaineth in him." Luke 8:11 says the seed is the word of God. In the 12th verse, he explains that the devil sometimes "taketh away the word out of their hearts"—steals the seed. As long as the word of God re-

Scanned by TLC

mains in the Christian's heart, he cannot sin; but if he allows the devil to steal it out of his heart, he can and will sin. If 1 John 3:9 teaches that a child of God cannot sin under any circumstances, the apostle contradicts himself—and that within less than three chapters. Let us read 1 John 1:8-10: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us."

(2) "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (Romans 4:8). But who is the man "to whom the Lord will not impute sin?" Answer: Those who "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham" (Verse 12). The promise is "through the righteousness of faith" (Verse 13). The righteousness of faith is revealed in the gospel (Romans 1:16, 17). Therefore, the promise applies only to those who live according to the gospel. The imputed righteousness is the righteousness of Christ. This righteousness is imputed only to those who are in Christ (2 Corinthians 5:21). And we may get out of Christ (John 15:1-10; 1 John 2:24; Revelations 3:16). The whole fourth chapter of Romans is a contrast between the law and the gospel, showing that Christians are not under the Mosaic law, but are saved by the righteousness of Christ. That does not mean that the Christian is without law. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Romans 8:2).

(3) It is true that God chastises his children for their sins in this world, but it is also true that they will be finally lost if they are not converted from the error of their way (James 5:19, 20).

(4) If the spirit of the Christian does not sin, it must be only his body that God punishes. How can the Christian's body suffer without his spirit suffering? Dr. Rice

Scanned by TLC

takes the position in his tract on "Hell" that both body and spirit go to hell. Now he tells us that the spirit may belong to God while the body belongs to the devil. Then we may have a spirit in heaven, whose body is in hell! What an absurdity! A man's spirit is responsible for all his sins. The body knows nothing, it is the spirit that knows. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" (1 Corinthians 2:11). "The body without the spirit is dead" (James 2:26). The spirit is responsible for allowing sin to reign in the body. "Let not sin reign in your mortal body" (Romans 6:12). The desire for some things grows out of the flesh, but the purpose to gratify those desires in an unlawful way is formed in the heart. The sin of the heart comes first. Matthew 5:28: "But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." "For out of the heart cometh evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, railings: These are the things which defile the man" (Matthew 15:19, 20). The body is but the instrument through which the spirit acts, either for good or for evil. Romans 6:19: "Ye presented your members as servants of uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto sanctification." The spirit is responsible for the manner in which it uses these instruments. "Therefore brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (Romans 8:12, 13). The "ye" is the spirit of the Christian. The same "ye" shall die, if the bodily instruments are used unlawfully. God commands that our bodies be presented unto him holy (Romans 12:1). Our bodies are members of Christ. "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" (1 Corinthians 6:15).

Scanned by TLC

"Your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit" (1 Corinthians 6:19). "Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's (1 Corinthians 6:20). Both the spirit and the body of the Christian belong to God. My opponent will never be able to excuse his sin on the ground that it is in his body, which belongs to the devil. If his body belongs to the devil, so does his spirit. Once more; 1 Corinthians 3:16, 17: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." My friend's doctrine is directly antagonistic to this plain teaching of God's word. However, his doctrine is not new. It is almost as old as time itself. The devil taught it in the garden of Eden. God warned his children that if they sinned, they would "surely die." The devil said, "Ye shall not surely die."

I think I have noticed all of my arguments which have been in any way questioned by my opponent. In the few remaining minutes, I shall introduce some new argument. 1 John 3:15: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." Can a child of God hate his brother? If so, he can lose the promise of eternal life.

Galatians 6:7, 8: "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; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." The rule: "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap," is universal. It applies to all men—"saints and sinners. It is here addressed to Christians. Based upon this universal, unalterable, and inevitable rule, the Christian has before him two courses: (1) He may "sow to the flesh." The harvest will be "corruption." (2) He may "sow to the spirit." The har-

Scanned by TLC

vest will be "life everlasting." The man doesn't live who can harmonize the Baptist doctrine of "Once in grace always in grace" with Galatians 6:7, 8.

Matthew 5:22: "But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." We have been trying to get Dr. Rice to tell us whether a child of God can call his brother a fool. He still refuses to answer. However, his answer is not necessary. We all know the truth of the matter. (1) A child of God can call his brother a fool. (2) He who calls his brother a fool is in danger of hell fire. (3) Therefore, a child of God can be in danger of hell fire.

The principles governing the eternal destiny of man are announced in John 5:28, 29: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." There are only two classes at the resurrection: (1) Those who have done good. (2) Those who have done evil. There will be no sin in heaven. The child of God who sins, and dies with his sins unforgiven, will find himself among those who "have done evil," and his resurrection will be "the resurrection of damnation."

God's children have their names written in heaven. Hebrews 12:23: "To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven." God has promised that he will not blot out the names of the ones who overcome. Revelations 3:5: "He that overcometh shall thus be arrayed in white garments, and I will in no wise blot his name out of the book of life." Those whose names are not found written in the book of life will be lost. Revelations 20:15; "And if any was not found written in the

Scanned by TLC

book of life, he was cast into the lake of fire." God has said that under certain conditions he will take away our part in the book of life. Revelations 22:18: "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life, and out of the holy city which are written in this book." Those who sin will be blotted out of the book. Exodus 32:33 "And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book." (1) Only children of God have their names written in the book of life. (2) Those whose names are not found in the book will be lost. (3) Children of God may have their names blotted out of the book. (4) Therefore, children of God may be lost.

Jude 6: "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains unto darkness until the judgment of the great day." Again, 2 Peter 2:4: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." Peter argues that if even angels may be lost because of sin, certainly men will be lost because of it. (1) The original estate of angels is holy. (2) Some sinned and fell. (3) They were lost in hell. Again! (1) Angels who sinned are cast into hell. (2) God is no respecter of persons (Acts 10:34). (3) Therefore, all who sin will be cast into hell. Once more: (1) Children of God can live and die in sin. (2) All who die in sin are lost. (John 8:21). (3) Therefore, children of God may be lost.

My friends, the blackest thing on this old earth is sin. It has caused all the sorrows known to mankind. It will damn the soul of him who lives and dies in it. I beg you to flee from it. If God will not spare his angels from the eternal consequences of sin, he will not spare you and me.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Eighth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 25, 1935.

FOURTH PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach That a Child of God, One Who Has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ Can so Sin as to Be Finally Lost.*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

(Third Negative Address by John R. Rice.)

Brother Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and my Brothers and Sisters:

I am glad to be here tonight, and take great heart. At last—after eight nights—my Brother Oliphant has called me "brother"! Now Brother Oliphant is coming right along! If I had six or eight months I could teach him something. Some of the rest of you could learn faster than that. It took me four nights ever to get him convinced on the idea of the millennium. He said the word was not in the Bible and the "thousand years" was only mentioned one time. Finally things got so hot when I pulled the Millennial Harbinger on him, that he said, "All right, I believe in a millennium of a literal thousand years." Finally he said he believed it!

Now, after seven nights, I got him in the notion of calling me "brother." Brother Oliphant, you are coming, that is fine. Brother Oliphant, you are coming right along. If I had plenty of time, I wouldn't have any trouble in fixing Brother Oliphant on the rest of these questions! Amen! I am happy about that. He is learning. He is young, give

Scanned by TLC

him some time! Brother Oliphant, I feel better about that, that you now call me "brother".

Notice that Brother Oliphant, in his position last week, said that there is neither Jew nor Gentile in Christ. But in the case of Ananias, he is going to have to make a concession there. He said Ananias only called Saul "brother" because he was a brother Jew. I recall that just last week on another subject he said there are neither Jews nor Gentiles. Rather bad to bring up your statement on this subject here, isn't it? I remind you that Ananias was converted and still called Paul, "brother." If there were neither Jew nor Gentile back there last week, there are not any this week. You will have to give up one position or the other. The same is true about that man in James. As far as I am concerned, do as you like, Brother Oliphant. You will have to give up the idea that that man was just a Jewish brother and that Paul had not been saved, but was just a Jewish brother; or you will have to give up what you said last week about there being neither Jew nor Gentile. You take your choice.

The fact of the business is, it is a pretty bad line of argument to have to jump from one side of the fence to the other. One time he is a brother because he is a Jew, and the next time there is no such thing as Jew and Gentile after a fellow is saved. It is a pretty bad line of argument to depend on subterfuge like that. But I am glad Brother Oliphant called me "brother." He is coming fine, and if I just had plenty of time we would get this whole thing fixed like we got the millennium fixed last week. He finally admitted a literal millennium of a literal thousand years. He is right about it, too, and right to call me "brother."

That is just like he was about Simon in the 8th chapter of Acts. Last night Brother Oliphant said the fellow believed in Christ, and then he said, "Brother Rice agrees he believed, was baptized and was saved. I agree he was saved."

Scanned by TLC

All right, now Brother Oliphant, I believe in Christ; I was baptized. Why don't you agree I was saved? I am dead sure I have not been as far gone on a lot of things as that man Simon was. Certainly you ought to have called me "brother" all the time. Now Brother Oliphant, you are doing fine—you just listen and you will get along all right, so far as this business of "brother" is concerned. If I just had plenty of time, we could get Brother Oliphant fixed.

Now friends, I come tonight with very deep concern. Your attention has been wonderful and I beg you in Jesus' name, as I come to bring Scripture after Scripture, that your hearts will open to the "thus saith the Lord." God's word is the thing that settles this business. May I say to you again—again I say the whole thing can be settled on that simple basis if you are willing to take what God's word says. I beg you now in Jesus' name that your hearts will be open and it will be settled on this simple basis.

In my next speech, I do not intend to bring any new arguments as they cannot be replied to. I have some rebuttal that I will leave until that time, and will bring new arguments now if I bring them at all.

My friend jumps here and yonder and says, "That fellow looks bad to me." But, mark you, he did not bring one single case where the Scriptures said a man that had been saved is now lost. He told some other things about Bible Christians that are pretty bad. But I can tell you more than that about some that are saved. But the Lord did not say that saved people were lost. And some of them that you said were saved, Brother Oliphant, the Lord did not say were saved.

Coming to John 5:24 again,

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

Now, my friend, the first night that was mentioned, you

Scanned by TLC

began to shrink under it a little bit, and you said that I was getting ahead of the subject. You said that was on the subject of the eternal security of the believer. Because I even mentioned that verse back yonder, Brother Oliphant said I was getting on this subject. It does prove the security of the believer. If there were not another verse in the Bible, that one is still so. How did he know I was getting on this subject? How did he know if that verse did not prove that one who believes in Christ has everlasting life? John 5:24 proves forever that a man is saved when he trusts Christ, and is passed out of death unto life, and from that time forth he shall not come into condemnation.

Now let us see it again. Here it is, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." It did not say "shall have" but he has it now, and shall not come into condemnation. If you say *heareth* is present tense, all right that means *hears*. No man can speak more than one word at a time, only one at a time. Hearing words would have to be more than aorist tense, since words continue, so it is simple present. One after the other, Brother Oliphant and I are speaking. You are listening, present tense. "He that heareth my words and believeth on him that sent me hath (present tense, not shall have) everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation." That is a settled fact, and no exegesis from anybody in the world would claim other than that. He "shall not come into condemnation." Here is a matter that is already proven, already settled, that he shall not come into condemnation. Now the Lord Jesus is the one who said that. But then he also said, "But is passed from death unto life." Let me remind you, he mentioned again,—my brother mentioned last night everlasting life and eternal life. He was in a tight place. He says now he did not mean the Scripture taught or meant that eternal life just continues on. If it does not continue on, where is the "everlasting" part of it then? That is

Scanned by TLC

what it means when it says *everlasting*, that it lasts. That is what *everlasting* means,—that it lasts forever. What does it mean if it does not mean what it says? The Savior said, "He shall not come into condemnation." A child of God, one who has been born again "shall not come into condemnation."

I say again what I said before, the trouble with Brother Oliphant's position is the same as with many good men. Paul was a good man before he was saved. Of course no man is good in heart except as God makes him to be. But Paul said, "I was blameless in my conscience trying to do right." He meant well. I am not saying Brother Oliphant is not saved, but I say many good men are wrong on the thought and on the plan and scheme of redemption. They are wrong on whether you earn your own salvation and get it by works, or whether you get it free by God's everlasting mercy. If you do the saving, you will have to do the keeping. But if God does the saving, God will have to do the keeping. You are right about that. The trouble with my friend all the way through on this, is that he has the wrong plan of salvation. Why, to be sure, if he has to get himself saved, he will have to keep himself saved.

Brother Oliphant uses this Teachers' Gospel Quarterly. There it says on page 77, of the last quarter of 1930:

"One of the first things to be gotten rid of is the old superstition that conversion is miraculous in its nature. This is the direct opposite of the truth as taught in the Scriptures. Conversion is a natural process carried on according to the laws of God. . ."

Now the trouble with Brother Oliphant is that he has the idea that conversion is not miraculous, that it is not that God just supernaturally changes a man's heart and makes him into a child of God. He thinks it is "a natural process."

Now, in my house there are several children—five girls of mine, they are all Rices. The way they got to be Rices is that they were born into the Rice family. That is the

Scanned by TLC

way they got to be Rices. There is another girl there who has lived with us about three years. She does my work. She is a good girl, but that girl is not of the Rice family, because she was not born into it. She lives in our home, but she was not born there. She is not of the Rice family. We got her on the basis that she do the work. If there ever comes a time when she is not of any use in the work, we have no special obligation to keep her. There is one basis of being born in a family, and another of work hard and earn it. That is Brother Oliphant's plan of salvation, work hard and earn it. The other plan is God's, the plan where we are born in the family of God.

Brother Oliphant thinks there will be some of the family of God in hell, but he did not find one Scripture that says a member of God's family is in hell. He went back a thousand or fifteen hundred years and said, "This fellow here *is* lost too." He did not show any Scripture that said he was. That is the trouble with Brother Oliphant's position all the time. He does not mind jumping seven hundred or fifteen hundred years or from one Scripture to another. If he stays there very long it gets hot!

Now read John, chapter 10, verse 27 and following. Here is a very interesting thing. I remind you again, this is the word of God. The Scriptures I am giving you are not guesses, and you do not have to interpret them. You can take them at what they say, and they say whether God keeps his saints or not.

"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.

"My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."

But you say, "What if they do not hear his voice?" But this Scripture says they do. What if they do not follow? But Jesus said they would. You need not waste any time guessing about that. "And I give unto them eternal life."

Scanned by TLC

What kind? Eternal life. How did they get it? "I give it to them." Did they pay for it? No! Didn't they earn it? No! Did they work for it? No! Did they trade for it? No! Did they deserve it? No! How did they get it, then? "I *give* unto them eternal life," Jesus said. "I *give* unto them eternal life." To last until they do wrong? No! "I give them life, and I give the eternal kind," Jesus said. *"Eternal"*—that is the kind of life I give them. *"Eternal"* —Jesus gives that, the same as he gives the life. That is the way one gets it, Jesus gives it. Whatever goes with it, Jesus gives. And it is free, and you do not have to pay for it.

"They shall never perish." What is that? Jesus said, "My people shall never perish." All right, that is a plain statement. There are four in this brief passage,—four express statements that cannot be denied. They ought to be taken by honest Bible-believing Christians.

1. "I give unto them eternal life."
2. "And they shall never perish."
3. "Neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand."
4. "My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."

He did not say, "They will never perish if they do right and hold out faithful." He did not say, "If they do not get drunk they shall never perish," and this, that and the other, but, "I give unto them eternal life and they shall never perish," is what it says here. "And neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand."

