

**HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM DEBATE**

**THE SUBJECTS OF HOLY SPIRIT  
BAPTISM**

**REG. ROGERS and MARION R. FOX**

© 1990 Five F Publishing Company

FIVE F PUBLISHING COMPANY  
4004 SE Twisted Trail Road  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73150-1910

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

First proposition: **The Scriptures teach that both Gentiles and Jews were baptized in the Holy Spirit in these last days; the apostles were thus baptized on the Pentecost of Acts 2, Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius.**

First affirmative-Reg Rogers	1
First negative-Marion R. Fox	5
Second affirmative-Reg Rogers	9
Second negative-Marion R. Fox	12
Third affirmative-Reg Rogers	16
Third negative-Marion R. Fox	21
Fourth affirmative-Reg Rogers	25
Fourth negative-Marion R. Fox	29
Affirmative summation-Reg Rogers	33
Negative summation-Marion R. Fox	34

Second proposition: **The Scriptures teach that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is the same as the miraculous gift of apostleship.**

First affirmative-Marion R. Fox	35
First negative-Reg Rogers	40
Second affirmative-Marion R. Fox	44
Second negative-Reg Rogers	50
Third affirmative-Marion R. Fox	54
Third negative-Reg Rogers	60
Fourth affirmative-Marion R. Fox	64
Fourth negative-Reg Rogers	73
Affirmative summation-Marion R. Fox	77
Negative summation-Reg Rogers	81
Rejoinder-Marion R. Fox	81

Scripture index	82
Charts	93
Acts 10 and Acts 11 Parallel	95

## WHO WAS BAPTIZED IN THE HOLY SPIRIT

Proposition: **The Scriptures teach that both Gentiles and Jews were baptized in the Holy Spirit in these last days; the apostles were thus baptized on the Pentecost of Acts 2, Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius.** Reg Rogers, affirms; Marion Fox denies.

1 It has only been recently that we heard anybody deny that the Gentiles were immersed in the Spirit as well as, the same as the Jews. Why this plain truth of the gospel is denied by the negative and those who stand with him, I wish I knew; perhaps this discussion will bring to light the weakness of a cause that calls for the deletion of a portion of present truth!

2 Perhaps the anti-Gentile-baptism--in-the-Holy Spirit, (anti), is a reaction to the Pentecostal Church doctrine that we hear on the radio every few minutes. These Pentecostals keep urging their converts to "go on and seek and receive 'the baptism', and speak in tongues." By "baptism", they ordinarily mean Holy Spirit baptism. If these brethren are reacting out of fear of the Pentecostals, I pity them and sympathize; but I shan't excuse them. I strongly suspect that the negative and his disciples are reactionaries against the Pentecostals who say, "All Gentiles may be baptized in the Holy Spirit". One bit of error is as acceptable as another!

3 I'm in the second generation of preaching and hearing preaching that speaks on this wise: "There are only two instances of baptism in the Holy Spirit mentioned in the Bible---Acts 2 and Acts 10, 11." If we were not preaching the truth, we were teaching error; and if the latter, we stand condemned. Do these antis, (now remember how I'm using the term -anti"---paragraph three), believe we are heretics? It would be nothing novel for an anti to condemn the faithful preaching

of the exact text. One of these antis even said, “Paul was baptized in the Holy Spirit”! No need to tell you what they did when we called for proof for the imagined phenomenon! The embracing of a false doctrine unlocks the imagination. Perhaps this new doctrine on immersion in the Holy Spirit accounts for the uncontrolled fantasy of those who have grabbed it up.

4 This neoimmersionism is false, divisive and destructive of faith in God. Those who teach it are engaged in a work of ignorance, and lead their disciples into darkness! Those who deliberately teach error in one point are off on one or more other points. It is my aim to correct this error. It is my purpose in this discussion to take the Scriptures and set forth, in the most emphatic, graphic and clear way and manner the exact truth on the baptism in the Holy Spirit of both Jews and Gentiles; the fact thereof, the purpose thereof, the times thereof, and the results thereof. This I do because I believe and teach the truth on this question. It is also my aim and purpose to expose the sophistry, refute the error, and to point out the quibbles of him who would presume to foist the error of the negative upon the readers. Hence, to the fray!

5 No one ever denied that Jews were baptized in the Spirit; therefore I shall not spend much time on that phase of this discussion; but it seems good to briefly set it forth.

6 John, preparing a people for the Lord, said to his audience, “I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I ... he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire.” Matthew 3:11. He had reference to what happened for the apostles on the Pentecost in question, Acts 2:1-17, and the immersion in fire for the disobedient and impenitent at the end of time, Revelation 21:8. Certainly not every individual that heard

there would be thus baptized. “Baptize” in this proposition is a figurative use of the term as in Luke 12:50, “But I have a baptism to be baptized with and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!”

7 Again, immersion in the Spirit for the apostles was mentioned by Jesus just after his death and resurrection, and just before his ascension as he spoke to the apostles, Acts 1:4,5, “And being assembled together with them, he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me; for John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence”.

8 Let us go now to Acts 11:15, 16, where Peter declared by inspiration, the fulfillment of the word of Jesus in Acts 1:4, 5. “And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit”. We learn from this that which was not mentioned in Acts 2, namely, that the Holy Spirit fell on the apostles at the beginning. As it fell upon the apostles, it fell upon the Gentiles. This “falling” of the Holy Spirit was an immersion in the Holy Spirit; if it were an immersion in the Spirit for the Gentiles in Acts 11, and Peter said it was, then certainly it was no less for the apostles on that Pentecost. Moreover, Peter declared that “God gave them (the Gentiles) the like gift as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ”. Acts 11:17. That “like gift” from God was the great invitation into the new covenant.

9 But back to Acts 10; is it not a little strange that most enlightenment on immersion in the Holy Spirit is obtained from Acts, chapters 10 and 11 where the Gentiles received it? Here in Acts 10:47 Peter said of baptism in the Spirit for the Gentiles, “Can

any man forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?”. The Jewish brethren who came with Peter had witnessed the falling of the Holy Spirit upon these Gentiles and heard them speak in languages, foreign to the speakers but familiar to the hearers; 11:46. A similar gift came to the Jews on that Pentecost, Acts 2:4. “And they, (the apostles) were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance”. These apostles were speaking “the wonderful works of God;”, where the Gentiles spoke under the same influence, they “magnified God”. Acts 10:46

10 When the apostles, believers on the Lord Jesus Christ, were baptized in the Holy Spirit, and were thus enabled to amaze their hearers by speaking in languages they had never learned and, therein, speaking the wonderful works of God, as noted, their credibility was established to open the way for the greatest announcement the Jews ever heard, namely, that God would accept them under a new covenant and everlasting, by the blood of Christ.

11 In like manner, when the Gentiles were immersed in the Holy Spirit at the house of Cornelius, those who witnessed were astonished, Acts 10:45. And at what were they astonished but that the Lord had demonstrated that the Gentiles also were now acceptable unto God under the new testament, the same as the Jews? Now tell me how a believer on the Lord can deny that the Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius, were immersed in the Spirit as were the Jews, and a failure to love that truth invites from God a working of error! “And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie that they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness”, II Thessalonians 2:11,12.

12 Back to the events of Pentecost, please; when the apostles were given the gift of the immersion in the Holy Spirit, that is, when the Holy Spirit fell on them, they began speaking in languages foreign to them which they did not know. They were speaking to persons native to all the tongues spoken. It was known to the listeners that the speakers were ignorant of the tongues being spoken. Some listeners were amazed to hear, in their own tongues, “the mighty works of God”. Others accused the apostles of being drunken on new wine; “But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and spake forth unto them, saying, Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and give ear unto 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 hath been spoken through the prophet Joel: and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I WILL POUR FORTH OF MY SPIRIT UPON ALL FLESH”. Acts 2:14-17A. The word “pour” was used here to describe the baptism of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles and at the house of Cornelius, when the skeptical Jews, who accompanied Peter, “were amazed ... because that on the Gentiles ALSO was POURED out the gift of the Holy Spirit, for they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God Acts 10:45, 46. The antiGentile position denies the immersion to them; they avow and declare that upon the Jews the Spirit was poured out in fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel; but Joel said ALL FLESH! The apostles were not “all flesh”. The prophecy of Joel was not all fulfilled as respects immersion in the Holy Spirit, until the Gentiles also became recipients of it at the house of Cornelius.

13 My aim in this discussion, has been to set forth, in the most emphatic and clear manner, the exact truth on the baptism in the Holy Spirit. This, I believe, I have done. You won't have any trouble understanding what I say. If you take issue with it, you'll know what

you are dealing with.

14 I started out to discuss the fact of the immersion in the Holy Spirit of, especially, the Gentiles, because that is the fact that is being denied. I feel obligated to do this, inasmuch as I am enjoined to “contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints”, Jude, V. 3. Look again at the divine fact: “While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Spirit fell on all them that heard the word”, Acts 10:44. “And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning and I remembered the word of the Lord how he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit”, Acts 11:15, 16. Jesus, before Pentecost gave his word to the apostles that they would be baptized in the Holy Spirit, Acts 1:4, 5. In fulfillment of his word, the Holy Spirit FELL upon the apostles, Acts 11:11. Peter understood that the “falling” of the Spirit upon the apostles, at the beginning was the fulfillment of the words and the promise of Jesus to them that they would be baptized in the Holy Spirit. If that FALLING of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles was an immersion, why was not the same thing upon the Gentiles, an immersion? Peter thought it was! Consider this:

15 The falling of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles at the beginning constituted a baptism in the Holy Spirit, Acts 1:5; 11:15. Second: Any falling of the Holy Spirit upon anyone, as it fell upon the apostles, constitutes an immersion in the Holy Spirit. Third: Upon the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, the Holy Spirit fell AS on the apostles at the beginning, Acts 11:15, therefore, the Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius were

16 One anti said that the falling of the Spirit upon the Gentiles, “only reminded Peter of the baptism in the Spirit of the apostles,

only it wasn't". That's a little like the man who moved to California, from Oklahoma to get away from tornadoes because one blew his house and barn away. But he was no sooner settled in California than a storm blew his house and barn away, as in Oklahoma. He remarked that if he didn't know better, he'd call that twister a tornado.

17 That should do it for the fact of the immersion of both Jews and Gentiles in the Holy Spirit. Now, again, the times of the immersions: first, they were "in the last days", Acts 2:16; second, once upon the Jews; third, once upon the Gentiles, Acts, chapters. 2, 10, 11. That should settle it for the times of the immersions, or the instances thereof.

18 Then, as to the purposes of both instances, it seems most clear that they were to get the attention of the witnesses thereto, and to give occasions for changes in the minds of the witnesses as to acceptability into covenant relationship with God through the new covenant by the blood of Christ. Acts chapters. 2, 10, 11.

19 Finally, as for the results of the two instances of immersion in the Holy Spirit, the stated purposes were accomplished, Acts 2:36-42; Acts 11:18, "And when they heard these things they held their peace, and glorified God, saying; Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life".

## FIRST NEGATIVE - Marion R. Fox

1a In setting forth my reply to brother Rogers the reader should note the areas in which we agree; (1) The Holy Spirit baptism was only for the first century, (2) No person today has received the Holy Spirit baptism or any miraculous gifts, (3) The word “baptize” of Acts 1:4-5 is used figuratively, and (4) The twelve apostles received the Holy Spirit baptism. I personally, teach that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was only for the apostles including Paul. This debate was arranged as a tool for the giving of our teachings a “good airing” to determine their soundness. I have no personal animosity toward brother Rogers although I do disagree with his doctrine.

2a As one in the negative I have no obligation to explain the events of Acts 10. My sole duty is to demonstrate that the interpretation set forth by brother Rogers is unsound.

3a Brother Rogers appeals to tradition to prove his point when he says: “It has only been recently ...” (Paragraph 1) It does not matter what any man has heard preached in the last 50 years because the standard is the Scriptures. Denominational people made this unsound argument when they could not answer the arguments of Alexander Campbell. Tradition has absolutely no authority in determining right or wrong.

4a Brother Rogers resorts to **name calling** when he attaches the label “anti” to me. This has the effect of causing some people to “turn me off” without hearing my side of the issue.

5a Brother Rogers seems to be saying that I deliberately teach error. Because I love brother Rogers I will not attribute to him any improper motives (I Corinthians 13:4-7). Further, I will not

knowingly use sophistry (“ ... a fallacy designed to deceive.” [Webster]). I assure the reader that my motives are only to determine what the will of God is in this matter and any other matter. I am willing to change if one will show me from the Scriptures that I am teaching error.

6a Brother Rogers also is guilty of “begging the question” when he asserts that my teaching is “false, divisive...” (paragraph 4) My position is not in question since I am not in the affirmative, but in the negative. I will send him a proposal for a second debate in which I will be in the affirmative, he can then attack my position. “Begging the question” is a fallacy of assuming what one is trying to prove then using the assumption as part of the proof.

7a Brother Rogers asks “Do these antis, ... believe we are heretics?” I could respond by asking him does he label me as a heretic? Perhaps it would be better to lay aside these weights of accusations and deal with the issues.

8a Brother Rogers has failed to use sound principles of Bible interpretation in dealing with Acts 1:4, 5, 11:15, and 16. We have, for some time, recognized that we must ask: (1) Who is speaking? and (2) To whom is he speaking? This second question when asked refutes his proposition. Jesus is speaking to the apostles in Acts 1:4-5. Does Peter quote this passage out of context in Acts 11:15 and 16? The word “ye” in Acts 1:4-5 refers to the apostles why does the same “ye” in Acts 11:15 and 16 refer to others?

9a Brother Rogers has failed to apply another principle of Bible interpretation: Once an expression is explained that explanation is to be used as a general rule. For example the expression “baptism in the name of Jesus Christ” (Acts 2:38) is said to be in water (Acts

10:47-48). We rightfully conclude that this expression always refers to water baptism. Brother Rogers said “ ... this falling of the Holy Spirit was an immersion in the Spirit; ... ” But, the laying on of the hands of the apostles to impart spiritual gifts is called a “falling of the Holy Spirit” in Acts 8:15-17. This being the case the doctrine that Cornelius received the baptism in the Holy Spirit implies that those of Acts 8 were baptized in the Holy Spirit. The following syllogism sets forth my argument:

Major Premise: All those upon whom the Holy Spirit fell are those who were baptized in the Holy Spirit.

Minor Premise: Those of Acts 8 are those upon whom the Holy Spirit fell.

Conclusion: Those of Acts 8 are those who were baptized in the Holy Spirit.

The falling of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:16) is equal to receiving the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:15, 17, and 19). This expression is also used in Acts 10:47 to refer to the events at Cornelius’ household. The falling of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:16) is also equal to “giving the Holy Spirit” (Acts 8:18). Peter calls the events of Acts 10 “... giving them the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 15:8)

10a I certainly agree that the events of Acts 10 had the purpose of confirmation of the truth that Gentiles were acceptable to God as members of the church. Brother Rogers has not proven that his proposition is truth. He repeatedly asserts that it is true but has not given a sound argument to that effect.

11a Since Joel’s prophesy included Jewish daughters (Acts 2:17-21) where is the instance of the Jewish daughters receiving the Holy Spirit baptism? The reader must be aware that “all flesh” included Jewish daughters. Where are they? The truth is that Joel’s prophesy included the baptism in the Holy Spirit but was not exclusively the

baptism in the Holy Spirit.

12a When Peter gave an account of what happened at the household of Cornelius in Acts 11 he begins in verse 15 to give an account of the reception of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Peter said that the Holy Spirit fell upon them (Cornelius and his household) even as (adverb of manner literally-of the same manner, after the fashion Acts 11:15) upon us.

13a The adverb “as” refers to the manner in which the gift came. This same Greek word is found in 41 other instances in the New Testament. In all 41 instances it is employed in a figure of speech called a “simile.” There is no doubt that this (Acts 11:15) is a simile also. Note the definition of a simile:

The simile states a comparison between two things that do not normally belong to the same class. Grammatically, the simile is often linked by “as” “like” or “than.” Robert Burns’s line “O my love is like a red, red rose” is a simile. To say, however, “Jane is as pretty as Helen” is not to employ a simile. The two items of this comparison belong to the same class. On a closer examination you can see that it is only in certain respects that the image is to be compared with its subject. Burns, for instance does not want the reader to consider the dampness of a rose, nor its short life. (Brewton and others, pages 170-171).

14a Other sources can be cited to demonstrate this point. The simile compares two things which have one similar quality, but otherwise are different. The one likeness or similarity between the events of Acts 2 and those of Acts 10 is the coming of the gift of the Holy Spirit (powers) directly from heaven and not through the imposition of an apostles’ hands.

15a The reception of powers directly from heaven “reminded” Peter of the events of Acts 2. The Greek word translated *remembered* in Acts 11:16 means “to be reminded.” (Thayer, page 415, Bagster, page 270) Both of the lexicons give the first definition of this word as “remind.” Vine states that this word means “to remind when used in the active voice.” (page 995) Note that this Greek word is deponent and; therefore, is always to be translated as the active voice.

16a Brother Rogers and I agree that the events of Acts 2 and Acts 10 happened in the “last days.” But the events of Acts 8 were also in the “last days.” Since Acts 8 is called a “falling of the Holy Spirit” was it a baptism of the Holy Spirit? Since the events of Acts 8 were referred to as a “falling” and they were in the proper time sphere they should have been a baptism in the Holy Spirit, according to Rogers.

17a The Methodists will rejoice to learn that baptism has another mode (pouring). Rogers says: “... the word ‘pour’ was used here to describe the baptism of the Holy Spirit ...” (paragraph 12). I cannot agree that the word “pour” makes these events (Acts 2 and Acts 10) the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Besides the word “pour” is used in Titus 3:5-6, does this refer to the baptism in the Holy Spirit?

18a There have been four basic purposes of miracles: (1) Creation (Genesis 1:1), (2) Incarnation (Isaiah 7:14), (3) Inspiration (II Peter 1:19-21), and (4) Confirmation (Mark 16:20). The events of Acts 2 were for the purpose of confirmation and revelation whereas Acts 10 was only for the purpose of confirmation. How can one say these are equal when they had different purposes?

19a The results of the events of Acts 2 and Acts 10 also reveal that

they are not the same. In Acts 2 the recipients were given apostolic powers whereas in Acts 10 tongue speaking was the only result, how can these be the same?

20a Brother Rogers seems to say that the tongue speaking of Acts 2 and Acts 10 is what made these two events the baptism in the Holy Spirit. I am nearly certain that he does not teach this because he knows that many others spoke in tongues (e.g. Acts 19:1-7 etc.). Brother Rogers, please explain what was unique about the events of Acts 10 and made it a baptism in the Holy Spirit?

21a I have several questions which if Brother Rogers will answer will make manifest the truth on this matter.

- 1-Was the Holy Spirit baptism equal to the coming of the Comforter?
- 2-What passage promises the Holy Spirit baptism to Gentiles?
- 3-Were Jewish daughters the recipients of the promise of Joel 2:28-32?
- 4-Did the Holy Spirit baptism in Acts 2 confer apostolic powers upon the twelve?
- 5-What powers were given to Cornelius in Acts 10?
- 6-Do you believe in the “law of exclusion”?
- 7-Did Cornelius only receive the gift of tongues or did he receive all the gifts the apostles received in Acts 2?
- 8-To whom does the pronoun “we” refer in Acts 10:47?
- 9-If the word “baptize” in Acts 1:4-5 was equal to pouring, why can’t the word “baptize” in Acts 2:38 be equal to pouring?
- 10-Was Matthias present when the promise of Acts 1:4-5 was made?
- 11-If you answered “no” to question #10 was it necessary to be present when Jesus made this promise to be a recipient of it?
- 12-Was the promise of Acts 1:4-5 an exclusive promise (Does the

law of exclusion apply?)

#### REFERENCES

Bagster (No date). *The analytical Greek lexicon*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House.

Thayer, Joseph (1970). *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House.

*The new Webster encyclopedic dictionary of the English language (Vols. I & II)*. New York: Grolier Inc.

Vine, W. E. (No date). *Vine's expository dictionary of New Testament words*. McLean VA: Macdonald Pub. Co.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE- Reg Rogers

20 Marion, you affirm that you “personally teach that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was only for the apostles, including Paul”. Then you say you disagree with “my doctrine”. Fox, I have no doctrine save book, chapter and verse in Scripture! Disagree with it if you choose, and personally teach that Paul was baptized in the Spirit, pure fiction. If you prefer that to the oracles of God, someone or something will say to you, “Be my guest”. Fox: “Baptism in the Spirit was for the apostles only”. God: “All flesh”, (Joel 2:28; Acts 10:44, 11:15).

21 Marion, this is a good place to refute your “simile” fiasco. The Bible abounds with similes, but you went to Burns for one; hear the word of the Lord, (Song of Solomon 4:1), “Thine eyes are as doves behind thy veil. Thy hair is as a flock of goats”. You make these and all other similes, figures, parallel to Acts 11:15, as a refutation of Gentile immersion in the Spirit. Peter declared, “And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, (the Gentiles), even as on us at the beginning”. Fox, you wrote, “The simile compares two things which have one similarity, but are otherwise different”. Well! Hear the word of the Lord: “For AS the Father hath life in himself, even SO gave he to the Son to have life in himself” (John 5:26). Fox, the consequence of your wild assertion about “AS”), in Acts 11:15, is, that Christ and the Father have one similarity but are otherwise different. Actually, Fox, the truth is, that Christ is to God, “the very image of his substance” (Heb. 1:3). Marion, I am ashamed for you! The “as” in John 5:26, is the same word in Acts 11:15, translated “as”, (ὡσπερ).

22 Marion, you chided me for appealing to tradition to prove my point. You jest. When I cited history as to the recent appearance of

your novel notion about the Gentiles missing out on what was promised to them, the baptism in the Holy Spirit, I did a thing powerful to point up the weakness and unprofitableness of a thing invented since the finishing of the New Testament. This is frequently and effectively done in discussions, e. g., “The melodeon was introduced into the public worship in Midway, Kentucky, in 1854”.