(It is a little warm in here—open the windows, please).

Notice verse 28.

"And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall NEVER perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand."

Brother Oliphant, the Revised Version is a little clearer. You are more or less familiar with the usage of it there.

Scanned by TLC

"And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand."

In the Authorized Version, the word man is in italics, meaning it is not in the original. "Neither shall any," is what it really says. The marginal rendering is, "Neither shall ought." Neither anybody, nor anything, devil, man, circumstance or anything else—"Neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." That is what the Lord Jesus said. Can't I do it? Are you anybody or anything or any kind of a circumstance? Again and again I say, no, you cannot. "And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."

Now notice this, God gives me to Jesus and Jesus gives me eternal life. Nobody can take me away from Jesus and nobody can take me away from God the Father. All that is very plain in the brief statement of these two verses. You do not have to have a dictionary to understand that. That is what the Bible says. It says, "My sheep hear my voice and I know them, and they follow me." Jesus said, "I give to them eternal life." To whom? To them that hear my voice and follow me. He didn't say *if* they do. He said, "They follow me." Sheep do not follow perfectly and Christians do not follow perfectly either. But God's sheep hear his voice. Make all the fun about the witness of the Spirit that you want to, but the word of God says, "My sheep hear my voice." And I do, and if you have been born again, you do, too. If you do not, you had better get it, Brother. The word of God is clear. You had better hear, for he said, "My sheep hear my voice and they follow me." I just want to suggest to you, you ought to take very seriously the question of following Jesus. If you are not doing that, you had better check up and see if you are one of his sheep, if you ever have been or not. "My Father, which gave them me is greater than all; and no

Scanned by TLC

man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." The word *man* there again is in italics. No one, nothing, ought is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. That is how secure my soul is.

There is more of it, I wish we had time for much of it. Here is another in John the 4th chapter. Here is some explanation on some of these things. The Savior is talking to the woman at the well. He would not deceive her. Come, and we will look at verses 14 and 15.

"But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

How does he get it? "I give it to him," Jesus said. It is just free.

"The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw."

Will one who drinks of this water ever thirst? He never will. One who drinks of this water will never thirst. On whose authority? On Christ's authority. Jesus said, "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him *shall never thirst;* but the water that I shall give him shall be in him *a well of water* springing up into *everlasting* life." Why? I will tell you why. Because the Scripture says, the Savior said, "He will have a well of water in him springing up into everlasting life." Brother Oliphant, you ought to have read all of that before now.

"But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him *shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlast*ing life."

How long will that well flow? As long as everlasting is, and that is as long as God is. God put into me his divine nature (we are partakers of the divine nature), and made me a child of God, because I have been born of God. I John 3:8, 9 says,

"He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil

Scanned by TLC

sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

Brother Oliphant, laugh all you want to, that is still in the Bible. You say, "I do not understand that." But that does not change the fact. That is what Nicodemus said when Jesus was talking about the same thing exactly. There are a lot of people who live a ceremonial, legalistic, Pharisaical life like Nicodemus, who do not understand it. But that does not change the fact that there is something in that new birth that comes as the wind, as the Scripture says. "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," the Scripture says. Mock if you want to at the witness of the Spirit of God in man's heart. Nevertheless, my friend, the Savior makes it clear that in the heart, one who drinks of this water has a well of water in him that does not go dry. But he will have a well of water in him, and he shall never thirst again. The Savior expressly said he shall never thirst. God's word is true. But if you turn this a little, and twist that a little, you may make it say what it does not mean. What are you going to do about the plain, express statements of the Savior again and again where he said to this poor woman who was a heathen, "If you will drink of this water you will never thirst again, but there will be in you a well of water springing up into everlasting life?" The Savior is clear about this business. This woman said to him, "Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw." All this woman understood about this was, she knew Jesus, but she did not understand about the nature of the water. Many another cold heart does not at first, does not understand about the nature of this water. But she understood she would never be thirsty

Scanned by TLC

any more, however she got it. Take Jesus by faith and you will never thirst again. This woman was happily saved, and was saved by believing, too. The Scripture tells about many of the people of Samaria being saved the same way. Not every one of them were saved, but many were.

All right, here is some more. Here is Psalms 37th chapter. You do not have to guess about this. Well, you say, "I think it is implied." This is not settled by implication. It is settled by what God's word plainly says, that a saved person cannot be lost. You say, "It looks to me that it is reasonable for men to be saved by works and lost when they do not work." Men are going to hell depending on their reason. That "Church of Christ" quarterly that Brother Oliphant endorses says that conversion is just a natural process. I deny it. Conversion is not just a natural process. But that quarterly says:

"One of the first things to be gotten rid of is the old superstition that conversion is miraculous in its nature. This is the direct opposite of the truth as taught in the Scriptures. Conversion is a natural process. . . . ."

I deny that. Conversion is a *supernatural* birth. It is according to a miraculous act of God, contrary to nature and against nature. It is the nature of man to sin, and only by being born again are we made children of God. Folks are now going to hell depending on their reason, aliens from God, children of hell. It is only by God's mercy that a child of hell becomes a child of God.

The 37th Psalm, verses 23 and 24, 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: for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand."

You say, "Can a good man fall?" Yes, he can fall, but he will not fall into hell. "He shall not be utterly cast down." Jesus told Peter that he was going to deny him and said, "Satan hath desired to have you, that he may

Scanned by TLC

sift you as wheat: But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not" (Luke 22:31, 32). You say, "Can a good man fall?" Yes, he can fall, but not into hell. "He shall not be utterly cast down." Peter fell into sin. You can fall into sin and fall into disgrace. Noah did, David did, and the rest of us have, too, as far as that is concerned. But the Lord said in Psalm 37:24:

"Though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down: for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand."

Now this is the difference; if you do your own climbing, and you slip and fall, you are a goner. But there is a difference if God takes hold of you with his right hand. You are saved, and though you fall, you will not be utterly cast down. Did not the word of God witness to it? The trouble with this that Brother Oliphant is defending, is that it is a false plan of salvation that puts the honor on man instead of on God. That is "works salvation" instead of "grace salvation." That is salvation from keeping the ceremonial law, instead of by the mercies of God for sinners.

In the same chapter, verse 28 says:

"For the Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved forever: but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off."

I remind you that the word *saints* in the Bible does not mean perfect people as our Roman Catholic friends use it. They have led people wrong on that. The word *saints* many, many times in the Bible, refers to the saved. The word *saint* comes from the word *saved.* "For the Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved for ever: but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off." Somebody will ask me, "Brother Rice, do you believe in the *perseverance* of the saints?" No, I do not. But if you ask me if I believe in the *preservation* of the saints, then I can say, "Yes, I do." Too many put the emphasis on man instead of on God. God will do it. But do not count on my goodness nor on your goodness—God will

Scanned by TLC

preserve. He preserves his saints. How long? "They are preserved forever"! Do God's people do it? No. God does it.

"For the Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved for ever: but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off."

And the next verse, verse 29, says,

"The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein for ever."

Brother Oliphant, that is a mighty good one any time, either on last week's subjects or this week's!

There is more here. Romans the 7th chapter. Romans has lots of good things in it, Brother Oliphant. Turn to Romans 7:25 and part of that verse says:

"So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin."

Brother Oliphant did not like it because Romans 7:25 says, "With the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." I did not say that. That is what Paul said by divine inspiration. Mock all you want to. Paul still says it, and it is still there. If Paul said it, I can afford to say it, too. Mock all you want to, but the spiritual things are not easily discerned, many times. But we ought to have contrite and humble hearts and take what God's word says. God's word says it, and I say, "Amen" to Romans the 7th chapter.

Here are some happy things in Romans the 8th chapter. There are many good things in the Bible. The 33rd verse of the 8th chapter of Romans says:

"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth."

But who are you? Will you say, "I am going to charge you with doing wrong?" Who are you to lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. The same thing is said in the 4th chapter of this same book and the 8th verse.

Scanned by TLC

"Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin."

Brother Oliphant laughed at that, but the words are the words of the Bible. I read it to you again and again last night. Then I say, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." That settles the condemnation question.

Brother Oliphant did not like John 5:24 either.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

The Revised Version says, "Cometh not to judgment." I will not even come to judment. Christ died: that is why I will not come into condemnation as far as the judgment of my soul is concerned. My sin was judged in Jesus on the cross. When Jesus said, "It is finished," and went back to the Father's right hand and sat down, it was finished and finished for good as far as this poor soul is concerned! I committed my soul to him and he has it. I put my eternal soul's welfare in that bank, and that bank has not gone broke. The Great Physician has never lost a case, and never will!

Reading on in Romans the 8th chapter and 35th verse:

"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?"

He did not say who will stop Christ's love for me. That is not it. It says, "Who shall *separate* us from that love?" Who will take John R. Rice out of touch with that love? The devil cannot separate me from Christ's love nor can anybody else. Of course it will not be stopped. But the connection will not be severed either. The connection between God and his child will not be severed either.

Then verse 38 says:

"For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor

Scanned by TLC

angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come,"

Not anything living, nor anything dead, nor angels—good angels or bad angels; nor principalities nor powers—powers in heaven, powers in hell or powers on the earth; nor things present nor anything you can mention can take me out of that love. Cannot I take myself out? Are you present? Then you cannot. No, sir! Are you going to be present some time to come? Then you cannot. The Lord expressly mentioned you before. No, you cannot. Then he goes on to say in Romans 8:39:

"Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Nothing all the way up to the heights of heaven, nor down to the depths of hell, nor any other creature God made, no, nor any other thing that God ever created, can separate us from that love. No, you cannot stop God's works. No, you cannot get away from that love. And nothing can separate between me and Christ's love. The Scripture says that none of these shall be able to separate us from the love of God. "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor heights, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." It is in Christ, that is why. It is in Christ, that is why! My salvation, where does it rest? It rests in Christ. He paid for it, and it is bought and settled, signed and sealed, thank God! When Jesus said, "It is finished," Brother, it is finished! And the Scripture says:

"For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come.

"Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:38, 39).

Scanned by TLC

Nothing can separate the child of God from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Not only, he cannot be separated from the love of God, but that is true about the salvation also. Nothing can separate between the two —it cannot take place.

Oh how many, many happy Scriptures there are! Here the Scripture in Jude is interesting, for in Jude the Scripture expressly says we are preserved. Well, you say, "I think something else is implied." Do not go by implications and guesses—go by what the Scripture says. Jude 1 says:

"Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called."

It did not say those that are preserved are those that hold out faithful. It says it is those that HE preserves. If you have been born again, you are one of the preserved ones. Some pray this prayer so much and say, "Save us in heaven." No, this world is the time in which to get saved, and not the next. You had better get this thing settled now. Thank God, I got that settled back there as a nine year old boy! Praise the Lord for it! If you are saved, you ought to get someone else to Christ. We are the preserved. Yes, sir, we are the preserved!

There is much more of it. Here are some. 1 Peter 1:4, and Hebrews 7:23. Let me turn to Hebrews and read it. I might misquote it.

Hebrews 7:23:

"And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death."

(Five minutes, Brother Rice.)

Here we are. I can come back to the other. I used the one in Peter before. I must get to this while I can. Hebrews 7:23. Here is an interesting item.

"And they truly were many priests, (Aaronic priests) *because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death."*

And the verses following:

Scanned by TLC

"But this man (Jesus) *because he continues ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.*

"Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that COME unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.

"For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;"

Save those who do what? That just come! That do what? That come. That is what John 6:37 says, too.

"All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."

"Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost." How long? *"To the uttermost* them that come unto God by him." Now why? Because we hold out faithful? Oh, no. On what basis, on man's goodness? Oh, no! Because we go to church and Sunday School on Sunday morning and keep the five steps, keep to the hour of death every thought, feeling, purpose, word, and deed? No! On what basis then? No! But ". . . . seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." On what basis am I kept saved? Christ did the saving and he is ever present to intercede to keep me saved.

"Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself." (Heb. 7:27).

He settled it because he is able to take my part, and that is what he meant when he said the same thing in 1st John.

"My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John 2:1).

Thank God for that!

Here is another. Hebrews the 10th chapter. That is a good chapter. Brother Oliphant went back and had hash

Scanned by TLC

again tonight. I do not blame him for using that. We have turkey on Christmas and hash the next day. We had turkey last night, and hash tonight.

All right here are some more. They are mighty good. Come back to the 10th chapter of Hebrews.

Hebrews 10:6-12.

"In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure.

"Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God.

"Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law;

"Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.

"By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

"And 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;"

"Once for all." Now read on, *"But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God."* Now listen, one offering, one sacrifice forever, one Priest forever. Now then, listen. We have but one offering. Yes, and he has perfected forever them that are sanctified. Sanctified means set apart. Then they are set apart by the blood of Christ, set apart as God's children. They are sanctified; set apart by Jesus Christ. They are perfected. He has perfected forever their salvation. You are right on this, Brother Oliphant. You misquoted me, saying the body belongs to the devil. I quoted what Paul said, you remember, in the 7th chapter of Romans, and it is still there, and it is still so, too, thank God. The fact is, I did not say that, and the passage did not either. "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit

Scanned by TLC

sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." The Savior makes clear he does not impute iniquity to the child of God. There is but one Sacrifice, Jesus, and "he hath perfected FOREVER them that are sanctified." Read on.

"Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before,

"This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;

"And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more" (Hebrews 10:15-17).

And that is the reason I say the question hangs on that, a changed heart, being born again, being made a partaker of the divine nature. That is what you need. May God grant you will see it tonight!

Have I another minute?

Moderator: One-half minute.

Here is another one. I want to remind you, Brother Oliphant, I made some arguments you did not refer to. He will get time a little bit later. I asked him to show me one time out of the forty-five or more times where "everlasting life" is mentioned or "eternal life," I asked him to show me one time where it ever said a child of God could be lost. It does not say it. It does not say it! God bless you. There will be more later.

The time is up.

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Eighth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 25, 1935.

FOURTH PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach that a Child of God Who has been Saved by the Blood of Christ can so Sin as to be Finally Lost.*

W. L. Oliphant, Affirmative;
John R. Rice, Negative.

(Fourth Affirmative Address by W. L. Oliphant.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Dr. Rice, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you for the last time in this series of discussions. Dr. Rice has the last speech. You will please remember that I have no reply to what he may say in that speech. No, I am not complaining because he speaks last. I am only insisting that it is unfair for him to fail to notice my arguments in his speeches to which I have a reply, and then try to answer them when I have no opportunity to show the weakness of his efforts. He has done this on former propositions; I hope he will not be guilty of the same unfairness tonight.

The Doctor says we have turkey on Thanksgiving, and hash the next day. My arguments must still be turkey; he has not "hashed" them any. He has not even tried to bite into most of them!

It is amusing to hear Dr. Rice read, "their sins and iniquities will I remember no more" (Jeremiah 31:34 and Hebrews 8:12), and apply it to Christians in this age. Last week, while he was trying to get all the Jews saved in Canaan, he applied this prophecy to his future millennium. Now, while he is trying to prove that children of God in

Scanned by TLC

this age can never be lost, he thinks it is now being fulfilled. What do you think of the consistency of a man who so handles the word of God? But I am glad that the Doctor is at last right on the time of the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophecy, even if he does not know what it means. Jeremiah 31:31-34, of which Hebrews 8:8-12 is a quotation, contrasts the old and new covenants. Under the old covenant there was no actual forgiveness of sins. The old covenant had only animal sacrifices which could never take away sin. "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" (Hebrews 10:3, 4). Under the new covenant we have the blood of Christ, and Christians have their sins everlastingly forgiven. Sins and iniquities once forgiven are remembered no more. But this does not mean that sins can be forgiven before they are committed. Baptist doctrine at this point is very much like the old Roman Catholic doctrine of indulgences. God does not license anybody to commit sin.