23 Marion, you imagine I am begging the question; sir, you don't appear to know what this is! Your first speech abounds in that of which you accuse me; I'll show you where, from time to time!

24 You affirm that I “failed to use sound principles of Bible interpretation”, in dealing with Acts 1:4,5; 11:15, 16. Actually, I quoted and applied them without interpretation; Fox, it's the text that's gnawing on you. I showed by Acts 10:44-48; 11:15, 16, that in them we learn for the first time, that when the apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit, it fell on them AS. As how? Well, AS on the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius. In fact, we are indebted to Acts 10:44-48; 11:15-18 for most of what we know about the reality of baptism in the Holy Spirit!

25 M., you talk of my failing to apply a principle of Bible interpretation, stated the principle, then applied it to another matter! In fact, you pitched in and made some rules of your own about the “falling” of the Holy Spirit; you said bro. R. said “the falling of the Spirit was an immersion in the Spirit”. I said no such thing; now let me quote me faithfully; “THIS falling of the Holy Spirit was an immersion in the Holy Spirit”, : the falling of the Spirit referred to is that described in Acts 11:15, 16, was a falling of the Spirit on the Gentiles, AS. AS, Marion, “on us (Jews) at the beginning”. You cited other passages where the Spirit “fell”; but what you overlooked, was, that the Spirit “fell” in at least two ways: AS he

fell on the Gentiles and Jews in fulfillment of a promise, and AS he fell upon those upon whom apostolic hands were laid! The expression in Acts 11:15 is used nowhere else; your apology is accepted.

26 Marion, your syllogism on page 2 sets a world record on question begging! Hear the truth!

Your major: “Those upon whom the Holy Spirit fell are those who were baptized in the Holy Spirit”, a misquotation of me.

My major, and affirmation in my first speech: Those upon whom the Holy Spirit fell, (AS UPON THE APOSTLES AT THE BEGINNING), are those who were baptized in the Holy Spirit”.

My minor: (sans begging the question), Those in Acts 8 ARE NOT THOSE UPON WHOM THE SPIRIT FELL AS ON THE APOSTLES AT THE BEGINNING.

Your erroneous conclusion: “Those of Acts 8 are those who were baptized in the Holy Spirit”.

My conclusion, in truth: Those of Acts 8 are therefore not those who were baptized in the Holy Spirit. You’re welcome.

27 No, Marion, I don’t “seem to say that speaking in tongues constituted an immersion in the Spirit on Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius”. Marion, when I say something, it won’t “seem” like I’m saying it, I’ll be saying it emphatically!

28 Marion, you appealed to the Greek to make affirmations that reflect upon the excellence of our English translations. I had it in mind not to smatter at all in the Greek in this discussion; but since you made an affirmative argument there I shall certainly reply. So, you would translate Acts 11:16, “And I was REMINDED of the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit”. Your assertion that “The

reception of powers directly from heaven ‘reminded’ Peter of the events of Acts 2”, is completely false---let Peter tell us what he remembered when he beheld what happened to the Gentiles in Acts 10; he said he remembered THE WORD OF THE LORD; you said THE EVENTS OF ACTS 2. Who is right? You said that the events of Acts 10, reminded Peter of the events of Acts 2; Peter said, the word of the Lord in Acts 1. Who is right?

29 Marion, your objection to the “all flesh” argument, is, hear you, “Joel’s prophecy included the baptism in the Holy Spirit but was not exclusively the baptism in the Holy Spirit”. Ye got it, M.! Now, remember what you said, and thus you’ll be “reminded” that the prophesying of the Jewish daughters did not mean they were baptized in the Holy Spirit. Joel didn’t say that the daughters would receive the baptism of the Spirit, but that they would prophesy.

30 Marion, you are mysterious in some ways, re, “pour”; you wonder if Methodists will rejoice that baptism has another mode. You agreed in your first speech that “baptism”, in this proposition, is used figuratively, paragraph one. And, if you will grant that Acts 2:1-4 describes the baptism in the Holy Spirit, you get nigh to, or arrive at altogether an immersion, for, “it filled all the house where they were sitting”. As the late, and lamented L. R. Wilson once said, “I have no objection to pouring for baptism, as long as you pour on enough to bury them”.

31 Brother Fox, in your paragraph 20, you lump everything together in Acts 2, then accuse me that I “say these are equal”, with one thing in acts 10. Your inability to, or refusal to recognize that immersion in the Spirit was one thing, in Acts 2, and, that the apostles received something in addition to it, contributes to the confusion in your mind over the differences between Acts 2 and Acts 10 and 11. Your

negation continues, “Results of ... Acts 2 and Acts 10 are not the same”. Who said they were? Your statement, “in Acts 2 ... recipients (of baptism in the Holy Spirit), were given apostolic powers”, should have read, “in Acts 2, recipients of baptism in the Holy Spirit were ALSO, that day, given apostolic powers”.

32 Marion, you requested me to “explain what was unique about the events of Acts 10 that made it a baptism in the Holy Spirit?”. Please rephrase this; made what “a baptism in the Holy Spirit?”.

33 Your questions, paragraph 21, the answers, “which will make manifest the truth on this matter”, M. Fox; are you ready? No. 1, No. No. 2, Joel 2:28. No. 3, You said “promise”, several are made in Joel; specify. No. 4, No. No. 5, Your question implies a plurality of powers, please be specific. No. 6, If you mean, like “gopher wood”, Genesis 6:14, yes. No. 7, This question is too vague; no, to “apostolic powers”. No. 8, Jews. No. 9, You agreed that “baptize” in this proposition is figurative. No. 10, The text doesn’t say; see Acts 1:21. If it weren’t necessary for Cornelius to be present when the promise was made to receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit, it certainly wasn’t necessary for Matthias, (Acts 11:16); John promised his hearers that Christ would baptize them in fire, but some will get it that didn’t hear John say it, (Revelation 21:8). No. 11, Which promise? Two are mentioned. No. 12, Again, you must specify as to which promise.

34 I started out to take the Scriptures, and to set forth, in the most emphatic, graphic and clear way and manner the exact truth on (about) the baptism in the Holy Spirit of both Jews and Gentiles; the fact thereof, the times thereof and the results. This I have done to my complete satisfaction. Moreover, having received the negative’s first reply, I have answered every objection to my affirmations with the

greatest possible degree of self-satisfaction. I therefore thank and glorify the name of God.

35 My syllogizing on page five was ignored by the respondent, therefore I restate it; first, The falling of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles at the beginning constituted a baptism in the Holy Spirit, (Acts 1:5; 11:15). Second, Any falling of the Holy Spirit upon anyone, as it fell upon the apostles, constitutes an immersion in the Holy Spirit. Third, (conclusion), Upon the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, the Holy Spirit fell AS on the apostles at the beginning, (Acts 11:15), therefore, The Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius were baptized in the Holy Spirit.

## SECOND NEGATIVE - Marion R. Fox

22a In reply to paragraph 21 I quoted from an English book to explain the figure of speech known as a simile. Rogers quoted Song of Solomon 4:1 which fits the definition I set forth in paragraph 13a. There is only one likeness between the eyes and doves and the hair and flock of goats under consideration in this passage. The first illustration fits my definition not that of Rogers. His second passage (John 5:26) also harmonizes with the definition of a simile that I am using (paragraph 13a). John 5:26 is comparing only one aspect of Jesus and the Father in the context. Rogers is really saying that the word “as” (Acts 11:15) means “equal to” just like in John 5:26. This forces Cornelius to be equal to the apostles in every sense because of the parallel to the Father and Son (John 5:26). Were the apostles equal to Cornelius’ household in every sense?

23a In reply to paragraph 22 I respond by reducing your argument to a syllogism:

Major Premise: All those whose teachings have appeared since the close of the New Testament are those whose teachings are false.

Minor Premise: Those teaching that the Holy Spirit baptism was only for the apostles are those whose teachings have appeared since the close of the New Testament.

Conclusion: Those teaching that the Holy Spirit baptism was only for the apostles are those whose teachings are false.

It is apparent that you have “begged the question” again. The minor premise is the point in question in this debate. Again I quote Brewton and others (cf. paragraph 13a): “When a person assumes in a statement what he is trying to prove, he is begging the question...” (page 79) It is not my intention to embarrass you brother Rogers but you have not constructed a single syllogism properly. Those things

you call syllogisms (paragraphs 15, 26 and 35) are not properly constructed (valid). They prove nothing! Please obtain a logic book and determine how to make a valid syllogism.

24a If one knows how to construct a syllogism and his opponents minor premise and conclusion he can reconstruct the major premise the opponent used. This is why I know that Rogers is constantly “begging the question.” The following is a proof of this point:

Major Premise: All passages of Scripture which relate to the Holy Spirit baptism are passages of Scripture which teach that the Gentiles received the Holy Spirit baptism.

Minor Premise: Acts 11:15-17 is a passage of Scripture which relates to the Holy Spirit baptism.

Conclusion: Acts 11:15-17 is a passage of Scripture which teaches that the Gentiles received the Holy Spirit baptism.

It is evident that the major premise is the point in question in this debate and, therefore, Rogers is “begging the question” in many of the prior paragraphs (paragraphs 1, 2, 4, etc.).

25a As far as my teaching a new doctrine (paragraphs 1, 3, 4, and 22) I could accuse Brother Rogers of teaching a new doctrine. I can document, from brotherhood writings, that well-known preachers preached what I preach on this issue in the last century. This is nothing more than an appeal to tradition anyhow (paragraph 3a). I have not heard very many brethren deny that the apostle Paul received the Holy Spirit baptism or that the Holy Spirit baptism gave apostolic power to the apostles. The major premise of Rogers’ argument (cf. paragraph 23a) is also used by the non-Bible class brethren to try to prove that Bible classes are sinful. Is it really sound?

26a Brother Rogers observed the passover in passing over my

argument from Acts 1:4-5 etc. (paragraph 24). He has not dealt with my arguments set forth in paragraph 8a. Please deal with these arguments.

27a Please prove that the Holy Spirit fell in two different ways (paragraph 25). Your whole case falls if you cannot prove this point, and you cannot prove it! If the pouring (paragraphs 12 and 30) is equal to the Holy Spirit baptism and the falling (paragraphs 8, 12, 14, and 25) is equal to the Holy Spirit baptism then: The pouring must be equal to the falling (law of identity).

28a In response to paragraph 28 Peter does not separate the words of Acts 1:4-5 from their fulfillment in Acts 2. You are surely aware of this. The first definition is the most frequently used definition of a word (paragraph 17a).