Dr. Rice says the 10th chapter of Hebrews is a good chapter. Certainly. Every chapter in the word of God is a good chapter; but he doesn't seem to believe this one. It still teaches that those who are guilty of wilful sin, in that they trample under foot the Son of God, count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and do despite unto the Spirit of grace; will be lost, in spite of the fact that they have been sanctified with the blood of the covenant (Verses 26-29). He quotes, "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Verse 14). If this means what my opponent says, it does not apply to him, because he admits that he sins every day. What does it mean? Simply that Christ, unlike the Levitical priests, does not have to "stand daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins" (Verse 11). His sacrifice of himself was a final and

Scanned by TLC

complete sacrifice. Not all for whom Christ made this sacrifice will be saved. If so, the whole world will be saved, for Christ "tasted death for every man" (Hebrews 2:9). Though Christ died for all, only those who accept the benefits of his blood by faith and obedience to him will be saved. Though Christians are cleansed by his blood, their continuing clean is dependent on their "walking in the light as he is in the light" (1 John 1:7). In the very same chapter where the apostle tells us that Christ has by one offering "perfected for ever them that are sanctified," he also admonishes: "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; for he is faithful that promised" (Hebrews 10:23). If Christians are lost, it will be through no fault of Christ's offering, but because of their failure to "hold fast the profession of their faith."

Our friend reads Hebrews 10:39: "But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." His own proof text shows that there are some "who draw back unto perdition." They could not "draw back unto perdition," if they had never left their lost state. Hence, his own proof text proves my proposition.

Our attention is called to Hebrews 7:23-26: "And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." Paul is here contrasting the Aaronic priesthood with the priesthood of Christ. The high priests of the old covenant had to continually make offerings. They could not serve forever, because they were subject to death. Our high priest made an everlasting offering in the sacrifice of himself and can continue to

Scanned by TLC

make intercession for us, because he is not subject to death. No one will be lost because of the death of the high priest, or because of the failure of his offering.

While on the cross Jesus prayed for those who crucified him. Fifty-three days afterward they were still unsaved. They were still charged with the sin of his crucifixion (Acts 2:23). Jesus' prayer for them was still unanswered. When was his prayer answered? When they accepted the terms of salvation offered by the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:37-41). Christ is the Christian's high priest. He intercedes for us, but he does not ask that we be saved contrary to the will of God. We must "walk in the light as he is in the light."

We are "preserved in Jesus Christ" (Jude 1). But notice that the preservation is in Christ. I have shown over and over, that abiding in Christ is conditional. We may get out of Christ, and thus lose the promise of being preserved. To the very same people whom Jude addressed as the preserved in Jesus Christ, he said: *Keep yourselves in the love of God,* looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ *unto eternal life* (Verse 21). Though preserved in Christ, we must continue to abide in Christ and keep ourselves in the love of God.

We are kept by the power of God (1 Peter 1:5). Yes, but it is "through faith." Early in the debate I showed by plain statements from the word of God that Christians may cast off their faith, depart from it, or make shipwreck of it. My arguments on these scriptures have never been so much as mentioned by my opponent.

We have listened to quite a lengthy argument from Romans 8:35-39. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.

Scanned by TLC

For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Does this mean that all whom God loves will be saved? Then no one will be lost. God loves the whole world (John 3:16). But granting that this scripture applies particularly to Christians, it does not teach the impossibility of apostacy. No external thing can separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus; but we may separate ourselves. John 15:9, 10: "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: *continue ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love;* even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his *love.*" Thus we see that the child of God has the obligation of keeping himself in God's love. Again, Jude admonishes: "Keep yourselves in the love of God" (Jude 20, 21). Jude's Epistle was written to Christians: "To them that are sanctified by God, and preserved in Jesus Christ" (Verse 1). He warns them to keep themselves in the love of God. The warning was timely, because some had already separated themselves from the love of God. Verse 19: "These (those who walk after their own ungodly lusts, Verse 18) be they who separate themselves . . . " One does not become a mere machine, in becoming a Christian. God leaves us free moral agents. We retain the power of choice. We can separate ourselves from him through sin. "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear: But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear. For your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity; your lips have spoken lies, your tongue hath muttered perverseness" (Isaiah 59:1-3). No external force can compel the Christian to depart from Christ. Nor is God responsible for our going away from him. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for

Scanned by TLC

God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" (James 1:13-15). Our separation from God must begin in our own hearts.

Dr. Rice says he has deposited his money in the bank of heaven, and the bank has not gone broke. It is not a question of the bank's going broke, but has God locked up our deposit and refused to allow us to withdraw it?

He says he has engaged the Great Physician who has never lost a case. But the physician can do him no good, so long as he refuses to take his medicine.

We are asked to consider Psalms 37:23, 24. "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: for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand." This is the wrong passage for Rice. After all his criticism of good works, he now tries to rely on the promise made to a "good man." Doctor, it is the steps of a *good* man that are ordered by the Lord? And why didn't you read on through the 27th verse? You would have learned that this promise is conditional. "Depart from evil, and do good; and dwell for evermore." My friend seems to have learned that he must not read too far.

Jesus' statement to the Samaritan woman is introduced: "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst" (John 4:14). "Drinketh" indicates a continuing action. Is the child of God to drink once and quit, or is he to continue to drink?

He keeps talking about salvation being a gift. Sight is a gift, but I cannot see if I close my eyes. Hearing is a gift, but I lose the gift when I stop my ears. Many of God's gifts to us are conditional. Rice should understand that. He understands that we are commanded to believe and that if we refuse to do so, we cannot be saved. Why

Scanned by TLC

does he not say; "Lord, I refuse to believe. You have said salvation is a gift. If I have to do something for it, it ceases to be a gift." Suppose I should take a $10.00 bill from my pocket and say to one of these boys in the audience: "Come to the rostrum, and I will give you this $10.00." (Understand, I am not going to do this, for the perfectly good reason that I do not have the ten!) But would you say that the $10.00 ceases to be a gift, because it was predicated upon the boy's coming to the rostrum after it?

Let's notice 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." This passage does not read right for my opponent. According to him, God gives eternal life to a goat in order to make a sheep out of him. Let us analyze the passage: (1) They are sheep. (2) They hear his voice. (3) They follow him. (4) He gives them eternal life. (5) They shall never perish. It is after they have become sheep, heard the voice of Christ and followed him, that he gives them eternal life. How long are we to follow Christ? "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" (Revelations 2:10).

I have more than once answered his agruments on the scriptures which speak of eternal life in the present tense. I tried to avoid a lot of quibbling on these passages by taking them up in my first speech on this proposition and showing the harmony between them and the passages that speak of eternal life as a promise to be fulfilled in the world to come. All of my efforts seem to have been in vain, so far as my opponent is concerned; but I believe the unprejudiced people of this audience understand and appreciate my fair and honest handling of these scriptures.

But let's notice more particularly the passage on which he so much relies. John 5:24: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on

Scanned by TLC

him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." John 3:36 says, "He that believeth not the son shall not see life." If John 5:24 means that the believer can never become an unbeliever and be lost, then John 3:36 means that the unbeliever can never become a believer and be saved. "Shall not" is as permanent in one case as it is in the other. If the unbeliever can become a believer and "see life," the believer can become an unbeliever and "come into condemnation." I have shown from John 17:3, that eternal life is to know God; and from Jeremiah 2:32 and 2 Peter 1:9, that children of God can forget God. If eternal life is to know God, does the one who forgets God have eternal life?

No, Doctor, I did not "finally" admit the millennium. There was no "finally" or "admitting" about it. I stated the position I have held all the time. I now believe, and have always believed, exactly what Revelations 20 says. I have never believed, nor do I now believe, your false theories about a millennium. It seems to me that the gentleman is trying to throw up a smoke-screen to hide his defeat on the millennium question. This audience is too intelligent for you, Doctor. I believe they can see that, after all of your boasting about taking the Bible literally, you refuse to take your principal proof text on the thousand year reign just as it reads. But I am satisfied with the arguments I made on that question. I am willing to allow this great audience to decide, on the basis of the scriptures offered, what the truth is. If my friend's defeat hurts so badly, and he thinks he can do better, I shall be glad to give him a "second chance," by debating the proposition with him again at some future date. However, I do wish that he could get his mind off of that question until we have finished our present proposition.

Dr. Rice first said he was a Jew and expected to go back to Palestine. Now he says he is a Gentile, and rejoices

Scanned by TLC

in the fact that I have called him "brother." Although I did not do it, if he can get any consolation out of thinking that I call him a "brother Gentile," I am glad for him to have that relief. He insists that since he has been baptized, I should be willing to recognize him as a brother in Christ. My friends, I do not prize baptism so highly as to think that the mere act of baptism saves. It must be prompted by the proper purpose. So long as my opponent denies that baptism is for the only thing that God ever said it is for, I shall have to think that he has not been scripturally baptized.

My questions remain unanswered. I give my opponent credit for having sense enough to know that to have attempted to answer them was to have revealed the falsity of his position. His refusal speaks well for his judgment, but says little for his fairness and love of truth. I have engaged in a number of religious discussions, but frankly say that I have never before met a man who had the nerve to so completely ignore the questions I asked.

Since I shall have no reply to anything that may be hereafter said on the other side, I do not care to introduce any more argument.

In the time remaining I want to give you a resume of the work of the affirmative on this proposition. The child of God lives in hope of eternal life (Titus 1:1, 2). He receives eternal life in the end (Romans 6:22). Christians are urged to lay hold on eternal life (1 Timothy 6:12). God renders eternal life at the judgment (Romans 2:6, 7). Disciples of the Lord will receive eternal life in the world to come (Mark 10:29, 30). The Christian's reward at the judgment will be to enter into eternal life (Matthew 25:46). A number of scriptures speak of the child of God as now possessing eternal life. The honest student of the word of God does not array these scriptures against each other. I have tried to show the harmony existing between them. "Eternal" means that which has no begin-

Scanned by TLC

ning, as well as no end. Life existed before man received it. It may exist after he loses it. To know God is eternal life (Matthew 17:3), but God's children may forget him (Jeremiah 2:32). Christ is called eternal life (1 John 1:1-3). The Christian is said to have eternal life because he is in Christ, but the Christian's abiding in Christ is conditional (1 John 2:24). This harmony of God's word on the question of eternal life I offered early in the debate. I have reiterated my arguments along this line from time to time. My opponent has completely ignored them. The men and women of this audience have sufficient intelligence to see the truth of the matter.

The Christian is not kept in God's favor through man's righteousness, but through God's righteousness. God's righteousness is revealed in the gospel (Romans 1:16, 17). His commandments are righteousness (Psalms 119:172). Living according to the gospel—keeping the commandments of God—is not self-righteousness.

Christians are kept by the power of God, but the keeping is through faith (1 Peter 1:5). Faith comes by hearing the word of God (Romans 10:17). To be kept through faith, therefore, is to live by the word of God. "It is written man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matthew 4:4).

We cannot be saved apart from Christ. Many of Christ's disciples forever separated themselves from him (John 6:66). They were, therefore, lost.

The Christian life is a life of faith. There is no salvation for anyone apart from faith. But the Christian's faith may be overthrown (2 Timothy 2:18). Christians may depart from the faith (1 Timothy 4:1). They may make shipwreck of their faith (1 Timothy 1:19). They may cast off their faith. When they do they have damnation—not salvation (1 Timothy 5:12). Men may receive the word with joy, believe for awhile and then fall away (Luke

Scanned by TLC

8:13). Baptists contend that all those who believe are saved. Dr. Rice has never explained how these believers were lost. He cannot do so, and still hold his positions on the plan of salvation and apostacy.

The second chapter of 2 Peter tells of people who were bought by the Lord and escaped the pollutions of the world. Thereafter they went astray, forsook the right way, became cursed children, presumptuous, self-willed, despisers of government, like beasts, rioters, spots and blemishes, deceivers, adulterers, wells without water, clouds carried with the tempest, worse than they were at the beginning, so bad that it had been better for them never to have known the way of righteousness. They were finally lost. Peter does not say they were beasts, as my opponent contends, but that they became *like* beasts. He did not say they were dogs or sows. In illustrating their apostacy, he used the proverb of the dog turning to his own vomit and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire. His challenge that I find where God's people are called dogs is foolish; however if it will help the gentleman any, he may read 2 Samuel 9:8.

From Luke 12:43-47, we have learned that the Lord's own servants may become sinners and that when the Lord returns, they will be appointed a place with the unbelievers. The appointment of one to a place shows that he did not already have that place. If the servant had been a bad man to begin with, he would have already had a place with the unbelievers. This scripture, by itself, is enough to prove my proposition. My opponent has chosen to give it no consideration whatever. He cannot plead insufficient time. I gave him this argument in my first speech. The man doesn't live who can refute it. I say this, not because it is my argument, but because it is God's eternal truth.

Matthew 25:14-30 records the parable of the talents. Our Lord is represented as "a man traveling into a far

Scanned by TLC

country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods." To one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one. "And straightway took his journey." The men with five and two talents used them to their good and to the glory of their Lord. The one-talent man hid his Lord's money. "After a long time the Lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them." The five and two talent men were rewarded. The one-talent man was called a "wicked and slothful servant." The talent he had was taken from him and he was cast into outer darkness. Here we have one of the Lord's own servants who "so sinned as to be finally lost." Why did Dr. Rice pay no attention to this plain scripture? Why will a man who claims to love the truth hold a position which forces him to ignore much of God's holy word?

In John 15:1-10, Jesus compares himself to a vine and his disciples to the branches in the vine. The branches are clean; they are in Christ. Some of the branches bear fruit. These are purged that they may bear more fruit. The branches that bear no fruit are taken away by the Father. They are gathered and burned. I introduced this argument in my first speech. It has not been accorded the courtesy of even a brief mention by the opposition. Anything he may say about it in his last speech should be "taken with a grain of salt," for he seems to have known that there is nothing he could say that will bear investigation. It will do him no good to say that men do the burning. Angels are often called men (Genesis 18:2 and Acts 1:10). Jesus says it is angels who will at the final judgment "gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire" (Matthew 13:41, 42). If he says it is literal branches that are burned, then I remind him that Jesus says, "Ye are the branches." As the husbandman of the literal vineyard prunes his vines and burns the unfruitful branches; so, God "takes away" the Christian who is fruitless. Through the agency of his

Scanned by TLC

angels, they are "gathered out" and cast into hell. I again urge upon my opponent that the branches (disciples) are in the vine (Christ), and that they are "clean." Only the blood of Christ can cleanse. Therefore, these disciples are children of God "who have been saved by the blood of Christ." Some of them are taken away and burned. John 15 eternally establishes the truth of my proposition.

To be in the kingdom is to be born again—saved (John 3:3-5). Some will be gathered out of the kingdom and cast into hell (Matthew 13:41, 42). Therefore, some who have been born again—saved, will be cast into hell.

We are saved by grace (Ephesians 2:8). Christians may fall away from grace (Galatians 5:4). Therefore, Christians may be lost.

A child of God can "err from the truth." If one converts him from the error of his way, he "saves a soul from death" (James 5:19, 20). Since no one can save from physical death, the death from which a Christian may need to be saved is eternal death. According to my opponent, the child of God can never be in danger of this death. We are confronted with two alternatives: (1) Believe the apostle James, or (2) Believe John R. Rice.

The apostle Paul found it necessary to "buffet" his body and "bring it into bondage" lest he should, after his long life of service, be "rejected" (1 Corinthians 9:27). My opponent claims for himself something which the great apostle knew he did not have. A brother may "perish" (1 Corinthians 8:11, 12). A brother may be "destroyed" (Romans 14:15). These scriptures, although introduced early, have not been so much as mentioned by the man who so earnestly contends that he believes all the Bible.