29a I respond to paragraph 29 by asking if the gift of apostleship was part of the fulfillment of Joel 2. Were the events of Acts 8:14-20 (the receiving the Holy Spirit) part of Joel 2? Rogers cannot answer these questions without placing himself into a dilemma. The expression “all flesh” (Acts 2:17) is followed by a colon which introduces a list of examples explaining the expression “all flesh.” This proves that “all flesh” includes: (1) sons, (2) daughters, (3) young men, (4) old men, (5) servants, and (6) handmaidens. Since this was written to Jews and spoken to Jews (Acts 2) it includes Jewish daughters (paragraphs 8a, 11a, and 29). I know that the Jewish daughters did not receive the Holy Spirit baptism but your reasoning implies that they received it. The daughters had the Holy Spirit poured upon them (Joel 2) as did the Samaritans (Acts 1:4-9 and 8:4-24) as I set forth in paragraph 9a. Notice your fallacy: The Holy Spirit baptism was the pouring of Joel 2 (paragraph 12) and Joel 2 included Jewish daughters (paragraph 29), but the Holy Spirit

baptism did not entail apostolic powers (paragraph 31). But the only way the Jewish daughters received gifts was by the laying on of the hands of an apostle (i.e. apostolic powers). Therefore the Holy Spirit baptism was not for “all flesh” (no Jewish daughters). You contradict yourself!

30a My agreement that the word “baptize” is used figuratively does not necessarily mean that I agree with you (paragraph 30). Brother Wilson is in error (paragraph 30). Pouring can never equal baptism, you can not get out of this. Besides, that which was poured forth (shed forth KJV-Acts 2:33) was seen and heard and since no man has beheld God (I John 4:12), the Holy Spirit was not poured forth. This is obviously a metonymy (a figure of speech) where the cause (the Holy Spirit) is put for the effect (power to work miracles). Paragraph 17a still stands. What figure of speech is this brother Rogers?

31a In response to paragraph 31 I ask when did they receive apostolic powers (a miraculous gift)? Did they receive it as a result of the outpouring of Joel 2? Did they receive apostolic power before Acts 2? Was the baptism in the Holy Spirit the first gift given in the church?

32a Brother Rogers: You didn't answer paragraph 20a (paragraph 32). The readers know that you are evading the issue. What made the falling of the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:44) a baptism of the Holy Spirit? This is the heart of the matter I still do not know what you teach is entailed in the Holy Spirit baptism. You have evaded my questions (paragraph 21a). Note your evasion of questions: 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 12. I have given this material to several gospel preachers and they cannot determine what you are saying is entailed in the Holy Spirit baptism.

33a The reason brother Rogers will not answer my questions is evident when one looks logically at his position: (1) He cannot say the tongue speaking was unique (cf. paragraphs 20a, 27, and 37a). (2) He cannot say that the direct impartation of the Holy Spirit (falling) was unique because of the Samaritans (paragraph 9a). (3) He cannot say the pouring was unique because of Titus 3:6 (paragraph 17a). (4) He cannot say the impartation of miraculous powers directly from God, without the laying on of the apostles' hands, was unique because Paul received the gift of apostleship without the laying on of hands (Galatians 1:1, 19, etc.).

34a Brother Rogers please list the promises of Joel 2 and tell the reader which one or ones apply to the Jewish daughters (paragraphs 21a and 33). What power or powers did Cornelius receive as a result of the Holy Spirit baptism in Acts 10? My questions #5 and #7 need to be answered (paragraph 21a). The figurative usage of "baptize" does not change the meaning of the word (paragraphs 21a and 33). Please list the promises of Acts 1:4-5 (paragraphs 21a and 33)?

35a The Lord made a distinction between Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles (Matthew 10:5-6 and Acts 1:4-9). Does Joel's promise of the pouring of the Holy Spirit include Samaritans?

36a I want to list the assumptions brother Rogers makes which I deny. (1) The words "as on us" (Acts 11:15-16) refer only to the apostles. (2) All flesh means Jews and Gentiles. (3) Pouring equals baptism. (4) Falling equals a baptism. (5) There are at least two kinds of pouring of the Holy Spirit. (6) There are at least two kinds of falling of the Holy Spirit. (7) The Holy Spirit baptism did not entail apostolic power. (8) Jesus made a plurality of promises in Acts 1:4-5. (9) The expression "us who believed" (Acts 11:17-paragraph

8) refers to the apostles. (10) There exists some figure of speech that changes the meaning of the word “immerse” to “pour.” (11) The “like gift” was the invitation into the new covenant (paragraph 8). Notice your equivocation when in paragraph 8 you say the gift is the invitation and in paragraph 9 you say: “... were all filled ... (paragraphs 9 and 12).” You give away your point when you called these two gifts “similar” (paragraph 9). Since you are in the affirmative you are obligated to prove these points. I do not have to answer your assertions in these 11 matters, only your arguments.

37a The reader should be aware of why it seemed to me that brother Rogers was saying that tongue speaking was evidence of the Holy Spirit baptism (paragraphs 20a and 27). In paragraph 12 Rogers says: “The word ‘pour’ was used to describe the baptism in the Holy Spirit ...” which he equates to the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:45-46). But Luke, by inspiration, explains why they knew the Gentiles had received the gift (Rogers says Holy Spirit baptism). “**For they heard them speak in tongues** ... (Acts 10:46).” The Greek word translated “For” γαρ (Acts 10:46) expresses a reason or explanation (Dana and Mantey, page 242). Rogers would have to paraphrase this: “*The reason they knew the Gentiles received the Holy Spirit baptism was because they heard them speak with tongues.*”

38a I have additional objections to make but will wait until my next negative article. Rogers is long on assertions and short on proofs. The reader should note that he is not answering my questions.

#### REFERENCES

Brewton, John; Peterson, R. S.; Kinnick, B. J.; McMullan, Lois. (1962). *Using good English*. River Forest, IL: Laidlaw Brothers,

Pub.

Dana, H. E., Mantey Julius R. (1955). *A manual grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Toronto, Ontario: The Macmillan Co.

### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE- Reg Rogers

36 We started out to prove by the Scriptures that both Jews and Gentiles were immersed in the Holy Spirit in fulfillment of prophecy and according to the announcement of John. To accomplish this we quoted Joel 2:28a where the Lord said, “And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh”; also, Matthew 3:11; Acts 1:5 and 11:16. Now brother Fox is even denying that there was any Spirit at all, even on Pentecost! In his reply at 30a he declares, “The Holy Spirit was not poured forth.” You gasp? Peter, on Pentecost, quoted Joel thus, “But this is that which hath been spoken through the prophet Joel, ‘And it shall be in the last days, saith God, I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh’”, (Acts 2:16, 17ab). Peter, explaining something that happened on Pentecost, said, “This is that”, (Acts 2:16). Fox says “that the Holy Spirit was not poured forth.” Any doctrine that implies a contradiction is a false doctrine.

37 Fox, to justify his “Spiritless” baptism in the “Spirit” said it was “metonymy, (a figure of speech)”, Ibid. Fox takes the baptism in the Holy Ghost away from the Gentiles with a simile, then takes it away from the Jews with metonymy, 30a. As for his “simile”, (Acts 11:15, 16), “And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit”. We must conclude, therefore, that Fox hasn’t the foggiest as to what a simile is; note his 22a. The “AS” in Acts 11:15 is the same “AS”, as in John 5:26; see my second affirmative at 20 and 21. Yes, Marion, the baptism in the Spirit upon the Gentiles was exactly as it was upon the Jews at Pentecost; yea, exactly “as” the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son to have life in himself”. You didn’t check this out until after you made your wild

assertion about Acts 11:15.

38 Fox, we cited the late appearance of the doctrine that says, “Holy Spirit baptism was only for the apostles”; you place it in a syllogism that reads, 23a, “Those teaching that the Holy Spirit baptism was only for the apostles are those whose teachings are false”. I believe you are right, Marion. I don’t know precisely when doctrines of nuns and novenas started; but I do know that they started too late to be in the Inspired Text. You want me to get a book on logic; physician, heal thyself. Fox imagines that I am begging the question; he is unaware as to what that means, else he carps about it because he can’t deal with my answers,. We have met, head-on every quibble, all sophistry and every false notion he holds!

39 Now, re your amazing assertion that because God is invisible, the Holy Spirit himself is therefore invisible, he was not poured out on Pentecost, only in figure,. (metonymy), where cause (the Holy Spirit) is put for effect, well! Since the Son is God as well as the Father and the Spirit, (John 1:1), He is equally invisible; the implication is that he didn’t really come; he just sent a baby to the manger to grow up and go to the cross while he sat in the heavens! Marion, if I weren’t restrained, I’d think you mad. Any doctrine that implies a contradiction is a false doctrine. We set forth in our second, (29), that Joel prophesied that the Spirit would be poured out on all flesh. Now Marion is denying that Gentiles are any part of “all flesh”. Any doctrine that implies a contradiction is a false doctrine! Are Gentiles included in “all flesh”? Well, if they aren’t, they can’t be saved, for Isaiah, speaking of the ministry of John, said (Luke 3:6), “All flesh shall see the salvation of God”. Marion, your ways are not equal. He thinks that because Jesus forbade his disciples to go to the Samaritans and Gentiles, during his personal ministry, only to the house of Israel, that Samaritans are a third

division of flesh, not sharing the privileges of either Jews or Gentiles. Any doctrine that implies a contradiction is a false doctrine! The Samaritans, implicitly, because they were part Jew, received the gospel before the Gentiles, (Acts 1:8, 8:1-25). So, then, as to privilege, God considered the Samaritans, Jews; for it was “to the Jew first, and also to the Greek”, (Romans 1:16).

40 Marion thinks pouring can't constitute baptism, regardless of how much pouring is done, 30a. Can immersion result from pouring? Oh yes. A young couple were camping out on volcanic Mt. St. Helens, in Washington, last Sunday, (April 18, 1980), when the mountain erupted; they were immersed in volcanic ash, several feet deep; they dug their way to the surface and lived. The volcano, after over a hundred years of dormancy, poured forth a billion tons of volcanic ash. Marion, where do you keep your wits? Remember that Marion said, (30a), “the Holy Spirit was not poured forth”. A news reporter at Mt. St. Helens used the very word “baptized” in connection with the tragedy---a literate lad he was! Implicit in Marion's teaching that the Holy Spirit was not poured forth because He is invisible, therefore couldn't be poured forth is a little like saying that the wind is invisible, therefore the wind cannot blow that we may behold its power to bend the trees and to hear its voice as it rakes the earth!

41 Again to Acts 11:16; when Peter witnessed the fulfillment of the promise of immersion in the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles, he said, “And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit”. Marion says (17a) his answer still stands. Why Marion, it was never on its feet! You said that the “reception of powers directly from heaven ‘reminded’ Peter of the events of Acts 2”. I corrected you on this and you did not repent of your perversion of the text! So, that's what Fox said, but Peter said something else; he said, “As I began to

speaking, the Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning”. You said, “The reception of powers directly from heaven” where did you learn not to speak as the oracles of God? But this is the crime here; you have Peter “reminded” of the events of Acts 2; but Peter said, “I remembered the word of the Lord”, then quotes Acts 1. Who is right? Did you or Peter, speak by inspiration?

42 We taught the fact that the Spirit was poured out and fell upon the Gentiles as on the apostles at Pentecost. Marion disputes that the “falling” of the Spirit can constitute “baptism” as it fell on Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius. Well, it did. When the Spirit “fell” on the Gentiles, Peter remembered the word of the Lord that said “baptized”, (Acts 11:16). Marion wants to know again if the Spirit can fall in more ways than one? We told him and he would not hear; see my #25. On Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius the Spirit “fell” in a measure to constitute immersion, (Acts 11:15, 16); when the Spirit “fell” upon them upon whom hands were laid, nowhere is it said in Scripture that it so fell as to constitute immersion therein.