From Hebrews 10:26-29, we have found that a child of God—one who has been sanctified with the blood of the covenant—may trample the Son of God under foot, count the blood an unholy thing, and do despite to the Spirit of grace. After such sin, there remains for him nothing but

Scanned by TLC

"a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation."

Hebrews 6:4-6 tells of children of God being lost. Those "who were once enlightened, tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come," so far fell away that it was "impossible" to renew them again unto repentance. Here are people who were once saved and then departed so far from God that is it impossible for them ever to be saved. This amounts to a demonstration of my proposition. I need only write my proposition, followed by Hebrews 6:4-6 and Q.E.D. The matter is reduced to a mathematical certainty.

Acts 8:12-24 tells of the conversion and apostacy of Simon. After the time when my opponent admits Simon was saved, he was declared to be "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." He was urged to repent and pray that he might be saved. Will Dr. Rice tell us that he would have been eternally saved if he refused to repent and pray?

Dives was a child of God, being one of God's chosen people (Deuteronomy 14:1). He went to hell (Luke 16:19-31). Here is another demonstration of my proposition.

The children of Israel who crossed the Red sea were saved. They ate and drank of Christ; they were "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Many of them fell and were destroyed. Paul cites their experiences as an evidence of the possibility of a Christian so sinning as to be lost (1 Corinthians 10:1-12). This debate is between Paul and John Rice. Paul's argument has not been answered.

A child of God who calls his brother a fool is in danger of hell fire (Matthew 5:22). It is a dangerous thing to try to hide a danger which the Lord has pointed out.

The rule governing all life is, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Galatians 6:7, 8). Christians are

Scanned by TLC

told that they may "sow to the spirit and reap life everlasting," or "sow to the flesh and reap corruption."

Christians who live after the flesh will die (Romans 6:13). This cannot mean the death of the body, for all must die that death.

There will be but two classes at the resurrection: (1) Those who have done good. (2) Those who have done evil. Those who have done evil will be raised to "condemnation" (John 5:28, 29). God is no respecter of persons (Acts 10:34).

"But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die" (Ezekiel 18:24). Those who die in their sins cannot go to heaven. John 8:21: "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: whither I go, ye cannot come." (1) A saint may die in his sins. (2) Those who die in their sins will be lost. (3) Therefore, a saint may be lost.

God's children have their names written in the book of life (Hebrews 12:23). Those who overcome will not have their names blotted out of the book. Those who sin will be blotted out of the book and have no part therein (Exodus 32:33; Revelations 22:18). Those whose names are not found written in the book of life will be cast into hell (Revelations 20:15). This is another unanswerable argument in support of my proposition.

The apostles spent much of their time warning Christians against falling away and being lost. A few of these warnings which I have quoted are those found in 2 Thessalonians 2:3; Hebrews 12:15; 2 Peter 1:9; 2 Peter 1:10; 2 Peter 3:14; 2 Peter 3:17; Galatians 5:4; James 5:19, 20; 1 Timothy 5:15; 1 Corinthians 8:11; 2 Peter 2:14, 15; 2

Scanned by TLC

Peter 2:20, 21; 1 Peter 5:8; 1 Corinthians 9:27; John 15:1-6; Hebrews 6:4-6; Revelations 22:19; and Matthew 25:30. I am unable to see how any honest man can, without prejudice, read these scriptures and still believe in the impossibility of apostacy.

In their efforts to thoroughly convince children of God that God will not spare those who sin, the apostles tell us that he will not spare even his angels (2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6).

It is the spirit of the child of God that may sin and be eternally lost—not merely his body. I have conclusively shown this fact from 1 Corinthians 2:11; James 2:26; Romans 6:12; Matthew 5:28; Matthew 15:19, 20; Romans 6:19; Romans 8:12, 13; Romans 12:1; 1 Corinthians 6:15-20; and 1 Corinthians 3:16, 17.

Ladies and gentlemen, this will probably be the last time I shall have the opportunity of speaking to all of you. Like the apostle Paul, I want to be "free from the blood of all men." I warn you that you cannot live in sin on the earth and then spend eternity with God and the blest in heaven. The Bible as clearly teaches this as it is possible for a thing to be taught. The grace and mercy of God are boundless. His love for us is beyond measure. It is only through his wonderful grace that any of us can be saved. But, consistent with the majesty and holiness of deity, God cannot approve sin in any one. The Lord demands that we be faithful to him to the end. Does that mean that we must be faultless? None of us live faultless lives, but we may live faithful lives. To illustrate: Here are a man and a woman celebrating the golden anniversary of their wedding. They have been married fifty years; they have been faithful to each other for half a century. Does that mean that they have been perfect? Have they been faultless? Have they never mistreated each other and had to apologize and forgive and overlook wrongs? No, it does not mean that. But it does mean that they have never been divorced. So

Scanned by TLC

the man who has been faithful to Christ has never been divorced from Christ. He has not deserted Christ or ceased to believe in him or serve him, even though his service has been imperfect. The grace of God will make that one faultless who has been faithful. If in our efforts to serve him, we make mistakes, our opportunities for forgiveness are legion; he has provided a plan whereby we may be forgiven. This plan involves repentance, confession, and prayer (Acts 8:22; James 5:16). Our high priest, in loving sympathy and perfect understanding, intercedes for us at the throne of mercy. He "can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities," since he "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Hebrews 4:15). The Son of God, as our advocate, constantly represents us at the court of heaven. "If any man sin, we have an advocate wth the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John 2:1). But if we spurn and reject the opportunities of his advocacy until death overtakes us, we cannot expect a home in heaven: There is no sin there. Life's pathway is crooked, rugged, and dangerous. We can safely travel it only by following in the footsteps of him who gave his life for us. The turbulent stream of death must be crossed by all of us. Only by clinging to the hand of him who conquered death can we safely cross this stream and find rest under the shade of the tree of life. When the children of Israel, in their march to Canaan, came to the Jordan river, they were told that they could not stem its turbulent tide. From the viewpoint of man this was, no doubt, true; but God was leading. On the approach of God's appointed leader, Joshua, the dangerous water receded, and those who followed in the footsteps of Joshua crossed safely.

I beseech you, my friends, that you walk in the footsteps of the Christ, not just for awhile, but down to the very end of life's journey. When you touch the waters of death, you will find that the chill has been removed by the great

Scanned by TLC

burning heart of the Son of God. Holding to his gracious hand and looking to the light of his glorious countenance, you may cross the otherwise dark and chilling stream in the blessed warmth and light of him who is our "all and in all."

May God bless you!

Scanned by TLC

THE OLIPHANT-RICE DEBATE

Eighth Session: 7:30 p. m., January 25, 1935.

FOURTH PROPOSITION

Proposition: *The Scriptures Teach That a Child of God, One Who Has Been Saved by the Blood of Christ Can so Sin as to Be Finally Lost.*

W. L. Oliphant Affirms
John R. Rice Denies

(Fourth Negative Address by John R. Rice.)

Brother Chairman, Brother Oliphant, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

In this, the last speech of this debate, again I want to thank you for your courteous hearing and your attention given here. And may I say this debate has been a very great joy to me. I am sorry, always of course, if sometimes Scriptures are misplaced and misused, and yet I am glad to have an opportunity to reply.

May I say this word? I entered this debate with no apology, believing my brother would give me fair treatment, and I call you to witness, I have made no complaint from the beginning until now. I was willing for Brother Showalter to print the book of this debate. Although I have two stenographers here, I have not asked that they take Brother Oliphant's messages. I am perfectly content to risk my brethren here. I remind you again, last week I spoke in the affirmative, but I made no attempt to monopolize the services. That is all right. I had you brethren to sing and pray, and you had more of your folks here than I had. I have not been complaining about that.

I remind you, last week my friend Brother Oliphant had

Scanned by TLC

the closing address. If there was any advantage in that, he had it. I call you to witness, not one time did I complain about it or say I had been treated unfairly, nor shed any crocodile tears over the terrible fact that he had the last speech! I did not do that. I am very well content to let the matter stay as it is. Now, Brother Oliphant, in debates, people have last speeches sometimes. You had yours. He has warned you again and again that if I bring in new arguments, in this last speech, that I would violate the ethics of the debate. Every time he has stood here, he has repeated that to what I say in the last speech, he has no chance to reply. When I said I would bring some rebuttal in this speech, now he complains about that! What could I bring, Brother Oliphant? I cannot bring new argument. But it is understood I can bring rebuttal, and he knew I must do so. What else could I bring? Why complain, Brother Oliphant?

Brother Oliphant is evidently pretty well disturbed about this matter. He said the turkey he brought was not hashed yet, because he said that I have not answered his questions, because I have not chewed on it yet. I am reminded of the negro man in the army who went to France, and went over the top. He took his razor along. He was more at home with the razor than with the Enfield rifle which we carried in the army. He took his razor out when a German came along and swung his razor, and the fellow jumped back and said, "You never touched me!" And the negro said, "You wait until you try to spit!" That German found his throat was cut. Oh yes, Brother Oliphant, I touched you, and your turkey was hashed too! You wait until you try to spit!

Now I am glad for your interest and attention. I want a prayerful attitude for these closing remarks of this debate. Again I say the whole thing will be settled by spiritually-minded people taking just what God says. You know the Scripture says that Satan himself comes as an angel of

Scanned by TLC

light—no wonder his ministers are like that. I remind you the devil quoted Scripture, but he did not quote it correctly. If the devil were quoting Scripture he would have said in 2 Samuel 7th chapter—the devil probably would have said that that meant Jesus, when the Lord said if Solomon committed iniquity he would chastise him with the rod of men. The devil would probably have said that meant Jesus. Brother Oliphant said I introduced that passage. I did. But I did not say that it was Jesus who built the temple and began to reign when David died. I am not the one who twisted that Scripture and twisted others.

In Zechariah the 6th chapter, when Joshua the son of Josedech is particularly named, the man is named, his father's name is given, his companions are named, and then in the next verse (Brother Oliphant took it out of its setting) he said that verse about Joshua the son of Josedech, high priest after the return from Babylonia, meant Jesus and he said that proved that Jesus was reigning now!

I say the devil quotes Scripture. I am not saying Brother Oliphant is the devil or that he is working for the devil. I do not think that, but I say that he uses Scripture like the devil sometimes did. I am sorry he does that. I do not think he will do that any more. I hope he will not, at least. He says he has had lots of discussions. He says he has the truth and I have the brains. Better than that, I have the Scriptures, Brother Oliphant. "Doesn't he look intelligent?" he asks. Thank you for that, Brother Oliphant. I appreciate that. Brother Oliphant has brains enough, but that will not settle what *"the Scriptures teach."*

Now my friends, in this brief time, I want to continue to call attention to some things we have had before. Brother Oliphant mentioned a good many Scriptures. I want to remind you of this, those Scriptures that he mentioned said lots of things, but they did not say a child of God can so fall away as to be finally lost. They did not say that. I remind you again and again about that everlasting life that God promised to believers. He has not found a verse

Scanned by TLC

yet that mentions losing everlasting life, and yet everlasting or eternal life is promised forty-five times!

It is a funny thing to me. Brother Oliphant now insists that he believed all along in a literal "one thousand years." I hope he will just stay fixed on that now and not backslide. The next thing he will be saying is that he has been calling me "brother" for several nights here. That is all right. I am glad I got him over on that. If he backslides tomorrow, he is a goner according to what he says! I hope he won't.

He said Christians may fall from their steadfastness.

"Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness" (2 Peter 3:17).

What has that got to do with a child of God going to hell? Certainly some steadfast Christians lose their steadfastness, and all will if they do not take heed. But they will not lose their souls—that is different!

Here is another. Brother Oliphant mentioned Acts the 8th chapter about the case of Simon. I will not have time for all, but I can at least show the spirit and method and the way in which these Scriptures are used. I remind you the Scriptures are very clear.

Acts 8:9-23:

"But there was a certain man, called Simon, which beforetime in the same city used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one:

"To whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is the great power of God.

"And to him they had regard, because that of long time he had bewitched them with sorceries.

"But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.

"Then Simon himself believed also: and when he was

Scanned by TLC

baptized, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done.

"Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John:

"Who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost:

(For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.)

"Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.

"And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money,

"Saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost.

"But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money.

"Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God.

"Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.

"For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity."

What is said, is that he wanted Holy Spirit power and offered to buy it with money. Now that was wrong, wasn't it? Yes he did wrong. But this does not say he became a lost sinner because he offered to buy that power with money. If God had meant that, he could have said that mighty easily. That would have settled this business. But it does not say that. The Bible goes on and says, "And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, Saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost. But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that

Scanned by TLC

the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God." What is "this matter" that Simon does not have part in. This is the matter. He is trying to buy the power, that by the laying of his hands on people, they will receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. You cannot buy apostleship, nor the power that goes with it. Peter said to him, "Thy heart is not right in the sight of God." To be sure that was true, too. Any Christian who is not perfect has a heart not right in the sight of God.

Was Peter's heart right with God when he denied Jesus? Yet Jesus said, "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Peter's heart was not right with God, yet he was saved, his faith did not fail. Of any Christian not pleasing God, we might say his heart is not right in the sight of God. That does not mean he has lost salvation. There are many cases like that where the Scripture plainly said about children of God that they were not right. It did not mean something else besides what it said. It says what it means.

"Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee" (Acts 8:22).

What does it mean? You are trying to buy things of God with money. This is a new convert who did wrong about that. Whether it is a new convert or an older convert, it does not say and it does not mean that a child of God, one saved by the blood of Christ, can so sin as to be finally lost.

That has been the trouble all through this debate. Brother Oliphant has taken Scriptures and tried to put in them something they did not say and did not mean, but as he says, they "imply" a fact. On the contrary, I have given him Scripture after Scripture that expressly says a child of God will never perish, that he will not come into judgment, that he will not come into condemnation, but that he has been born of God, and God has imputed righteousness

Scanned by TLC

to him without works, and God will not charge sin against him. And I have also showed that this child of God even could not sin, for his seed remaineth in him so that he could not sin. This does not have to be settled by what Brother Oliphant thinks is implied. A child of God shall never perish.

Brother Oliphant said about the 37th Psalm that it was only of a good man. The 37th Psalm hit him pretty hard.

"The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord: and he delighteth in his way". (Psalms 37:23).

I remind you, Brother Oliphant—I remind you Jesus said there is none good but God. What did he mean then by a good man? Surely what he meant all along, the righteousness of Christ. That is it—and I have it, and am now counted righteous and good. It is imputed to the Christian. That is what God meant, too, for the Scripture expressly says the same many times. The goodness of God, the righteousness of Christ, is the goodness of the man in the 37th Psalm. That is the wedding garment. There is none good but God. There is no righteousness in that man that is going to save him and none that will keep him saved, except the righteousness of God. That is the same all the way through the Bible.

Brother Oliphant said, "What about the drunkard?" Very happily, the Scriptures mentioned tell something about the drunkard. If I had time, I would read the whole chapter instead of just the few verses of Scripture mentioned. You will find more enlightening things.

1 Corinthians 6:9, 10:

"Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind,

"Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God."

But the next verse, the 11th verse, says:

"And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but

Scanned by TLC

ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

Why, to be sure, my friend, no drunkard can inherit the kingdom of God until he is washed and justified. Then instead of being a drunkard, he becomes a child of God. God does the washing and the justifying. "And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." If we were not washed, we could none of us inherit the kingdom of God, for all of us are guilty of covetousness, if not drunkenness.