43 Immersion in the Holy Spirit of the apostles on Pentecost, preceded their receiving the promise of the Father which they had heard from Christ; they had heard of the baptism of the Holy Spirit before they heard of the promise of the Father from Jesus, (Joel 2:28 and implicitly, Matthew 3:11). The promise of the immersion in Spirit came before, or at least in distinction from the promise of the Father; see Acts 2:1-13. No, Marion, immersion in the Spirit was not a “church gift”, (Acts 10:44-47). Are you listening?

44 So I didn’t answer your 20a? It is vague and unanswerable. You assert events of Acts 2 were for the purpose of, (do you mean purposes?) confirmation and revelation. Do you imply that the immersion of the apostles and their receiving the promise of John

16:13 are one and the same thing? I'm evading the issue? Marion, it isn't clear in your mind what the issue is. Right there you asked, "what made the falling of the ... Spirit, (Acts 10:44), a baptism of the Holy Spirit?" Answer: not "what" but whom?---God! You say I have evaded your questions. Tell the readers what I said in response to every question you asked! You misrepresent me, why? for instance, #3, "Were Jewish daughters the recipients of the promise of Joel 2:28-32? You said promise, singular---several promises were made in the passage---be specific". Did you specify? No. Who evades? The "Jewish daughters", were not promised "visions" and "dreams". Also, I treated on "daughters" in my (29) and you ignored it. Why? Marion, another example of your deviation, in the matter of your questions, #5. "What powers were given to Cornelius in Acts 10?"; there is no occasion for a question on this matter again. I treated on it thoroughly in my first affirmative, paragraph 9; you thoroughly ignored it; please read it, perhaps for the first time. You think I'm the evader when you are it; you hallucinate!

45 Marion thinks that the pouring out of the Spirit cannot be unique, (very rare), because of Titus 3:5, 6. The implication here is that the pouring out of the Spirit, as it, He was poured out upon all flesh at the beginning and on the Gentiles, (Acts 2, 10), was a common experience then and all experience the same thing, now. Any doctrine that implies a contradiction is a false doctrine. In Titus 3:5,6, a "renewing of the Holy Spirit" is spoken of. This renewing is of the Holy Spirit, the renewing was to be poured out, not the Spirit. It is written again in Acts 2:38; "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit". Not the Spirit as a gift, but the gift that the Spirit has to offer! That was tough.

46 Fox excuses himself from the debate by calling our arguments "assertions" and lists eleven, (36a), #1. I "assumed" that "us" in

Acts 11:15 was anteceded by “apostles”. No I didn’t Marion; no! You yourself said earlier, that Joel 2:28 included the baptism in the Holy Spirit; the beginning had to be Pentecost, and none of the apostles were known to have been at the house of Cornelius, save Peter. When God poured out the Spirit on Pentecost, it didn’t go up, it fell; you yourself ruled out the one hundred twenty; so there was no one left for it to fall upon but the apostles! Now for #2 It is axiomatic, Fox, that “Jews and Gentiles” are the sum total of “all flesh”. #3. “Pouring equals baptism”. All pouring? Who said that? It is also axiomatic that if the pouring is sufficient to burial that it fits the figure of immersion; and you confessed and denied not that in the proposition under discussion, that “baptism” is figurative! Remember? God poured the Spirit upon all flesh, Joel 2:28; Acts 2:16, 17; when God “poured” the spirit, the Spirit “fell”, (Acts 11:15); when that took place, Peter remembered “baptize”, (Acts 11:16). Peter remembered baptize, Marion wants to forget it. M., you call my arguments “assertions” and pout; but the readers will not understand you. #4. “Falling equals baptism”. Who said that? See my answer to your #3. #5. “There are at least two kinds of pouring of the Holy Spirit”. Did I say that? Where? #6. “There are at least two kinds of falling of the Holy Spirit”. I believe that is implied; see my 25 and 26; you ignored it once; what assurance do we have that you won’t ignore it again? #7. “The Holy Spirit baptism did not entail apostolic power; certainly not; but I am in the affirmative; let those who say it did prove it. #8. “Jesus made a plurality of promises in Acts 1:4, 5”. Ready now, Marion, and count: one, “the promise of the Father”, verse 4; count two, the fulfillment of John’s prophecy that Jesus would immerse in the Holy Spirit. Did you get them, Marion? Count again, one, two! #9. You missed the point here; read it: the gift of salvation was to all the Jews present on Pentecost; you misrepresented me. #10. Fox places words in my mouth; (his words are easier for him to answer): “There exists some figure of speech

that changes the meaning of a word from 'immerse' to 'pour'". Marion, again, we agreed at the outset that "baptize" in the proposition was figurative; God said, "pour", (Joel 2:28), and God called it "baptize", (Acts 11:16; Acts 1:5). Actually, your controversy is with the Lord. #11. "The 'like gift' was the invitation into the new covenant". Wasn't it? It can't be denied! (Acts 2:38b, 39), "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, for the promise is unto you and to your children and to ALL THAT ARE AFAR OFF". And, "God gave them, (Gentiles), the like gift as he did also unto us". Marion, you think I give my point away when I called the "two gifts similar"; not two gifts, Marion, there is one gift here. The gift has to be received before it is possessed; the Gentiles, after the immersion in the Spirit, had the gift in prospect and promise just as the Jews did on Pentecost; the Jews received it to possess upon repentance and immersion in water, for the remission of sins, (Acts 2:38); exactly so with the Gentiles, (Acts 11:17; 10:48). Face it, man, don't call these truths assertions!

47 Marion, in your (37a) you misquote my paragraph 27: Why? Also, in your (37a), you credit me with inspiration: but it was Joel and Peter that taught that the "pour" in Joel 2:28 and Acts 2:16, 17; and Acts 11:15,16, described the baptism in the Holy Ghost. I appreciate the flattery, but let the glory remain with those who said it first. Finally, Marion, you continue your misrepresentation in (37a); you left off, "and magnify God"; not just "speak in tongues". Men can speak in tongues on their own without a trace of influence from the Holy Spirit; uncle Ricardo speaks seven languages; he learned them all, trading with foreigners. "Rogers would have to paraphrase this: The reason they knew the Gentiles received the Holy Spirit baptism was because they heard them speak with tongues". Again, you failed to quote, as I do, "and magnify God". So, I didn't paraphrase---you have to tamper with the text; the text

teaches my doctrine. It isn't stated that "they" knew that the Gentiles were immersed in the Spirit, Peter knew it and they depended upon him for their information. Peter said "I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit", (Acts 11:16). "They" were witnesses to the fact that the Gentiles spoke in languages strange to them and MAGNIFIED GOD; then "they" backed Peter when he testified to the apostles and brethren which were in Judea, (Acts 11:1-19). "They" knew that whatever claim Peter made for the house of Cornelius was the exact truth, for they had seen and heard the effects of the falling of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles; hear Peter, one more time, "And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning", (Acts 11:15). The promise of the Lord by Joel to pour out His Spirit upon all flesh was fulfilled and accomplished; there has not been an instance of immersion in the Spirit

### THIRD NEGATIVE-Marion R. Fox

39a Brother Rogers misunderstood me when he said that I am “denying that there was any Holy Spirit...” (Paragraphs 36, 37, 39, and 40) I deny a literal pouring of the Holy Spirit. There are three reasons for this denial: (1) It is absurd to have a literal pouring of a person. (2) The argument I made in paragraph 30a which I will expand here:

Major Premise: All persons who are seen are persons who are beheld (evident truth).

Minor Premise: The Holy Spirit is a person who was seen (Roger’s interpretation of Acts 2:33).

Conclusion: The Holy Spirit is a person who was beheld (false-I John 4:12 and John 1:18).

Brother Rogers objects to this by appealing to the visible nature of Christ while He was in the flesh. This is unsound because we aren’t speaking about Jesus but the Holy Spirit. Can anyone see or has anyone seen the Holy Spirit? No! No human has seen the Spirit of Jesus Christ, though they did see His fleshly tabernacle. (3) The last argument will be based upon the Greek grammar. The grammar shows that the Holy Spirit was the origin of what was poured forth. Since the word translated **Spirit** πνεύματος is in the ablative case the preposition απο **apo** (from) is used. The ablative case is the case of the origin or source. It must be noted that the ablative case forces the usage of the preposition απο. This πνεύματος would be in the ablative case without the preposition απο, but one would not be able to prove such. The translators did not even translate this word. They translated this as the genitive case rather than ablative case, which was a mistranslation of this passage. This passage literally translated should read: “ ... I will pour forth from my Spirit...” (Acts 2:17) A true parallel to the wind (paragraph 40) would be: Since the wind is invisible when one sees the tree leaves moving and hears them rustle

he is not seeing the wind. Brother Rogers says that the pouring equals the baptism (paragraph 12) and the baptism is figurative (paragraph 6). If these are true it follows that the pouring is figurative. What figure is it if not metonymy? Brother Rogers implies that to deny the literalness of the word “pour” is to deny the Holy Spirit (paragraph 36) but brother Rogers denies the literalness of the word “pour.” Hence the following demonstrates his error:

Major Premise: All those who deny the literalness of the word “pour” are those who deny that there is any Holy Spirit. (brother Rogers)

Minor Premise: Rogers is one of those who denies the literalness of the word “pour.”

Conclusion: Brother Rogers is one who denies that there is any Holy Spirit.

I must reject the authority of the news reporter (paragraph 40) as a valid source of the proper definition of the word “baptize.”

40a I understand brother Rogers to be saying that there are only two kinds of falling of the Holy Spirit (paragraphs 25, 26, 35, and 42). He seems to be saying that one falling of the Holy Spirit was by means of pouring (a direct impartation of the Holy Spirit without the imposition of the hands of an apostle). He also seems to be saying that the other falling of the Holy Spirit was by means of the laying on of the apostle’s hands. Since the first gift given was apostleship (I Corinthians 12:27-28 and Ephesians 4:8-12) it is in order to ask how this gift was imparted. Remember brother Rogers says that the pouring of the Holy Spirit was a baptism in the Holy Spirit so he cannot say this gift was imparted without the laying on of hands (poured out) without having the apostles baptized twice and saying that the Holy Spirit baptism gave the apostles apostolic powers. The following chart illustrates this argument:

First kind of falling } Holy Spirit baptism } Direct from heaven }	} ?-apostleship-? {	{ Second kind of falling } not a Holy Spirit baptism { Through laying on of hands
--	---------------------	--

41a In response to paragraph 38 I certainly agree that the major premise of paragraph 23a is true. I deny the truthfulness of the minor premise of paragraph 23a. Once more I will illustrate his circular reasoning (begging the question). Brother Rogers argues the minor premise of paragraph 23a, which I deny. He argues that this is new because it is false then argues that it is false because it is new. He has not proven that is a new doctrine and cannot do so. I have proven that the doctrine that Cornelius received the Holy Spirit baptism is a new doctrine and is therefore, false.