Brother Oliphant asked, "What would happen if your body did not get redeemed?" That is not left to happen so. He that began a good work in you will carry it on. The Scripture said in the same 8th chapter of Romans:

"Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified" (Romans 8:30).

What God started before, he knew before, and will finish it, until we who are saved are conformed to the image of his Son! God knew ahead of time—he knew who would believe in him when he started out. Foreknowing, he carries it further than justifying, it is finished with glorification. That is one reason, Brother Oliphant, that I insisted that in the whole first week we should discuss prophetic subjects, and give a whole week to baptism and apostacy. There is a lot said on them in the Bible.

The 3rd chapter of Philippians explains this in verses 20 and 21.

"For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ:

"Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

Do not talk about that to me, about what would happen if that was not done. The Lord will do it. He said he would. "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence

Scanned by TLC

also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." That is going to happen, and it will happen to Brother Oliphant, too, if he has been born again. The Lord will be the one who does it, and he will get the glory for it, too. You are right about that.

Here is more about it in John 15. That is an interesting Scripture. Notice Brother Oliphant is a little bit scared about that. But that is all right. It is hard on Brother Oliphant for me to have the last speech. Some one loan him a handkerchief, so he will not weep all over the platform because I have the last speech. But here in the 15th chapter of John—you had the last speech, Brother Oliphant, the last word last week, and you had just as much time tonight as I have. If you could have fixed it, why didn't you fix it? And if you could not, why hollow when I do?

John 15:1, 2:

"I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman.

"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."

Where does he take him? To hell? It did not say so. Well, if it didn't say so, why didn't it? Because it did not mean it, that is the reason. You say, "Brother Rice, do you believe that a Christian can be out of touch with God?" Yes, I know he can. A child of God can be out of touch with God. In your family, is it true that a child of yours can be out of harmony, out of fellowship, out of touch? Certainly it is true in my home and in my family, and in God's family, too. You are right about that. But that does not say anything about a child being cast out. And that does not mean that Grace Rice is not any longer Grace Rice, not in the Rice family, if she had to leave the table because she had to be chastised. The Lord did not say that, and did not mean that either. Why put it in there,

Scanned by TLC

then? The fact is, Jesus tells what he is talking about here —bearing fruit. He is talking about bearing fruit, and said, "Without me ye can do nothing." He said, "Except ye abide in me you will not get your prayers answered." He did not say, "I am warning you lest you go to hell." He did not say that, and did not mean that.

That has been Brother Oliphant's attitude all the way through this debate. He is always supposing the Bible means something else besides what it says. Brother Oliphant has been very kind to me, and I was not embarrassed about it when he would not call me "brother." Perhaps it is a matter of conscience. But it is a very narrow sectarianism, none the less. I am not embarrassed about that, and I do not mind. I call you "brother" because I feel that way, and I trust we will both feel kinder through the years toward each other. I want to see you often. I want you to come down to see me and I will come to see you. If you come down to see me, I will teach you some more! We will get some things as we go along all the way through this debate. You take a passage here and say this means something else. It does not mean something else, it means what it says. He is in a tight.

Read on and let's see what it says here:

"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 15:2).

"Purgeth it." What for? Purged in order to get saved? No. He is already saved, already kept saved. What about it? "That it may bring forth more fruit." What is he talking about? Bearing fruit. What if a Christian did not bear fruit? He becomes withered like a branch of a grapevine out of touch with the vine.

1 Corinthians, 3rd chapter, very clearly tells what happens when a Christian does not bear fruit.

1 Corinthians 3:15:

"If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

Scanned by TLC

Finally that is what happens when a child of God does not bear fruit. He loses his reward. Why? Because he is rewarded for his good fruit. And those that do not bear fruit will lose that reward, but will be saved "yet so as by fire." Salvation is free, by grace, not of works. But rewards, treasure in heaven, differ according to works.

Read on.

"Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me.

"I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing" (John 15:4, 5).

What is he talking about? Bringing forth fruit. What will it do for you if you abide in him? Keep you out of hell? No, the blood of Christ keeps you out of hell. What will staying close to Jesus do? It will make you bring forth a lot more fruit. "Without me ye can do nothing."

"If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, (like a branch—take it at face value) *and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned"* (John 15:6).

Did you ever see a withered Christian? I have seen a lot of them. Peter was awfully withered when he followed the Savior afar off.

"But Peter followed him afar off unto the high priest's palace, and went in, and sat with the servants, to see the end" (Matthew 26:58).

David said, "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation." He did not say he had lost his salvation, but he lost the joy. "And is withered"—you are right he was a withered branch.

"If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned" (John 15:6).

Brother Oliphant says, "Well it says men gather them, but it means angels." He says that the Bible says they gather grape branches, but means that they gather men.

Scanned by TLC

The Bible says *fire,* but he says it means *hell!* Brother Oliphant, if it did not say angels, how do you know it means angels? The fact of the business is, angels do not gather grape branches—angels gather men. This is talking about branches. Men wither like branches. Men gather the branches when they are withered up and burn them, to be sure. I take that at face value. Men do gather withered grapevines and branches and burn them. Men can be as fruitless as a withered grapevine. Withered Christians do not bear fruit. What is it talking about here? Fruit bearing. A Christian that does not bear fruit is as useless as a withered grapevine. I remind you that there is this difference, however. People plant grapevines for grapes, but God loves us for ourselves.

"If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you" (John 15:7)

You can ask what you will, if you abide in Christ. What do we abide in Christ for? To get our prayers answered, not to get to heaven. I already have that settled about getting to heaven, for Jesus said:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life" (John 5:24).

Jesus said you cannot be separated from the love of Christ even though you wither and do not bear fruit as you should.

"I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing" (John 15:5).

Why did not Brother Oliphant mention that? That is what the Savior stresses in every verse. Why talk about Christians getting lost and going to hell, when that is not what the Lord is talking about? Go through the entire chapter. You will find it the same way all the way through. It is talking about fruit bearing.

Again turn to Jeremiah 2:32. This is a favorite of

Scanned by TLC

Dr. Oliphant's. I want to tell you that my people are not accustomed to his way of using Scripture, but I want them to feel kindly toward Brother Oliphant. Some of them are indignant about it. I remind you that my Brother Oliphant is in a tight place. If you were standing up here trying to defend something and could not find a single direct statement in the word of God that says a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ can so sin as to be finally lost, you would be looking anywhere to find a straw that you could hang on to. That is his position, too. Brother Oliphant introduced the question of "eternal life" in this discussion and I showed him that more than forty-five times it was promised to those that believe, and asked him to show me *one* time where it was ever said that the child of God would lose it. It does not say it. But it expressly mentioned "eternal life" and "everlasting life" more than forty-five times, and not one time does it even hint that a child of God will lose it. It says many times that we will get it. It looks like the Bible would say sometimes he will lose it if it were so. Well, it is not so, that is the reason Brother Oliphant has to use the Scriptures like that.

Turn, then, to Jeremiah 2:32.

"Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire? Yet my people have forgotten me days without number."

Now the verse before it. I called his attention to it last night. He might not have known it before, but he knew it tonight when I referred to it.

"O generation, (what generation) *see ye the word of the Lord, Have I been a wilderness unto Israel?* (Unto who? Israel!) *a land of darkness? wherefore say my people, We are lords; we will come no more unto thee?"*

What is it about? It is about Israel in the days of Jeremiah, during the captivity.

"Can a maid forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire? Yet my people have forgotten me days without number" (Jeremiah 2:32).

Brother Oliphant knew then, that that verse referred to

Scanned by TLC

and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."

And Jesus says in John 5:24:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

Again and again that is said about a child of God.

Turn to Romans the 8th chapter. Brother Oliphant says of that, that it is just talking about externals. But God named everything he could—look at it again and see.

Verses 38 and 39:

"For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come,

"Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

God is eternal, isn't he? Is that just external? "Nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature." Is there anything in reality about the heights of heaven or the depths of hell? Are they just externals?

Yes, God says, I know there will come a preacher, a doctor, and he will not believe it. Why? He will have a plan of salvation like Cain had, like the Pharisees had—by works—by works, "works until the very hour of death." But God says I will put a word in there so he cannot get over it. Yes, that is what it means—"Nor any other creature." Nothing God ever made can separate us from the love of God. I cannot. If God made you, you cannot. If you are God's creature, you cannot. Brother Oliphant is agreed that we are God's creatures. But he says, "I think man has a free will." I do not care what kind of a will he has got, if you are anything God ever made, you cannot take yourself out or separate yourself from the love of God. That is what God's word says.

I hope that Scripture is clear in your hearts. I am not

Scanned by TLC

the nation Israel, not to individual Christians, and he knows it now. No, I did not admit those folks were Christians. Brother Oliphant goes back 800 years, jumps back there and says, "All right, I will show you how the Israelites, 800 years before this, were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. Therefore, Jeremiah was talking to Christians." That gang was not Christians. But he went back 800 years before, to another generation to try to prove that they were. Brother, we do not have to jump 800 years before that to find out. When the Lord expressly said in the verse just before, that he was talking about Israel, you do not have to jump 800 years. "O generation, see ye the word of the Lord. Have I been a wilderness unto Israel? a land of darkness? wherefore say my people, we are lords; we will come no more unto thee?" He is talking about Israel when he says, "My people." They are still God's chosen people. As chosen people, that does not mean that all the children of Israel are now saved. But the time is coming when Israel will be saved. "So all Israel shall be saved," the Scripture says. I do not mean that an Israelite is saved because he has been circumcised, as Brother Oliphant said when he was talking about the publican.

I say frankly, that any kind of argument which says a man is a Christian simply because he has been circumcised, because he was born of Abraham, or anything of the kind, that is a dishonest use of the Scriptures. I say that frankly. That is the only kind of Scriptures that my brother could find to try to prove that "the Scriptures teach that a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ, can so sin as to be finally lost." That is the reason that he makes that kind of use of the Scriptures. The Scriptures do not say anywhere that a child of God can fall away and be finally lost. The Scripture does not say that. But it does say in John 10:28, 29:

"And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.

"My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all;

Scanned by TLC

deeply concerned or over anxious about it. God will take care of his word. But I want you to know that kind of use of the Scripture is the only way that my brother has to prove his argument. There is not any statement in the entire Bible that teaches that a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ, can so sin as to be finally lost. It does not say that anywhere.

Brother Oliphant has had two nights to try to build up his argument about this. He argued this way and that. He said the man in hell was an apostasized child of God. He said that since the rich man said, "Father Abraham," he was a descendent from Abraham and therefore a child of God. Brother Oliphant, that does not prove he had been saved. My friend, that kind of argument does not prove a thing from the Bible! No, Sir! More than that, many another son of Abraham went to hell if he was never a child of God, never saved by the blood of Christ. That is the reason people go to hell. Was everybody born of Abraham saved? No, Sir! Many never were, many were never sons of God, were never born of God. The Scripture never teaches that every Jew, every circumcised Jew will be saved, that every son of Abraham will be saved. That rich man in hell was not saved. The Scripture tells why, too, and he knew why. That man said, "Tell my five brothers, so that they will repent." Abraham said, "They have Moses and the prophets." But he said, "They will repent if someone will warn them from the dead." He went to hell because he did not repent. His five brothers have gone, too, if they did not repent. He did not want them coming to hell. But being a son of Abraham would not do one any good when he comes to face God, judgment and eternity. He will have to have something more than the blood of Abraham in his veins. God bless you, Brother Oliphant, there is nothing personal in this at all. But that kind of teaching is what led the world wrong. All these years man rises up with a little foolish argument, based on man's goodness. They have their own standards of theology and systems, and

Scanned by TLC

twist the word around and say," I think the Jew ought to be called a child of God." The Bible did not say so, and you should not say so. That is not a fair argument. It is not unfair to me, but you will have to meet God for it. The weight of souls hangs on it.

I beg my friend to take particular concern about this matter, about the word of God and how it is treated. It is an important matter. You will meet God some day and give an account.

Here is more of it here. 1 Corinthians 6:10,

"Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God."

But this verse is explained by the following verse which says,

"And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

A drunkard washed in the blood, is no longer a drunkard in God's sight.

Brother Oliphant insists that the Israelites in Jeremiah 2:32 were saved and then fell away, and then goes on to prove they were saved back there in Moses' day because their forefathers were baptized in the cloud and in the sea.

Again speaking about the Jews, God's people as a race, not as individual Christians, he jumps down seventy years to Nehemiah, and says that their descendants were still saved seventy years later. That is very poor proof about it. He said he could not make a stronger argument than this one. If you cannot, you have not made a very strong one.

Hebrews 10 expressly tells about this matter as to whether it means a child of God can be lost. The word of God is very clear on it. So is Hebrews 6th chapter. While I am here, let me show you about these two. Brother Oliphant says Hebrews 6:4-6 and Hebrews 10:26-29 teach that a child of God can be lost. He is wrong, and both passages expressly show it!

Scanned by TLC

Now when you read Hebrews 6, verses 4 to 6, read on down to verse 9, which says the above is not for those who have salvation. Verse 9 says,

"But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak."

He is talking about those that have tasted the good word of God. Brother Oliphant made fun of tasting. They just tasted it, that is what the Lord said. "And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come." You can make fun all you want to, but that is what it says, twice in this passage. But Paul said about that, "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation though we thus speak." Those other things do not accompany salvation. You do not have to argue about that. I called his attention to it last night, and face it he must. I wonder why he did not refer to them. He said here he could not make a stronger argument. There is not any place for an argument. All he has done is just take something and twist it a little bit. But Paul said, "I am not talking about you folks." Why? "Because you have got better things than the above, things that accompany salvation. That other would not fit you." Mark especially verse 9 in that passage in the same chapter. "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak."

Those described in Hebrews 6:4-6 are lost people, greatly enlightened, but never saved. They are people who commit the unpardonable sin because they can never be brought back to the place of repentance. Paul then said in verse 9, "Those things I have mentioned do not accompany salvation, but I am persuaded better things of you, things that *do* accompany salvation." There, as clear as possible, the inspired writer says that Hebrews 6:4-6 is not talking about the things that accompany salvation.

Now in the 10th chapter of Hebrews. That chapter is likewise very clear. I remind you of this, there are some

Scanned by TLC

important verses in this chapter on this subject that Brother Oliphant did not read. See verse 10.

"By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ ONCE FOR ALL."

Salvation is a "ONCE FOR ALL" business, bought by the death of Christ.

Again in verse 14 we are told,

"For by one offering he hath perfected FOR EVER them that are sanctified."

The Christian, Brother Oliphant, is "perfected forever" by the offering of Christ, so the child of God cannot be lost. Christ made one offering, that is all, but that offering "perfected *FOREVER* them that are sanctified." Whatever Jesus did, he did *forever* on this question.

(Moderator: You have five minutes).

But Brother Oliphant said about that matter "Well, but suppose a man did not stay in and do right about this, and that, and the other?" Let us see a little further what the Scriptures say about that. Skip down to verse 39 for a moment and see.

"But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul" (Hebrews 10:39).

Drawing back to be lost as some do is the opposite of believing to the salvation of the soul.

Now read verse 26.

"For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins,"

In the same passage where it is said if we sin wilfully (verse 26), now verse 39 says,

"But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul."

We are not of that crowd that draw back who were once enlightened, but have sinned wilfully after they received the knowledge of the truth, but we are those that believe to the saving of the soul!

Scanned by TLC

It is not talking about "believers" in Hebrews 10:26-29. It expressly says so in verse 39 and it could not be misunderstood by honest hearts. I beg you in Jesus' name to look at it. It is important. Those mentioned in verses 26 to 29 draw back to perdition, and never did believe to the saving of the soul. So verse 39 plainly says. No wonder Brother Oliphant said, "I could not make a better argument." This ruins his position.