42a When we debate those who affirm that baptizing equals pouring we appeal to the definitions of the word “baptize.” Do we reflect upon the English text (paragraph 28) when we do this? The Greek is more accurate (exact) than the English. I freely acknowledge that the English text has weaknesses. The English versions frequently translate one Greek word several ways or they may translate several Greek words as one English word (e.g. the word “love” comes from two different Greek words).

43a Brother Rogers needs to look at the original in Titus 3:5. Brother Rogers says: “... the renewing was to be poured out, not the Spirit (paragraph 45).” The renewing was not poured out in Titus 3:5-6. The pronoun translated **which** (Titus 3:6) is a masculine or neuter pronoun, in the Greek. The word translated **renewing** is a feminine noun. Since “a pronoun agrees with its’ antecedent in gender and number” (Summers, page 43) the word **which** cannot refer to the word **renewing**. The grammar destroys his argument.

Since brother Rogers has already asserted that the Holy Spirit baptism equals the pouring of the Holy Spirit and that there is only one pouring of the Holy Spirit he must allow Paul, Titus, etc. to be baptized in the Holy Spirit. Brother Rogers is open to Pentecostal arguments. Brother Rogers has given away our one baptism argument from Ephesians 4 because Ephesians was written in AD 62 and Titus was written in AD 66 or AD 67. No interpretation is sound unless it can be substantiated by the grammar of the Greek and Hebrew. Because of this I am willing to stake my case upon the verbally inspired grammar. Incidentally Titus 3:5-6 is in the ablative case just like Acts 2:17 (cf. paragraph 39a).

44a In response to paragraph 22 I must add the following material: The frequent and effective appeal to tradition to prove a point does not make it a sound argument. The Roman Catholic Church frequently and effectively appeals to tradition. Their appeals are frequent because most of their false doctrines are supported by this broken reed. Their appeals to this are effective because they hold the loyalty of millions of people by these arguments.

45a Much of the case for brother Rogers' position is based upon the expression "all flesh" in Acts 2:16-21. Brother Rogers argues extensively from these words in paragraphs 12, 20, 29, 36, 39, and 46. I replied to his arguments in paragraphs 11a and 29a. The expression **all flesh** includes all racial, social, economic, and sexual distinctions. The apostle Paul is setting forth this same idea in Galatians 3:28. Under the Old Testament system most of those who possessed miraculous gifts were Jewish freemen. Under the New Testament the gifts were for all races, social groups, economic groups (slaves etc.), and both sexes. The reader should note that the pouring forth was "upon the servants and handmaidens" or lower class (Acts 2:18). Brother Rogers links his definition of **all flesh**

with Luke 3:6 (paragraph 39). This (Luke 3:6) is a quotation of Isaiah 40:5-8. James quotes this in James 1:9-11 and applies the expression **all flesh** to social-economic distinctions (rich-poor). This harmonizes with my definition of **all flesh**. The difficulty brother Rogers has with the Samaritans is evident. The premillennial teacher asserts that the words “Jew” and “Israelite” are not equal. Brother Rogers says that the Samaritans were Jews but Jesus said the apostles were to preach only to the house of Israel (Matt. 10:5-6). This implies that a Jew was not of the house of Israel. I deny this.

46a Brother Rogers still wants to equate pouring and baptism (paragraphs 40 and 46). Even when one pours enough to immerse the pouring does not equal the immersion. One could sprinkle enough to immerse and by this line of reasoning he should equate sprinkling to baptism. We ought not to confuse cause and effect. Brother Rogers can not prove that the Holy Spirit was poured upon Cornelius' household. The only time the word “pour” is used is in Acts 10:45 and brother Rogers has asserted that the gift was something other than the Holy Spirit baptism. Brother Rogers cannot link Acts 2 to Acts 10 by means of the word “pour” unless he equivocates on the word “gift.” He can say that the gift of Acts 10:45 is not the same as the gift of Acts 11:15-17 and escape this argument. If the gift of Acts 10:45 was not the Holy Spirit then the Holy Spirit was not poured out in Acts 10 and Acts 10 is not an instance of the Holy Spirit baptism. Remember, he says that there must be a literal pouring of the Spirit in order for it to be a Spirit baptism. If the word “pour” equals the word “baptize” because the word “baptize” is figurative then the word “pour” does not equal the word “baptize” when the word “baptize” is literal. I repeat an unanswered question: “What figure of speech changes the meaning of the word ‘pour’ to ‘immerse’?” I apologize for misrepresenting you on the topic of the gift (cf. paragraph 46 # 9). He goes on to say, by implication, that

one gift is similar to itself in paragraph 46 # 11. This does not harmonize with Webster's definition of the word "similar."

47a Brother Rogers stopped short of saying that the apostles were equal to the household of Cornelius in every sense (paragraphs 13a, 21, 22a, and 37). This is what his teaching on the meaning of the word "as" implies. If Cornelius was equal to the apostles in every sense, even those not mentioned in the immediate context as in John 5:26, the Holy Spirit baptism gave Cornelius apostolic powers. This follows because the 12 apostles received apostolic power in Acts 2. Brother Rogers goes outside the immediate context of John 5:26 to bring in ways in which the Father and Son are equal but won't do it in Acts 2 and Acts 10. Why not? Is this consistent?

48a Brother Rogers discusses my translation of the word in Acts 11:16 as "reminded" (paragraphs 17a, 28, 28a, 41, 42, and 46). The word "reminded" is a better translation for at least two reasons: (1) This is the first definition of the word and the first definition of the word is the most widely used definition (paragraph 17a). and (2) Because of the principle of hermeneutics I developed in paragraph 8a. This proves that the ones referred to in Acts 1:4-5 were the apostles and we must harmonize our interpretation of Acts 11:16 with the context of Acts 1:4-5. The only way to harmonize this is to take the first definition of this word (reminded).

49a There is only one promise in Acts 1:4-5 (paragraphs 24 and 46 #8). The ASV ends verse 4 with a colon and therefore, links the promise of verse 4 with its explanation in verse 5. The promise is equal to the Spirit baptism. The Greek word translated **for** ὅτι is a causal particle which introduces an explanation or explains the prior statement.

50a It seems like you are saying that if one had the Holy Spirit given by a direct means (pouring), without the imposition of the apostles' hands, and was thereby empowered to speak in tongues and magnify God he would have received the Holy Spirit baptism. Paul: (1) Magnified God (Philippians 1:20), (2) Received a pouring (Titus 3:5-6), (3) Spoke in tongues (I Corinthians 14:18), and (4) Did not have hands laid upon him (Galatians 1:1). Why didn't he receive the Holy Spirit baptism? I did not state that brother Rogers is inspired of God in paragraph 37a or any other paragraph. No man today is inspired of God. Did anyone besides the apostles and Cornelius' household speak in tongues and magnify God? If they did why didn't they receive the Holy Spirit baptism? Are the Pentecostals right when they state that there are two kinds of tongues: (1) Spirit baptism tongues in Acts 2 and (2) Gift of tongues (I Corinthians 14)? What was unique ("without a like or equal..." Webster) about the events of Acts 10 that made them a baptism in the Spirit? Brother Rogers is left with only the pouring, which he gave up (cf. paragraphs 43a and 46a). His affirmative has been disproven.

#### REFERENCES

Summers, Ray (1950). *Essentials of New Testament Greek*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.

*The new Webster encyclopedic dictionary of the English language (Vols. I & II)*. New York: Grolier Inc.

## FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE-Reg Rogers

48 This is the final affirmative in my attempt to set forth the exact truth on what the Scriptures teach relative to immersion in the Holy Spirit. As far as I know, this is the first debate on this subject. My respondent, it occurs to me, is as well qualified as anybody to deny; he is a teacher on the college level, a preacher and a debater of considerable experience; we therefore, I think, can be assured that the proposition has been reasonably tested and that conclusions can be drawn. After brother Fox replies to this paper, I have a brief space for summation.

49 Joel wrote, eight centuries before Christ, “And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your young men shall see visions”, (Joel 2:28). That lay in obscurity for nearly a thousand years to the Pentecost of this proposition, on which day, Peter, by the inspiration of the Spirit, declared, by way of explaining marvelous things seen and heard in Jerusalem, “This is that which hath been spoken through the prophet Joel: And it shall be in the last days, saith God, I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams.” (Acts 2:17). The apostles, on that occasion, with tongues, like as of fire that sat upon each of them, “spake with other tongues”, that is, in the languages of the multitude there, out of every nation under heaven. Those present from all the nations knew that for the apostles to be able to thus speak in flawless diction in unlearned tongues, things that natural men could not know without the direct operation of the Spirit, they would have to be and indeed were speaking as if it were God himself, and therefore they would have to acknowledge their obligation to hear them out and to obey whatever commandments

they should lay upon them.

50 Nearly a decade after this Pentecost when the Jews were thus immersed in the Spirit of God, God again sent the Spirit, poured out His Spirit upon the Gentiles as he did upon the Jews. John, you may recall, when he went preparing a people for the Lord, said, “I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire”, (Matthew 3:11). Remember also that just before his ascension, Jesus said to eleven of his apostles, “And being assembled together with them he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which said he, ye heard from me: for John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence, (Acts 1:4, 5). The promise in verse four refers to that made in these words, to the apostles, “But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send, in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you”, (John 14:26); see also John 15:26 and 16:5-15. The apostles would receive the promise of the Father when the prophecy of John should be fulfilled concerning the immersion in the Holy Spirit. Now again to the Gentiles; Joel prophesied that God would pour out His Spirit upon all flesh. The Lord, at the beginning, made no distinctions among people, as he did in later times when he made them either Jews or Gentiles; then, all flesh consisted of these two divisions. Joel promised that in the last days God would pour out his Spirit upon all flesh. The promise was half fulfilled on that Pentecost; the Jews were then immersed in the Spirit when the Spirit was poured out upon them; but it was not until Peter went to the first Gentiles, Cornelius and his house, that the work of immersion in the Spirit was fulfilled and finished. Peter was sent for by a marvellous vision from heaven, was ready to go to the Gentiles with the gospel of Christ. He

went and preached the word to them. As he began to speak the Spirit fell on them as on the apostles at the beginning; “And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit,” (Acts 11:16).