Jesus Christ is the one set apart by blood, sanctified, in Hebrews 10:29. Now Brother Oliphant, it says in Hebrews 10:29:

"Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

"Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

Brother Oliphant says it is the same "he" in the last of the verse as in the first. That last "he" refers to the last masculine noun, the first masculine noun above it. "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the SON OF GOD, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith HE was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

Suppose I say Brother Oliphant hit Brother Showalter, and he hit the chairman. Now who hit the chairman? Now who did the "he" refer to? To the first masculine noun ahead of it, of course. It is a good idea to soak that in. What is the idea of jumping over that? That "he" refers to the Lord Jesus. The blood wherewith he was sanctified. It is there. Jesus was set apart as a Savior by the blood.

Here is some more. In Luke the 16th chapter—the rich

Scanned by TLC

man in hell. Brother Oliphant said this rich man was a child of God fallen away. The Scripture did not say so. That is enough!

Here is another:

Revelations 3:16.

"So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."

Where is it about that that says the man is going to hell? Brother Oliphant said it inferred that. You think so, but the Scripture does not say so. This is not to be settled by inference, or what you think, but by what "the Scriptures teach," and the Scriptures do not teach that.

Go on a little further. In 1 John 3:8, 9. You did not like that.

"He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.

"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

Oh, well, he made a great deal of a joke about that. Brother Oliphant, you read that and you will find it is still there in the Bible after you are done joking. He did not like what Paul said in Romans7, "With the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin," but it is still there. My friend, I want to call your attention to the fact that the Scriptures are clear about it. Will you hear me tonight? We are coming down to the close of this debate? Every man and woman has a soul, and that soul must meet God.

Now you may think fasting, prayer, church membership, going to church, taking the Lord's supper, singing, preaching,—you may think that will get you by. But if you have not been bought by the blood of Christ, born again, been made a partaker of the divine nature, your poor soul will pay the forfeit for it. I beg of you do not depend upon

Scanned by TLC

man's righteousness and your own good works. God himself witnesses in his word again and again, "He that believeth on him is not condemned." If you are depending on everything else, you are not depending on him.

John 3:18 says:

"He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

The word of God is clear that there is only one hope.

The trouble with Brother Oliphant about this is that he has the wrong plan of salvation to start with. The blood of Christ is the only hope.

About that over there, how did Paul get his sins washed away? A sow may be washed with water, but only God's sheep are washed in the blood of Christ. Sows have not been washed in the blood. Let every man, search out your heart, I beg you, and make sure. I do not care what church you are a member of, whether you are a member of a Baptist Church or a member of a "Church of Christ"—I do not care which; only one thing counts. Have you met Jesus Christ face to face and been put under the blood?

Someone will say, well, Revelation 22:18, 19 says that if anyone takes away from the words of that book, God will take away his part out of the book of life. "His part," yes. There is a part for every soul ever born. There is a part for everybody, for 1 John 2:1, 2 says,

"My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous:

"And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for our's only, BUT ALSO FOR THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD."

Every sinner has a part prepared for him and offered him if he will accept it by faith. Those who do not take what the word of God says about Jesus, but turns him down, will lose that part. Jesus did not say, "I will write your name down and then take your name out of the book." He

Scanned by TLC

did not mean that; he meant what he said, no more and no less. "His part," sure. Tonight if you have not made sure, do not rest until you know in your own heart that your sins are forgiven and you have peace with God and have assurance by the word of God and your own heart that you are a child of God, saved by the blood. Such a child of God can never come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.

God bless you!

Scanned by TLC

Scanned by TLC

SCRIPTURE INDEX

FIRST PROPOSITION

"The Scriptures teach that the Jews as a Nation will return to Palestine when Christ returns to the earth and then will be converted to Christ."

JOHN R. RICE'S SPEECHES

OLD TESTAMENT

Scripture References	Page
GENESIS	
13:13, 14-17	12, 13, 41, 67
17:6-8	13, 42, 67
21:33	69
DEUTERONOMY	
3:1-6	71, 92
17:14, 15	39
18:15	39
28:15, 24, 25, 62	16, 19
28:15-68	69, 70
28:63, 64, 65	17
28:	41
30:1-6	20, 21, 41, 42, 43, 44, 70, 71, 92, 93
JOSHUA	
21:43-45	38
23:14, 16	93
23:16	94
2 SAMUEL	
7:10	44, 45
2 KINGS	
17:6	17
2 CHRONICLES	
36:20	18
PSALMS	
100:5	69
ISAIAH	
11:1-12	45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 71, 72, 73
14:1	49
24:5	95
40:28	69
JEREMIAH	
19:7, 10, 11	77
23:3-8	103
30:3	103
31:31-37	104, 105
32:42	93
33:14-26	49, 50
33:14, 15	105
EZEKIEL	
20:33-38	106
36:22-35	106, 107
37:22	107
DANIEL	
4:15	46
ZECHARIAH	
12:10	43
13: 6	43
13: 1	43, 44

NEW TESTAMENT

Scripture References	Page
MATTHEW	
21:41	41
24:30	21
LUKE	
21:20-24	18, 19, 21, 41, 69, 95, 96
ACTS	
3:19-21	79, 96, 97
7:5	14, 68
ROMANS	
11:1-13	98, 99
11:13-21	100
11:22-30	45, 101, 102
GALATIANS	
3:16	16
HEBREWS	
11:8-13	14, 15, 42
11:39, 40	44, 68
REVELATION	
21:1-3	78, 79

Scanned by TLC

W. L. OLIPHANT'S SPEECHES

OLD TESTAMENT

Scripture References	Page
GENESIS	
12:1-3	26, 84, 117
13:15	24
15:18-21	25, 84, 118
17:9-14	58
17:7-9	86
17:9-13	26, 86, 117
17:14	116
EXODUS	
31:16, 17	86
NUMBERS	
19:	109
DEUTERONOMY	
4:20-23	59
4:20-26	84
4:23	118
4:26	60
28:1, 2	27
28:15	27
28:29	28
28:62, 63	27, 28
29:10-13	87, 113
30:2, 3	27, 29
JOSHUA	
21:43-45	24, 26, 53, 84, 118
23:13	85, 114
1 CHRONICLES	
28:6-9	28, 59
NEHEMIAH	
9:7, 8	85, 118
PSALMS	
105:8-11	87
ISAIAH	
2:1-4	56, 82
5:1-7	90

Scripture References	Page
11:	55
11:1, 6	82
11:9	56
11:10	57
24:5	86, 113, 118
65:15	32
JEREMIAH	
18:7-10	28, 29
19:11	118
19:1-3	60
19:10, 11	60
23:16, 17	33, 34, 91, 111
23:31	34, 91
23:39, 40	34
31:	58, 110
31:31-34	57, 110
31	109
33:	57, 109
34:	57, 109
EZEKIEL	
3:11	109
12:13	109
19: 9	109
20:33-38	108
21:20-28	109
23: 9, 14, 42	109
36:25, 38	109
37:24, 25	109
DANIEL	
4:10-15	55
AMOS	
8:2, 9	88, 118
8:1-9	113
ZECHARIAH	
11:10-12	86, 113, 118
11:10-13	87

NEW TESTAMENT

Scripture References	Page
MATTHEW	
12:43-45	119
15:24	36
16:18	81
21:33-44	35, 36, 58, 59
21:43-45	119
23:37, 38	36
26:15	87, 113
27:45	88
MARK	
16:15	117
LUKE	
13:32	56
JOHN	
4:20-24	58
4:20-24	34, 119
19:15	36
ACTS	
2:5	29, 83
3:19-21	80, 111
3:22, 23, 26	112
10:34, 35	23
15:9	33, 111
20:29	56, 81

Scanned by TLC

Scripture References Page

ROMANS

2:28, 29 .....32, 33, 58, 117, 118, 120
3:21-23 120
3:23 121
8:9 121
9:3 .....61, 111
9:4, 5 .....111, 120
9:6, 8 .....58, 111, 120
9:7, 8 .....61, 111
9:30-33 .....61, 111
10:1 .....61, 62, 111
10:6-12 .....111, 112, 113
10:12 .....90, 111
10:12, 13 .....32, 61, 62, 111, 120
10:18 .....56, 57, 82, 111
11:1, 2 .....62, 111
11:5 .....62, 111
11:26 .....62, 111

1 CORINTHIANS

1:27-29 120
12:13 .....32, 120
15:50 120

2 CORINTHIANS

1:20 .....64, 89
2:20, 21 120
3:3 110
5:5, 6 119
5:6-8 .....54, 55
5:16 .....31, 116, 120
5:16, 17 .....33, 120

GALATIANS

3:6-9 .....26, 84, 117
3:13 115
3:26-28 .....32, 120
3:26-29 62
3:28 .....62, 89
5:2 27
5:2-4 115
5:6 .....27, 118
6:10 32

EPHESIANS

1:3 .....63, 89
2:3 120
2:11-19 30
2:14 88
2:14, 15 117
2:14-16 120

Scripture References Page

2:14-17 82
3:15 35
3:1-5 31
3:6 63
3:8-11, 15 32
3:21 .....33, 53, 121

COLOSSIANS

1:13, 14 63
1:14 89
1:23 .....56, 82
2:11 120
2:14 .....32, 88, 109 120
2:16, 17 116
3:1, 2 54
3:2 83

1 TIMOTHY

1:4 120

2 TIMOTHY

2:10 .....63, 89, 120

TITUS

3:9 120

HEBREWS

7:19 25
8:6-12 57
8:8-13 110
10:20 117
10:34 .....25, 83, 114, 118
11:40 25
11:13-16 54
11:16 .....25, 54, 114, 118
11:16, 39 83
12:22, 23 .....56, 58, 82
13:15 24

JAMES

1:25 25

1 PETER

1:4 91
1:7-9 119

2 PETER

3:10 83

REVELATION

1:7 54

Scanned by TLC

SECOND PROPOSITION

"The Scriptures teach that Christ will establish a literal throne in Jerusalem and will rule over the whole earth for a period of one thousand years."

JOHN R. RICE'S SPEECHES

OLD TESTAMENT

Scripture References — Page

GENESIS

13: 128
17: 128
32: 169

2 SAMUEL

7:10-17 ....127, 128, 129, 204, 205

1 KINGS

2:12 ....168, 197
9:3 252

PSALMS

16:10 233
89: 3, 4; 27-37 ....130, 160, 161
110:1 172

ISAIAH

35:5-10 250

Scripture References — Page

JEREMIAH

22:30 ....228, 229, 230
23:3-5 132
33:14-17 133

EZEKIEL

37:16-24 ....133, 134, 193
37:25-28 135
47: 252

MICAH

4:1-8 ....135, 136, 137, 162, 163, 164, 165

ZECHARIAH

6:12-14 ....205, 206, 207
14:1-5 ....137, 138, 164, 165, 166, 193, 230, 231, 251
14:8-10 ....166, 167

NEW TESTAMENT

MATTHEW

1:1-17 ....129, 229
3:4, 10 163
4:7, 8 163
5:35 252
10: 164
19:27, 28 ....169, 170
24: 163, 164
24:3 195
25:31 ....174, 194, 195, 235, 236

LUKE

1:30-33 ....167, 168, 197
3:23-38 ....129, 229
16:24 125
19:9-12 ....236, 237
19:11-27 ....170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 233, 234, 237, 238
22:29, 30 194
24:27 ....240, 241
24:32, 44, 45 ....240, 241

JOHN

17:5 ....161, 162
20:22 241

ACTS

1:3-8 ....239, 240, 241, 242, 243
2:29, 30 ....205, 207, 208, 231, 232, 233, 234, 240
3:20, 21 ....169, 240

1 CORINTHIANS

15: 131

2 CORINTHIANS

5:8 131

GALATIANS

4:4 164

PHILIPPIANS

3:21 131

2 THESSALONIANS

2:2 230

Scanned by TLC

Scripture References	Page
2 TIMOTHY	
4:1	234, 235
HEBREWS	
2:14	207, 208
11:13	239
1 JOHN	
3:3	170

Scripture References	Page
REVELATION	
2:2	135
2:25-28	173, 193, 194, 238, 239
3:21	161, 172
5:5-10	243, 244, 248, 249
19:11-16	245, 246
20:1-8	148, 246, 247, 249
20:11-12	235, 236, 249
21:2	135

W. L. OLIPHANT'S SPEECHES

OLD TESTAMENT

Scripture References	Page
GENESIS	
28:10-17	151, 182
EXODUS	
19:6	176
1 SAMUEL	
8:7	176, 222, 268
12:12	175, 176, 222, 268
2 SAMUEL	
7:10-17	146
7:12	213, 267
7:12-14	184
1 KINGS	
2:12	147
9:3-5	259, 260
9:6-9	260
1 CHRONICLES	
17:11	267
29:23	147
PSALMS	
2:6-8	186, 267
6:4	218
11:4	147, 254, 269
24:7	179
45:6, 7	223, 268
89:35-37	148
110:	222, 268
ISAIAH	
2:	155
2:2, 3	152
2:2-4	187, 264
8:20	191
11:4, 5	214, 220
11:9	151
35:5-10	259
40:	259
40:3-5	220
66:1	147

Scripture References	Page
JEREMIAH	
15:19	218
22:26-30	254, 269
22:28-30	221
23:5	149, 150
23:5, 6	214
23:29	217
33:	151
51:25	152
EZEKIEL	
21:26, 27	223, 224, 268
37:	212
37:24, 25	150
DANIEL	
2:	152, 153
2:44	157, 264
7:13, 14	179, 184, 256, 266
HOSEA	
6:5	220
JOEL	
2:14	218
MICAH	
4:	150, 182
4:3	151
ZECHARIAH	
3:8	214
6:13	182, 183, 266
6:12, 13	214
6:16	182, 183
11:	214
11:10-14	150
13:1	216, 253
13:2	216
13:6	216
13:7	218
13:9	217
14:	151, 220, 253, 254
14:1-5	217
14:5	218
14:8	217, 253
14:12, 13	216, 218

Scanned by TLC

NEW TESTAMENT

Scripture References — Page

MATTHEW

1:1-17 221
3:1, 2 ..... 153, 264
3:3 ..... 220, 221
10:5-7 ..... 153, 264
13:41 179
16:18, 19 151
19:28, 29 ..... 176, 177
20:20, 21 ..... 183, 265, 266
24:21 220
25:31, 32 ..... 175, 226, 269
25:32 257
25:41 270
28:18 ..... 148, 157, 189, 270

MARK

1:3 ..... 220, 221
1:14, 15 ..... 153, 264
8:38 226
9:1 ..... 154, 155, 180 189, 212, 213, 259, 266
..... 177
10:29, 30 ..... 183, 265, 266
10:35-37 153
14:42 ..... 154, 180, 265
15:43 ..... 154, 180, 265

LUKE

1:30-33 ..... 224, 268
3:4-6 ..... 220, 221, 259
10:8-11 ..... 153, 264
19:11-17 ..... 178, 255, 256
21:23 220
22:28-30 ..... 177, 212, 268
24:26 ..... 179, 184, 266
24:48, 49 ..... 154, 266

JOHN

2:13 153
3:3-5 178
4:10-14 217
5:28, 29 ..... 224, 269
6:15 ..... 181, 215
6: 39, 40, 44, 54 ..... 225, 269
6:53, 54 ..... 210, 211
7:39 184
11:24 ..... 225, 269
12:48 ..... 225, 269
14:6 259
14:26 258
17:10 182
18:36 ..... 215, 216
19:42 153
20:25 216

ACTS

1:6-8 258
1:8 ..... 154, 180, 189, 266
1:9, 10 ..... 179, 256, 266
2:1-4 ..... 155, 180, 266
2:17 ..... 151, 155
2:29-35 ..... 146, 185, 222, 267, 268, 269
2:30 ..... 150, 214, 254, 255
2:33 ..... 222, 268
2:36 ..... 183, 267
7:45-49 ..... 147, 148
7:48 254
7:49 269
8:12 180
13:30-39 ..... 187, 188, 267
17:7 ..... 148, 149
28:31 180

ROMANS

2:28, 29 143
5:17 ..... 176, 257, 268
9:27 217
15:12 183

1 CORINTHIANS

4:8 ..... 176, 257, 268
6:1-6 ..... 176, 268
11: 177, 268
15:23-26 ..... 185, 222, 223, 267, 268
15:50 149
15:51, 52 ..... 225, 269

2 CORINTHIANS

5:6-8 149
5:10 226
5:16 ..... 149, 216

GALATIANS

4:4 ..... 153, 154

EPHESIANS

1:19-23 ..... 221, 266
2:14-16 150
3:21 215
5:5 ..... 182, 269

PHILIPPIANS

2:5-11 221

COLOSSIANS

1:13, 14 ..... 156, 265
3:11 270

1 THESSALONIANS

4:16, 17 ..... 225, 269

2 THESSALONIANS

1:7-10 ..... 226, 227

1 TIMOTHY

3:15 ..... 151, 152, 182
3:16 ..... 179, 256
4:1 ..... 256, 257

2 TIMOTHY

2:12 257

TITUS

3:5, 6 177

HEBREWS

1:3 ..... 183, 222, 266
1:1-5 ..... 184, 186, 187, 267
1:8, 9 268
2:9 ..... 179, 256, 265
4:14 ..... 182, 266
5:6 ..... 222, 268
7:14 254
7:17 ..... 222, 268

Scanned by TLC

Scripture References	Page
8:1	182
8:4	182, 254, 269
8:	151
10:12-14	185, 186, 266, 267
10:20	259
11:16	151
12:28	156, 178, 180, 265
1 PETER	
1:4	270
2:5	176
4:17	223
2 PETER	
3:10	258
1 JOHN	
3:2	216
5:4, 5	257

Scripture References	Page
REVELATION	
1:5, 6	149, 257
1:6	176, 268
1:7	226, 269
1:9	156, 265
2:25-28	176, 257
3:21	257
5:6-10	257
5:9, 10	176
17:14	149, 183, 267
19:	263
19:17	263
20:	145, 213, 263
20:1-7	261, 262
21:1	257
21:2	150
22:3	182, 269

Scanned by TLC

THIRD PROPOSITION

"The Scriptures teach that baptism to the penitent believer is essential to his salvation from past or alien sins."

W. L. OLIPHANT'S SPEECHES

OLD TESTAMENT

Scripture References	Page
GENESIS	
5:33	282
EXODUS	
14:30	344
20:24	380, 381
NUMBERS	
20:12	286, 317
2 KINGS	
5:	278
PSALMS	
119:172	376
EZEKIEL	
44:7	380

NEW TESTAMENT

Scripture References	Page
MATTHEW	
3:5, 6	318
3:6-9	319
3:7	348
3:13-15	319, 376
3:15	277, 345, 387
10:33	285
12:18	377
26:28	342, 378
28:18, 19	277, 318, 381
MARK	
1:4	273, 274, 318, 319, 347, 348, 354
2:5	382
13:22	377
16:15, 16	287, 288, 318
16:16	274, 275, 286, 310, 315, 354, 382, 387, 388
LUKE	
1:60-63	318
3:3	274, 318, 347, 348, 354
7:29, 30	319, 351, 378
7:45	378
7:50	285, 351
8:21	314
11:7	377
18:10-14	380
24:46, 47	318
JOHN	
1:12	316, 387
1:17	275
2:23-25	313
3:5	342, 378
3:16	284, 285, 351, 386
3:18	285, 309, 351, 378, 386
3:18, 21	310, 351
3:36	284, 310, 386
4:1-4	277
5:24	285, 351, 378, 386
6:29	277
6:47	351
8:32	376
12:42, 43	285, 287, 310
19:34	317
20:30, 31	380
ACTS	
1:8	351
2:37	351
2:38	274, 310, 317, 318, 320, 342, 348, 350, 351, 354, 376, 377, 378, 380, 387
2:41	313
3:19	320
6:7	284, 317, 387
8:3	352
8:12	313
9:1	352
9:2	352
9:4-6	343
9:6	279, 280
9:10-19	311
9:13	352
9:14	352
9:19, 20	280

Scanned by TLC

Scripture References	Page
10:43	285, 348, 380, 386
10:48	380
11:21	320, 380, 387
13:39	378
16:31	285, 386
17:11	272
18:8	352
19:1-5	384
19:18	384
20:21	384
22:16	274, 280, 310, 311, 343, 354, 381, 382, 385, 386, 387
22:19	352
26:16	343, 380, 381
26:20	320, 387
26:28	377
ROMANS	
1:5	284, 317, 387
1:16	316, 376, 387
3:25	345
4:12	383
5:1, 2	279, 386, 387
6:3-4	280, 281, 317
10:1, 2	276
10:17	317
1 CORINTHIANS	
1:14	352
10:2	344
15:1, 2	376
15:8	344, 380, 381
2 CORINTHIANS	
5:17	281
GALATIANS	
1:8	376
3:26, 27	281, 345, 350, 387
5:6	284, 317, 387
EPHESIANS	
1:7	317
1:13	384
2:8	314, 376, 384
4:5	384
2 THESSALONIANS	
1:7-9	314

Scripture References	Page
1 TIMOTHY	
4:12	352
2 TIMOTHY	
2:10	281
TITUS	
3:8	352
HEBREWS	
5:9	284, 317, 387
9:17	353
11:	281, 284, 387
11:4-7	282
11:8, 9	283
JAMES	
2:14-17	285, 286
2:19	285, 287
2:20-23	312
2:21-24	383, 384
2:21-26	387
1 PETER	
1:9	316
3:18-21	346
3:21	274, 310, 345, 347, 354, 387
2 PETER	
1:5-11	315, 316
1 JOHN	
2:3, 4	312, 313, 385
2:4	311, 312
2:5	311
2:23	312, 385
3:7	313, 385
3:12	282
3:24	312, 385
4:2	385
4:3	312
4:7	312, 385
4:15	312, 385
5:1	312, 378, 379, 384, 385, 386
5:3	311
2 JOHN	
1:5, 6	311, 312
REVELATION	
2:10	316

JOHN R. RICE'S SPEECHES

OLD TESTAMENT

GENESIS		ZECHARIAH	
15:6	399	6:11	305

NEW TESTAMENT

MATTHEW		MARK	
3:7-9	325	1:4	324, 325
3:15	336	2:5	358, 372, 373, 397
12:18	335	16:16	401, 403, 404
13:22	335		

Scanned by TLC

Scripture References Page

LUKE

3:3 324
7:37-50 ..... 358, 372
7:45 396
11:5-7 334
18:13, 14 ..... 358, 371, 372

JOHN

1:11, 12 ..... 294, 295, 338
1:13 ..... 338, 339
2:25 398
3:16 404
3:18 ..... 304, 305, 360, 367, 369, 404
3:36 ..... 306, 360, 361
5:24 ..... 306, 357, 361, 362, 367, 401, 403, 404
6:28, 29 361
6:37 295
6:46 307
6:47 ..... 306, 307, 363
20:30, 31 364

ACTS

2:37, 38 ..... 335, 336, 392, 393, 401, 402
9:4-6 327
9:17 ..... 328, 332, 405
9:26, 27 ..... 329, 405
10:43-48 ..... 373, 374, 397
11:18 374
13:38, 39 ..... 357, 365, 403
16:30, 31 ..... 402, 403
22:16 ..... 326, 404, 405

Scripture References Page

ROMANS

3:20 398
4:1-5 ..... 367, 368, 398, 399
4:5-11 ..... 369, 399
6:3 ..... 332, 333, 335
6:5 334

1 CORINTHIANS

10:2 332
15:7, 8 ..... 329, 358

GALATIANS

3:11 398

EPHESIANS

2:6-9 ..... 370, 371

TITUS

3:5 ..... 371, 406

HEBREWS

11:6 295

JAMES

2:14-26 398

1 PETER

3:20, 21 ..... 337, 338, 392, 393, 394

1 JOHN

5:1 ..... 357, 364, 371
5:13 364

Scanned by TLC

FOURTH PROPOSITION

"The Scriptures teach that a child of God, one who has been saved by the blood of Christ, can so sin as to be finally lost."

W. L. OLIPHANT'S SPEECHES

OLD TESTAMENT

Scripture References	Page
GENESIS	
18:2	522
EXODUS	
32:33	491, 525
NUMBERS	
14:12	484
DEUTERONOMY	
14:1	447, 481, 484, 524
2 SAMUEL	
7:12	447
9:8	521
PSALMS	
9:17	452
37:23, 24, 27	516
119:172	413, 520
ISAIAH	
59:1-3	515
JEREMIAH	
2:32	452, 518, 520
31:31-34	511, 512
EZEKIEL	
18:20	418
18:24	525
18:31	446, 447

NEW TESTAMENT

Scripture References	Page
MATTHEW	
4:4	520
5:22	490, 524
5:28	488, 526
7:21	445
10:28	449
13:41, 42	418, 522, 523
15:1-10	449
15:9	443
15:19, 20	488, 526
25:14-30	416, 417, 449, 521, 522, 526
25:46	412, 448, 519
MARK	
10:29, 30	411, 412, 413, 448, 519
16:16	416, 451
LUKE	
8:11, 12	486
8:13	415, 442, 520, 521
8:21	444
12:43-47	416, 448, 521
16:19-31	484, 524
JOHN	
3:3-5	418, 523
3:16	412, 515
3:18	416, 418, 449
3:36	518
4:14	516
5:24	412, 517, 518
5:28, 29	490, 525
6:66	414, 520
6:66-68	444
8:21	491, 525
8:32	443
10:27, 28	517
14:6	443
15:1-10	417, 449, 487, 522, 523, 526
15:2, 6	486
15:5	414
15:9, 10	515
17:3	451, 481, 518, 520
17:19	483
ACTS	
1:10	522
2:23	514
2:37-41	514
8:12-24	451, 524
8:22	527
10:34	491, 525
20:28	441
23:1	446
23:5	444

Scanned by TLC

Scripture References Page

ROMANS

1:4 443
1:16, 17 ..... 413, 414, 446, 453, 485 487, 520
2:6, 7 ..... 411, 448, 519
4:8 486
4:8-13 487
6:12 ..... 488, 526
6:13 525
6:19 ..... 488, 526
6:22 ..... 411, 448, 519
8:2 ..... 445, 487
8:12, 13 ..... 488, 526
8:25 411
8:35-39 ..... 514, 515
10:17 ..... 485, 520
12:1 ..... 488, 526
14:18 ..... 449, 523

1 CORINTHIANS

2:11 ..... 488, 526
3:15 485
3:16, 17 ..... 489, 526
4:15 485
6:15 488
6:15-20 ..... 489, 526
6:19, 20 489
8:11, 12 ..... 449, 523, 525
9:2 485
9:24, 25 485
9:27 ..... 419, 485, 523, 526
10:1-12 ..... 481, 482, 483, 524
10:12 419

2 CORINTHIANS

3:2 485
5:21 487
10:12 446
13:5, 6 ..... 419, 485

GALATIANS

5:4 ..... 414, 418, 449, 523, 525
6:7, 8 ..... 455, 489, 490, 524, 525

EPHESIANS

2:8 ..... 418, 523

COLOSSIANS

1:27 412

2 THESSALONIANS

2:3 ..... 454, 525

1 TIMOTHY

1:19 ..... 414, 415, 448, 485, 520
4:1 ..... 414, 443, 520
5:11-15 ..... 414, 442, 454, 520, 525
6:12 ..... 411, 448, 519

2 TIMOTHY

2:18 ..... 414, 448, 520

TITUS

1:1, 2 ..... 411, 448, 519

HEBREWS

2:9 ..... 484, 513
4:15 527

Scripture References Page

6:4-6 ..... 450, 483, 524, 526
7:23-26 513
8:8-12 ..... 511, 512
10:3, 4 512
10:11, 14 512
10:23 513
10:26-29 ..... 450, 483, 512, 523
10:39 513
11: 512
12:15 ..... 454, 525
12:23 ..... 490, 525
13:12 484

JAMES

1:1-3 481
1:13-15 ..... 515, 516
2:1 481
2:26 ..... 488, 526
5:16 ..... 481, 527
5:19, 20 ..... 418, 449, 454, 481, 487, 523, 525

1 PETER

1:5 ..... 485 514, 520
1:23 446
2:2, 3 484
5:8 ..... 455, 526

2 PETER

1:3, 4 446
1:3-5, 11 452
1:5-11 ..... 453, 485
1.9-10 ..... 518, 525
2:1-20 ..... 415, 416, 441, 521
2:4 ..... 491, 526
2:14, 15 525
2:20, 21 ..... 454, 525, 526
3:14 ..... 454, 525
3:17 ..... 454, 525

1 JOHN

1:1-3 ..... 412, 448, 520
1:7 ..... 447, 513
1:8-10 487
2:1 527
2:24, 25 ..... 413, 448, 485, 487, 520
3:9 ..... 486, 487
3:15 489
5:12 412

2 JOHN

1:9 443

JUDE

1:1 ..... 514, 515
1:6 ..... 491, 526
1:19 515
1:20, 21 ..... 514, 515

REVELATION

2:10 ..... 445, 517
3:5 490
3:16 ..... 485, 487
20: 518
20:15 ..... 490, 491, 525
21:8 ..... 443, 444
22:18, 19 ..... 491, 525, 526

Scanned by TLC

JOHN R. RICE'S SPEECHES

OLD TESTAMENT

Scripture References — Page

2 SAMUEL
7:12-15 ..... 421, 531

PSALMS
51:12 486
37:23 535
37:23, 24, 28 ..... 502, 503
37:28, 29 504

JEREMIAH
2:31, 32 ..... 457, 540, 541

ZECHARIAH
6:12, 13 ..... 421, 531

NEW TESTAMENT

MATTHEW
13:21 439
26:58 539

MARK
2:5 424

LUKE
7:45, 50 424
16:23 548
18:14 424
22:31, 32 ..... 502, 503

JOHN
1:45 ..... 437, 438
3:16 ..... 436, 477
3:18 550
4:14, 15 500
5:24 ..... 434, 462, 477, 494, 495, 505, 540, 543
6:37 508
6:47 434
6:66 436
10:27-29 ..... 497, 498, 499, 500, 542, 543
15:1, 2 ..... 537, 538
15:4-7 ..... 539, 540

ACTS
8:12-24 493
8:9-23 ..... 532, 533, 534
20:28 472

ROMANS
4:4-6 ..... 475, 476
4:7, 8 ..... 476, 504, 505
5: 434
5:11 472
7:15-25 ..... 433, 449, 474, 509
7:25 ..... 477, 504, 549
8:16 432
8:30 536
8:33 504
8:35-39 ..... 505, 506, 543

1 CORINTHIANS
3:11-15 ..... 468, 538
6:9-11 ..... 535, 536, 537, 545
9:27 466
12:3 472

2 CORINTHIANS
5:17 ..... 430, 470

GALATIANS
6:15 ..... 430, 470

EPHESIANS
1:7 472

PHILIPPIANS
3:20, 21 536

COLOSSIANS
1:14 472

1 TIMOTHY
4:1 ..... 437, 438
5:9-12 ..... 438, 439
6:12 433

2 TIMOTHY
1:12 440

HEBREWS
6: 462, 473
6:1-9 ..... 463, 464, 465, 545, 546
7:23-27 ..... 507, 508
10:6-12 ..... 508, 509
10:10-14 546
10:12-17 ..... 509, 510
10:14, 26, 39 547
10:26, 27 465
10:26, 29, 39 ..... 460, 461, 462, 545, 548

JAMES
1:1 ..... 456, 457
5:19, 20 456

1 PETER
1:4 507
1:18, 19 472

2 PETER
1:4-8 ..... 430, 433, 466, 467, 470
1:10 468
1:11 469
2:1, 22 440
2:12-17 469
2:21, 22 468
3:17 532

Scanned by TLC

Scripture References	Page
1 JOHN	
1:7	471
2:1, 2	508, 550
3:2	434
3:8, 9	473, 475, 500, 501, 509, 510, 549
3:14	456
4:13	456
5:1	456
5:11, 12, 13	436, 456
JUDE	
1:1	507
REVELATION	
3:16	549
22:18, 19	550

Scanned by TLC

TOPICAL INDEX

FIRST PROPOSITION

"The Scriptures teach that the Jews as a nation will return to Palestine when Christ returns to the earth, and then will be converted to Christ."