51 Brother Fox revises the Bible to make it say “reception of powers directly from heaven (that) ‘reminded’ Peter of the events of Acts 2.” He never did say where he learned not to speak as the oracles of God. Also, we must be reminded that Marion said, “God (I John 4:12), the Spirit, was not poured forth.” When I quote him I quote him faithfully, (30a). No, I don’t understand you to say, Marion, that there isn’t any Holy Spirit, (39a) , but I understand you to say that there wasn’t any Holy Spirit present on Pentecost or at the house of Cornelius. Your denying that there was a “literal pouring”, then, is to admit, is it, that there was a real coming and a real presence of the Holy Spirit on these two occasions in such an unusual and bountiful way that it took the word “pour” and “baptize” to describe the real presence of the Spirit? We agreed in our first speeches that “baptize” is a figure of speech in this proposition, “It is absurd to have a literal pouring of a person”; who said that there was a “literal pouring of a person”? Is it absurd to say that there was a pouring of a person, the Holy Spirit? If it is, give God the credit. Marion, in your minor premise, (39a) you say that I interpret Acts 2:33, as “The Holy Spirit is a person that is seen”. Your conclusion is sophistry; you freely admitted that Jesus (God) was not actually seen, “though they did see his fleshly tabernacle”, (39a); so when you decide where you are coming from, let us know. Also when Jesus was immersed of John in Jordan, “went up straightway from the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, (the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily form, as a dove, upon him) and coming upon him”, (Matthew 3:16; Luke 3:22). Marion, is it absurd to say that the Holy Spirit was seen

by John, in a bodily form, like a dove? You talk about the “visible nature” of Jesus as if the Son only can have a “visible nature”; whatever this “visible nature” is. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God. Marion claims that my speaking of things pertaining to the fact that Jesus was seen is unsound because we are not talking about Jesus, but the Holy Spirit, (39a)---as if the Holy Spirit were not God, the same as Jesus is; your reasoning is singular!

52 Marion dived into the Greek. Brother N. B. Hardeman used to tell the student preachers in his classes, when they would attempt to refute some sectarian argument he threw out to them, by citing the Greek, “Boys, don’t let them run you out of the Bible”. Brother Hardeman, a debater of the first rank, could rout any opponent with the King James version of the Bible. He was thoroughly conversant with the Greek language having taught in the early days of the college that bears his name; yet he taught his students to remain on familiar ground. Marion states that Acts 2:17 in the English Bible is a mistranslation, (39a); he goes on, “The passage literally translated should read: “ ... I will pour forth from my Spirit ... ”. For beginners, if the grammar shows that the Holy Spirit was the origin of what was poured forth as you stated, there is a contradiction, for according to Joel 2:28, God was the pourer and the Spirit was the pouree---remember that Marion; too, the Spirit, called the Comforter, was sent by Jesus! “I will send Him unto you”, (John 16:7). Christ was the sender, the Spirit was the sendee---remember that, Marion; your misunderstanding of the Greek is phenomenal! Moreover you should level with your readers and tell them that the Scriptures cannot, in every place, be literally translated into the English.

53 Marion, the sophistry of your syllogism in 39a is in the major premise; you deny that there was any Spirit poured at all; the

doctrine of Christ is THAT THE SPIRIT WAS POURED; the Spirit was present on Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius the figures by which this is accomplished, you are using to deny the presence of the Spirit.

54 In 40a you hint that I say “there are only two kinds of falling of the Holy Spirit”; you attribute to me words that I didn’t say; easier to answer, aren’t they? Marion affirms now; I am taking the negative while in the affirmative. He proves that Paul was baptized in the Holy Ghost, 50a; there he proved that Paul “magnified God” and “spoke in tongues”; then, he sandwiched in between these truths, “Received a pouring”, (Titus 3:5-6); then he wants to know why he didn’t have the baptism of the Holy Ghost, having no hands laid on him. He affirmed weakly, for he turned and inquires why Paul didn’t have it. “A pouring”, is the key, there. Sure Paul had a pouring, but it is the same pouring that we all get from Titus 3:5, 6; and it is not the Holy Spirit that is poured in Titus 3:5-6; it is again singular that Marion fights so hard against pouring in Acts 2, then seeks to establish it in Titus 3. In 49a you want to know if the Pentecostals are right about two kinds of tongues. What has that to do with this discussion?--no. Did anyone besides Cornelius and the Jews on Pentecost magnify God and speak in tongues? Yes. Why didn’t they receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit? Ask God; he is the immerser in that element. It might help you to observe that the Holy Spirit fell in such a manner as to immerse on only two occasions: at Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius, and only upon those mentioned. These two occasions fulfilled all that had ever been promised for such baptism. On these two occasions, the Lord accomplished the results that he had in mind for the baptism in the Holy Spirit as has been noted throughout this discussion. What is unique about Acts 2, and 10 that made them a baptism in the Spirit? This has been exhaustively explained several times. You really want to hear it

again? Not what but whom; the answer is God. God made the events named, immersions in the Holy Spirit! So I am left with only a pouring which I gave up? Rather, which you gave up on my behalf. I remain with a pouring on two occasions, and with that which was poured, the Spirit of God, (Joel 2:28, Acts 10:44; 11:15, 16). “His affirmative has been disproven”; has it? If my affirmative is your revamping of all that I have said, you have done well.

55 Is Cornelius equal to the apostles in everything? Yes, concerning the baptism of the Holy Spirit. No, concerning the promise of the Father to them; but you can't see it; don't go to your tomb and your doom in blindness of the obvious. Jesus was AS the Father in all things; the house of Cornelius was immersed in the Spirit As the apostles were immersed in Him; my consistency in restricting similarities is that I speak where the Bible speaks. I cited “as” for the description of the manner of the reception of a thing, rather than a relationship to a person or persons. Marion still wants to correct the translators of the Bible and have Peter “reminded” of the “events of Acts two” and not “remembering the word of the Lord” in Acts 1. I would too, if I had his belief; I wouldn't want Peter to be remembering the word of the Lord where the Lord said, “baptized in the Holy Spirit”, (Acts 1:5). I would be like Marion, I would want to forget that.

56 The Holy Spirit used the word “pour” to describe the baptism in the Holy Ghost. Joel is the guilty party, he wrote, “And it shall come to pass afterward (in the last days) that I WILL POUR OUT MY SPIRIT upon all flesh”, (Joel 2:28). What he meant was, that He would baptize all flesh in the Holy Spirit, for, when this prophecy was fulfilled, it fulfilled the words of John, that Jesus would baptize in the Holy Spirit as Jesus warned the apostles, not many days before that Pentecost, (Acts 1:5). Moreover, when the Spirit fell on the

house of Cornelius as it did on Pentecost upon the apostles, Peter remembered the word of the Lord, “ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit”, (Acts 11:16). Marion quibbles over this calling for what changes the definition of “pour”, into “immerse”; we used to go to the branch to wash; it was my job to keep the fire going under the kettle and to carry water. Mom told me to bring rinse water; I poured in two buckets full and stopped to stare at the hawks; she told me to pour in enough to cover the clothes. I said, “Mom, what figure of speech changes ‘pour’ to ‘cover’”. As you might expect, she decked me. God said he would “pour out his Spirit” upon all flesh. He did. He poured out so bountifully that he called it, himself, “baptized”, as noted above numerous times. Marion has already confessed that he does not believe that the Spirit was poured out at all! Marion is apt to torture the Lord for the divine use of words when he comes into judgment!

57 Marion declares that “there is only one promise in Acts 1:4,5.” If you are right Jesus could have kept his mouth shut, for John had already promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit, (Matthew 3:11). Ah! but there was another promise! Which? “The promise of the Father, (Acts 1:4). Marion quotes me as saying the Samaritans were Jews. He can’t find where I said it. He quotes me unfaithfully. He that is unfaithful in little is unfaithful in much. Marion quotes me unfaithfully, makes an argument to refute the unfaithful quotation; his artfulness is not enviable. As for Israelites, Jesus himself preached to Samaritans; Jesus, that is, who said “I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel,” (Matthew 15:24). Marion sees a holy roller or a premillennialist behind every bush. The more Marion says about “all flesh” the more muddled it becomes; Joel said that God would pour out His Spirit upon all flesh; God did; he poured out His Spirit upon Jews at Pentecost and upon Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, and ceased. Hence, we have a divine

definition of “all flesh”, it is Jew and Gentile. You’re welcome. Marion makes a text a context, (Luke 3:6), he says it means economic distinctions; Isaiah spoke of those who needed salvation. “The only time the word ‘pour’ is used is in Acts 10:45”---Marion Fox; put on your glasses Marion and look at Joel 2:28; did you? Now look at Acts 2:17; what did you see? Pour? No? Get your lens changed! When the Holy Spirit was poured out on the Gentiles, the gift was poured out too. Can’t two things be poured at once? “Brother Rogers cannot prove that the Holy Spirit was poured upon Cornelius’ household”,---Fox. Well, the Holy Spirit fell upon them; when it fell upon the apostles at the beginning, it was poured, (Acts 2:17, 33); and as it fell on Cornelius, so it fell on the apostles. Where were you, Marion, when the wits were passed out? Marion, do you see how I linked Acts 2 and Acts 10 by the means of the word “pour”? You said I couldn’t do it. Well, really, Peter gets the credit.

## FOURTH NEGATIVE-Marion R. Fox

51a My duty as a negative writer is to answer the arguments set forth by the affirmative writer. First, I have demonstrated the unsound nature of his arguments by appealing to hermeneutics (Bible interpretation techniques). Second, I appealed to the logical implications of his teaching. Third, I demonstrated that his arguments contradict the verbally inspired grammar. Brother Rogers has introduced several new illustrations and some new arguments which I must refute at this time. Since it is the case that the negative writer has the last article in a debate I reserve the right to have a brief rebuttal to his summation (paragraph 48).

52a I have corresponded with brother Rogers concerning my affirming “The Scriptures teach that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is the miraculous gift of apostleship.” I requested that we follow the same format as this debate and both agree to abide by Hedge’s rules of controversy. Brother Rogers has not agreed to continue with this discussion. The reader should be aware that I am ready to offer positive affirmative proofs and explanations of the passages in question. I do not see a good reason for his refusal to discuss these matters. The fact that this is the only debate on this subject in print (paragraph 48) makes it all the more important to complete this discussion. If I can establish my affirmative proposition I will also refute his affirmative proposition. The readers deserve to hear both sides of this issue.

53a In paragraph 50 brother Rogers again assumes that “all flesh” means Jews and Gentiles. He also assumes that there are two promises in Acts 1:4-5. He did not respond to my negative arguments in paragraph 49a except to imply that my argument was unsound because of my appeal to the Greek (paragraph 52). While I

esteem brother Hardeman for his work's sake the statement attributed to him contains a logical fallacy. He quotes brother Hardeman: "... don't let them run you out of the Bible." This statement implies that one is not using the Bible when he appeals to the Greek. The Greek New Testament is the Bible. The English New Testament is the Bible only when it is accurately translated. Many of the so called translations (modern speech) are not translations and are not the Bible but man's commentary. The same arguments I made in 49a on the Greek word "for" can be made on the English word "for" and the colon (ASV). Just consult a dictionary and an English grammar book. The Pentecostals also claim that Acts 1:4-5 has two promises. They link their three kinds of tongues doctrine (paragraph 54) with this passage. In paragraph 57 he speaks of Jesus not needing to speak (... could have kept his mouth shut) because (for) John had already promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Why then did he even refer to the baptism in the Holy Spirit in Acts 1? This kind of reasoning is dangerous as well as unsound because it leads to all kinds of other errors.