Affirmative: John R. Rice
Negative: W. L. Oliphant

TOPICS	PAGES
Abrahamic Covenants	12, 13, 25, 26, 41, 42, 49, 58, 67, 68, 77, 84, 86, 87, 88, 95, 104, 105, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118.
Baptist Church	10, 52
"Branch"	46, 55, 71
Broken as Potter's Vessel	60, 61, 77, 78
Church Age	33, 39, 40, 53, 121
Church, Holy Mountain	82
Conditional Promises	27, 28, 29, 59, 84, 85
Conversion by Sight	54, 55, 119
Conversion of Israel	43, 44, 102, 107
Destruction of Jerusalem	18, 19, 40
Dispersion of Israel	16, 17, 19, 21, 29, 42, 43, 69, 83, 108
False Hope to Jews	34
God, No Respecter of Persons	23, 114
Gospel Preached to Whole World	56, 57, 82
Heavenly City	78
Heavenly Country	25, 54, 83, 91, 113, 114, 118
Literal or Figurative?	55, 56, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 81, 82, 109
New Covenant	57, 109, 110
No Difference Between Jews and Gentiles	30, 31, 32, 33, 61, 62, 63, 89, 111, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121
Parable of Vineyard	35, 58
Promises to Jews—Three Classes	24
Promises to Jews—Fulfilled	24, 53, 85
Promises to Jews—Unconditional	14, 20, 67, 70, 77
"Raised Up"	112, 113
Return of Israel	21, 41, 43, 48, 49, 70, 71, 92, 93, 101, 103
Samaritan Woman	34, 58, 119
Terms Defined	11
"Times of Restitution"	79, 80, 96, 97, 111, 112
Undenominational	10, 16
Vineyard Destroyed	90, 91

Scanned by TLC

SECOND PROPOSITION

"The Scriptures teach that Christ will establish a literal throne in Jerusalem, and will rule over the whole earth for a period of one thousand years."

Affirmative: John R. Rice
Negative: W. L. Oliphant

TOPICS — PAGES

Abrahamic Covenants ... 127, 128
"According to the Flesh" ... 207, 214, 231, 232, 233, 254, 255
"Ancient of Days" ... 179, 256
"Appearing and Kingdom" ... 234, 235, 256, 257
"At Hand" ... 153, 154, 163, 178, 180, 215, 264
"Brief History of Premillennialism" ... 126, 140, 189, 190, 199
Campbell, Alexander ... 141, 142, 143, 158, 189, 190, 191, 200, 202, 210
Christ, King ... 148, 149, 157, 182, 266, 267, 269, 270
Christ, On Throne ... 182, 183, 266, 267
Christ, Subordinate Place ... 237, 270
Christians Reigning ... 176, 257, 268
Church, an Accident ... 265
Coniah ... 221, 228, 229, 230, 254
Converted by Sight ... 149
Day of Christ's Power ... 222, 223, 268
"Feet on Mt. of Olives" ... 137, 138, 165, 166, 193, 216, 217, 231, 251
God, King of Israel ... 176, 221, 222
Heart in Temple Perpetually ... 252, 259, 260
Heavenly City ... 135
Heavenly Country ... 151
House of the Lord ... 135, 136, 150, 151, 165, 182, 187
In the Kingdom ... 156, 265
"In the Regeneration" ... 169, 170, 176, 177
Josephus ... 218, 219
Joshua ... 182, 183, 206, 207, 214
Judgment, "A" vs. "the" ... 226, 235, 236, 257
Judgment of Righteous and Wicked ... 226, 269
Kingdom, Appointed ... 177, 194, 212
Kingdom, "of Christ" and "of God" ... 269
Kingdom, Received ... 156, 178
Kingdom, Preached ... 180
Kingdom Rejected ... 163, 180, 181, 215, 264, 265
Kingdom, Restored to Israel ... 239, 240, 242, 243, 258, 259
Kingdom, Waited for ... 154, 265
Kingdom and Glory ... 183, 184, 266
Kingdom and Power ... 154, 155, 189, 266
"Last Days" ... 155, 162, 164, 186, 187, 264
Literal or Figurative? ... 124, 125, 131, 132, 144, 145, 150, 168, 198, 210, 211, 220, 221, 259
"Living Waters" ... 166, 167, 216, 217, 218, 230, 251, 252, 253, 254
Lord's Table in Kingdom ... 177, 212, 268
Nebuchadnezzar's Dream ... 152, 153, 264

Scanned by TLC

TOPICS	PAGES
New Covenant	151
Parable of Nobleman	170, 171, 172, 178, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238, 255, 256
"Raise Up" Christ	146, 147, 150, 185, 207, 254
Reign of Christ	185, 186, 266, 267
Resurrection of Righteous and Wicked	224, 225, 269
Return of Israel	127, 128, 133, 134, 135, 137
Second Psalm	186, 187, 188, 189, 267, 268
Terms Defined	124, 125
Thousand Years, the	197, 201, 213, 227, 228, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 258, 260, 261, 262, 263
Throne of David	127, 128, 129, 130, 133, 147, 148, 160, 161, 162, 167, 168, 184, 185, 197, 205, 207, 208, 210, 221, 224, 267
"Throne of His Glory"	174, 175, 194, 195, 213
Undenominational	202, 203, 211, 212

THIRD PROPOSITION

"The Scriptures teach that baptism to the penitent believer is essential to his salvation from past, or alien sins."

Affirmative: W. L. Oliphant
Negative: John R. Rice

Ananias	274, 310, 326, 328, 349, 381, 382, 405
Baptism—A Figure	337, 338, 346, 347, 392, 394
Baptism—First; Salvation Second	273, 274, 354, 387, 388, 395
Baptism—"For Remission"	274, 318, 348, 350, 351, 377, 378, 380
Baptism—Included in all Conversions	288
Baptism—John's	318, 319, 326
Baptism—Name Recorded in	380, 381
Baptism—"Of Repentance"	324, 325, 326, 347, 394
Baptism—Saves	274, 310
Baptism—Work of Christ	277, 278
Baptized—Sins Washed Away	274, 280, 327, 405
Believers—Born of God	364, 371, 384, 385
Believers—Saved and Unsaved	284, 285, 286, 287, 351
Believers, Penitent—Their Condition	290, 291, 292, 323, 361, 378, 379
Believers—Saved by Gospel	316
"Born out of Due Time"	329, 330, 343, 381, 391
"Brother"—Who is My?	314, 328, 362
"By Faith"—Meaning of	279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284
Campbell, Alexander	300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 313, 314, 330, 331, 338, 353, 354, 367
Church of Christ—Not a Denomination	315, 386
Contrast—Bible vs. Rice	387
Cornelius	373, 374, 380, 381, 397
"Eis"—Meaning of	332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 348, 350, 377, 378, 392, 393, 402
Faith—Comprehensive Term	312, 317, 352
Faith—Counted for Righteousness	368, 369, 383, 398, 399

Scanned by TLC

TOPICS	PAGES
Faith—Must be Expressed	284, 317
Faith—Synonymous with "Coming to Christ," etc.	294, 295
"Filth of the Flesh"	337, 338, 347
Gospel Advocate Quarterly	297, 298, 314, 315, 316
Great Commission	274, 277, 287, 318
Harmony—Two Sets Scripture	386, 387
John—Only Baptist	318
Letter—By Dr. Rice	311, 347, 348, 382
Literal, or Figurative?	321
Love—Keeping Commands	311, 312
Pharisee and Publican	299, 371, 380, 396, 401
"Premillennialism, A Brief History"	314
Questions—Asked (or Referred to)	275, 309, 334, 341, 342, 355, 357, 358, 359, 375, 376, 378, 379, 388, 391
Questions—Answered	342, 343, 344, 378, 379, 380, 382
Repent—Change of Mind	293
Repentance and Baptism for Same Purpose	350
Repentance—Involves faith	294
Righteousness—Christ's	277, 345
Righteousness—God's	276, 277, 316
Righteousness—Man's	276, 316
Salvation—by Blood	317
Salvation by Faith	278, 304, 305, 306, 307, 309, 310, 312, 313, 360, 361, 362, 363, 365, 369, 372, 373, 396, 397, 404
Salvation—by Grace	370, 371, 384
Salvation—by Love, Baptism, Repentance, Works, etc.	385, 386
Salvation—In Christ	281
Salvation—Two Plans	359, 400
Terms Defined	273
"Turning to Lord"—Follows Faith and Repentance	320
Water—No Value in	278, 279
Works—of Law	275, 276, 383, 384

FOURTH PROPOSITION

"The Scriptures teach that a child of God, one who has been saved by the Blood of Christ, can so sin as to be finally lost."

Affirmative: W. L. Oliphant
Negative: John R. Rice

Affirmation a Contradiction	422, 423, 447
Angels—Sinned	491, 526
Atonement Received	472
"Believe for a While"	415, 442, 443, 520, 521
Believer—Born of God	456
Believer—"Come into Condemnation"	495, 496, 517, 518
Book of Life—Names Blotted Out	490, 491, 525, 550
Brother—Destroyed	449, 523

Scanned by TLC

Brother—Perish ____ 449, 523
"Brother"—Who is My? ____ 444, 457, 480, 481, 492, 493, 494, 518, 519, 532
Child of God—Called Dog ____ 458, 459, 521
Child of God—Can he Sin? ____ 473, 474, 475, 486, 487, 501, 509, 510, 549
Child of God—Can he go to Hell? ____ 473, 485, 524, 548, 549
Child of God—Disinherited ____ 484
Child of God—Forget God ____ 451, 452, 453, 457, 481, 518, 540, 541, 542
Child of God—How get out of Christ? ____ 472, 473, 485
Child of God—Has Perfect Priest ____ 507, 508, 512, 513, 514
Child of God—Has Perfect Sacrifice ____ 509, 512, 513
Child of God—In danger of Hell ____ 490, 524
Child of God—Kept ____ 471, 485, 514, 520
Child of God—Partaker Divine Nature ____ 430, 431, 433, 446, 447, 452, 453, 470, 500
Child of God Sins—Body or Spirit? ____ 474, 487, 488, 489, 504, 526
Child of God—Sin not Imputed ____ 475, 476, 487, 504, 505
Child of God—Turned Aside ____ 442, 454
Child of God—Unborn ____ 470, 484
Children of God—Fell, our Ensamples ____ 481, 482, 524
Children of God—Impossible to Renew ____ 450, 451, 462, 463, 464, 465, 524, 546, 547
Children of God—Unfruitful ____ 466, 467, 468, 485, 538
Children of God—Works Burned ____ 468, 485, 538, 539
Children of God—Warned ____ 454, 455, 525, 526, 532, 533, 534
"Comparing Ourselves" ____ 446
Conversion—Wrong on ____ 430, 431
"Cursed Children" ____ 415, 416, 440, 441, 521
Devil, a Fool ____ 455, 456
Disciple, a Learner ____ 436, 437, 444
"Draw Back" ____ 461, 462, 513
"Drinketh, Never Thirst" ____ 500, 516
Eternal Life—A Promise ____ 413, 435, 448
Eternal Life—Can it be Lost? ____ 435, 448, 451, 452, 481, 489, 518
Eternal Life—Christ Called ____ 412, 413, 448, 519
Eternal Life—Final Reward ____ 412, 448, 519
Eternal Life—God Renders ____ 411, 448, 519
Eternal Life—in the End ____ 411, 448, 519
Eternal Life—In Hope of ____ 411, 448, 519
Eternal Life—In Present ____ 412, 434, 448, 462, 476, 477, 494, 495, 497, 498, 499, 517, 518, 519, 520, 550
Eternal Life—In World to Come ____ 411, 448, 519
Eternal Life—Lay Hold on ____ 411, 433, 448, 519
Eternal Life—Sheep Receive ____ 497, 498, 499, 517, 542, 543
Eternal Life—Soul Now, Body Later ____ 435, 474, 475, 536, 537
Eternal Life—To Know God ____ 451, 452
Faith—Cast off ____ 414, 438, 439, 442, 520
Faith—Departed from ____ 414, 437, 438, 443, 520
Faith—Made Shipwreck ____ 414, 448, 485, 520
Faith—Overthrown ____ 414, 448, 520
Four Contradictory Positions ____ 486, 487, 488, 489
Gathered out of Kingdom ____ 418, 522, 523
Gospel Advocate Quarterly ____ 425, 426, 427, 428, 431, 445, 496, 502
Grace—Fallen from ____ 418, 449, 523
Hate Brother, No Eternal Life ____ 489
Joshua ____ 421, 531

Scanned by TLC

Live After Flesh, Die ____525
Love of God—"Who Can Separate from?" ____505, 506, 507, 514, 515, 516, 543
New Covenant ____510, 511, 512
Parable of Sower ____415, 439, 442, 443
Paul—"Rejected, a Castaway" ____419, 466, 485, 523
Personal Testimony ____432, 433, 445, 446
Premium on Sin ____443, 444
"Proverb, a True" ____440, 442, 458, 459, 521
Publican ____421, 447, 458
Questions—Asked or Referred to ____410, 423, 424, 425, 445, 447, 448, 466,480, 519
Reign of Christ ____421, 447, 531
Righteousness—God's ____413, 414, 436, 448, 453, 520
Righteousness—Man's ____413, 436, 448, 453
Saints—Preserved ____503, 504, 507, 514
Salvation—Apart from Christ ____414, 436, 444, 520
Salvation—Gift ____516, 517
Salvation—Plan for Erring Child ____527
"Sanctified"—Who? ____461, 483
Saved by Grace—Lost by Works ____423
Servant—Cut Asunder ____416, 448, 521
Servant—Unprofitable ____417, 449, 521, 522
Simon ____451, 493, 524
Soul—Saved from Death ____418, 449, 454, 456, 457, 481, 523
Soul—"Sinneth Shall Die" ____418, 525
Sowing and Reaping ____455, 489, 490, 524, 525
"Steps of a Good Man" ____502, 503, 516, 535
"Tasted" ____463, 464, 484
Terms Defined ____409, 410, 421, 422
Thousand Years, the ____492, 518, 532
Turn Away from Righteousness ____525
Two Classes in Resurrection ____490, 525
Vine and Branches ____417, 418, 449, 522, 523, 537, 538, 539, 540
Wilful Sin ____450, 460, 461, 462, 465, 483, 484, 512, 523, 524, 546, 547, 548

Scanned by TLC