54a Brother Rogers does not answer my negative arguments on the reason for my translation of Acts 11:16 as "reminded" (paragraph 51). I gave two reasons in paragraph 48a for this translation but he did not respond to them. Why not, are they unanswerable? The reader should be aware of the fact that a thing can be real without being literal. For example, the church is really the body of Christ (Ephesians 1:22-23) but not literally the body of Christ. If brother Rogers understood a simile he would understand the words "as a dove." He could then harmonize his interpretation of Matthew 3:16 and I John 4:12. Merely ignoring these passages will not suffice to answer my arguments. The readers deserve an answer to my arguments. Remember Jesus was both human and divine and parallels between the Holy Spirit and Jesus (while in the flesh) are

not always proper.

55a Brother Rogers dislikes my translation of Acts 2:17 (39a) as the ablative case. My quote of this is from the Concordant Literal New Testament. Acts 2:17 is a passage which can be literally translated. If you prove that some passages cannot be literally translated you still haven't proven that Acts 2:17 is one of them. I quoted from Greek grammar books to support my points. Brother Rogers has studied Greek, why did he not challenge my arguments from the Greek grammar?

56a Brother Rogers again begs the question (assumes his point) in paragraph 53. I gave several arguments on the literalness of the language to which he did not respond. He should have explained John 1:18 and I John 4:12. He had ample time to explain these verses.

57a Brother Rogers is saying that there are at least three kinds of falling of the Holy Spirit now. I know this because his first sentence of paragraph 54 would be deceptive if he teaches that there are only two kinds of falling. He gave no proof of this third kind of falling of the Holy Spirit. He only assumes that there are three kinds of falling. A man can make it appear as though he has proven anything if you allow him to assume his major premise. I requested that he prove this in paragraph 36a but he has not done so. Is he unable to do so? Did he feel the force of my chart and arguments in paragraph 40a.

58a Brother Rogers did not answer my arguments from the Greek grammar of Titus 3:5-6. Most of these points can be made from the English grammar. He implies that I contradict myself in paragraph 54. I do not teach that the Holy Spirit was ever poured out literally which can be determined by the last sentence of paragraph 43a. I set

forth that the word “pour” is a metonymy in paragraph 39a.

59a Brother Rogers kept rewording my question “not what but whom...” (paragraph 54) This is a vital point which should have been answered. Why wasn’t it answered?

60a In paragraph 55 he persists in equating the words “as” and “equal.” Webster’s dictionary defeats this argument, consult it for a definition of the word “as.” He felt the force of my argument in paragraph 47a.

61a He again vainly attempts to equate the word “pouring” to the word “baptizing” in paragraph 56. In his example the word “pour” does not equal the word “cover.” Most gospel preachers will sharply disagree with the argument that baptizing equals pouring.

62a Brother Rogers taught implicitly that the Samaritans were Jews. The following is my proof of this assertion:

Major Premise: All people in the world are those who can be classified as either Jews or Gentiles.

Minor Premise: The Samaritans are people in the world.

Conclusion: The Samaritans are those who can be classified as either Jews or Gentiles (paragraph 50).

Since the Samaritans were baptized before Cornelius (Acts 8 & 10), and Cornelius was the first Gentile convert (paragraph 50) the Samaritans must be Jews. But Jesus made a distinction (paragraph 35a) between a Jew and a Samaritan. He did not reply to my argument of 45a. His position is identical to the premillennial position on Jew and Israelite.

63a Brother Rogers assumes that the expression “all flesh” refers only to racial distinctions in paragraph 57 (Jew and Gentile). I took

his passage (Luke 3:6) and proved from the oracles of God (Isaiah 40:5-8 and James 1:9-11) that the expression “all flesh” refers to social distinctions (paragraph 45a). Did he reply to my appeal to the oracles of God? Certainly the rich and poor need salvation. He begs the question when he says that “he poured out His Spirit upon Jews ... and upon Gentiles...” (paragraph 57)

64a Brother Rogers has the Holy Spirit pouring out two things in Acts 10 (paragraph 57). The oracles of God only speak of the gift of the Holy Spirit being poured out in Acts 10:45. Certainly two things can be poured out at once but the oracles of God only say one thing was poured out in Acts 10:45.

65a I have repeatedly asked questions and set forth arguments which have been ignored by my opponent. He asserted that the word “baptize” is a figure of speech (paragraph 6). I have requested that he set forth what figure of speech is employed in paragraphs 1a, 30, 33, 30a, 34a, 36a, 46, 39a, 46a, and 51. His replies have consisted of assertions which ignore my arguments. He must give up part of his argument if he allows this to be a metonymy. He said “who said that there was a literal pouring of a person?” (paragraph 51) as if to deny that he taught this. Then he proceeds to assert that there was a literal pouring of a person (the Holy Spirit). This is somewhat misleading. This is why I have sometimes misunderstood the position advanced by brother Rogers. I assure the reader that I have not intentionally misrepresented brother Rogers.

66a I appreciate the kind words of paragraph 48 concerning my abilities. These words are especially gratifying because they come from a man of many years of preaching experience (paragraph 3). Brother Rogers has apparently sat at the feet of brother N. B. Hardeman and other great men. The reader must judge the

arguments upon their merit and not on the basis of the credentials of the writer (Acts 17:11 and I Thessalonians 5:21).

67a Many of my questions remain unanswered. I did not answer brother Rogers on one question which was, is the Holy Spirit baptism the same as the coming of the Comforter? The answer is yes. I have some powerful arguments on this subject which I supposed I would use while in the affirmative. In addition I have several new arguments which prove my affirmative (cf. paragraph 52a). These arguments are in my book entitled The Work Of The Holy Spirit, Volume I which I hope to have in print within a year.

68a Brother Rogers asserts that Joel 2 teaches that the Gentiles had a pouring of the Holy Spirit then asserts that Acts 10 was that pouring. He turns around and then asserts that this proves that the Gentiles received the Holy Spirit baptism (paragraph 57). When questioned about Joel 2 he runs to Acts 10 and when questioned about Acts 10 he runs to Joel 2. This is a classic example of circular reasoning (a form of begging the question).

69a Last year brother Rogers approached me at the Spiritual Sword lectureship in Memphis about our having a friendly discussion of these matters. We both agreed to conduct ourselves as Christians in this matter. To do less is to sin. I have endeavored to treat brother Rogers with the respect due an older man in addition to my other responsibilities. I realize that I shall give account for my actions in this debate as well as in my life (Hebrews 9:27 and Revelation 20:11-15). If I know my heart I seek truth and not victory in this matter. I have tried to be gentle (II Timothy 2:24-25) so as to convert those in error. I am even more confident of my position than I was one year ago. If in any respect I have employed the unsound and unChristian techniques of ridicule or sarcasm (hateful words) I

beg that I be forgiven by brother Rogers. Ridicule and sarcasm provide nothing to the argumentation, but serve to divert the attention from the real issue to personalities.

70a I call upon the readers to be reasonable (Isaiah 1:18 and Romans 12:1-2). Consider these matters and ask yourselves “did brother Rogers prove his points or merely assert them?” People once claimed that the earth was flat and offered unsound arguments in a vain attempt to prove this. Are the arguments made by brother Rogers sound?

71a As a summation, I will refer the readers to the following paragraphs: 1a, 8a, 9a, 29a, 31a, 33a, 36a, 40a, 45a, 47a, 48a, 49a, and 50a. I commend the reader to God and to the word of his grace which is able to build you up and to give you the inheritance at the end of this life upon the earth.

## AFFIRMATIVE SUMMATION-Reg Rogers

58 When Christ was preached to the Gentiles by the apostle Peter, the Holy Spirit fell on them as it fell on the apostles at the beginning, (Acts 10:44-11:15). The apostle, on that occasion, for the first time in the last days, the last age of time, used the expression “baptized in the Holy Spirit”. As the Spirit fell upon the Gentiles, so it fell upon the apostles, as a token of available grace from the Lord for salvation, in the last days, for Gentile and Jew alike! John foretold this immersion before the beginning of Christ’s ministry, (Matthew 3:11).

59 Immersion in the Spirit was accomplished by the Lord when he fulfilled the prophecy of Joel (2:28), as he promised, “And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh..”. The pouring was of such bounty that it inundated the recipients; as men baptize, burying the penitents in water, so the Lord baptized both Jew and Gentile, burying them in the Spirit! When the Lord immersed the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, in the Spirit, the apostle remembered the word of the Lord in Acts 1:5, “baptized in the Holy Spirit”. Immersion in the Spirit was for a sign that those upon whom the Spirit fell were acceptable to God for the remission of sins under a new covenant, the testament of Christ that came by his blood. It was for all flesh, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. Immersion in the Spirit for the Gentiles accomplished exactly the same thing for them as the immersion in the Spirit did for the Jews in the beginning---nothing more or less! We have cited the texts for all these things numerous times in this discussion.

60 We are not responsible for those who demand that the Gentiles, in order to qualify for immersion in the Holy Spirit have to also have the promise of the Father, reserved for the apostles, that of special

guidance into all truth with signs to confirm it.

61 My respondent is pushed into his grosses through reaction to the Pentecostals; he preaches a regressive, reactionary doctrine. He wants another discussion; had he finished this one I would delight to meet him there.

62 More and more I see the wisdom of brother Hardeman's counsel---wish Fox had been there, for he is driven out of the Bible into a Greek nebulosity, and has even turned translator to reflect upon the most brilliant sitting of scholars ever convened----the translators of the King James Version, and the American Standard.

63 Brother Fox finished his portion of this discussion by saying, “If I can establish my affirmative proposition I will also refute his affirmative proposition”; he then moves into silence leaving my affirmative without refutation according to his own declaration! But nobody could have done any better, for, the doctrine I affirm is not mine, but his who taught me, even Jesus. If I evaded one thing, it was an oversight; he has the advantage over me in that I cannot reply to his final paper; in his last, he charged me falsely. He must have felt compelled to do so from his penury of resources, or integrity, or both. I shall not complain for I have sufficient; I can suffer the purloining of a few things, so again, be my guest, Fox.

## NEGATIVE SUMMATION: Marion R. Fox

72a In response to paragraph 58, the reader should note that John does not mention Gentiles (Matthew 3:11). Just because there was a similarity in the fallings does not prove that they were both baptisms. It also does not prove that other fallings of the Spirit were different. Brother Rogers assumes that the fallings of Acts 8 and Acts 10 are not equal because of silence, this is unsound reasoning. I gave arguments which linked these fallings in paragraph 9a.

73a Brother Rogers gives away his pouring argument in paragraph 59 when he asserts that the pouring brought about the baptism ( ... it inundated ... ). This is a tacit admission that a pouring is not equal to a baptism.

74a Brother Rogers again makes his “all flesh” argument which I refuted in paragraphs 45a and 63a and he did not reply to my arguments. I linked his proof text to Isaiah 40:5-8 and James 1:9-11. He just ignored my argument. I beseech the reader to consider this and note the implications of his ignoring this argument and others. No man will ignore an argument that he can answer, he replies to it.

75a Brother Rogers asserts that I did not refute his proposition (paragraph 63). Certainly I refuted his proposition but my affirmative proposition, if established, also refutes his affirmative. I can add to my arguments with affirmative arguments. Surely brother Rogers would not want to leave the false impression that I am a reactionary (paragraph 61). One might be led to think that I merely react to the arguments of others and have nothing to offer in return. In truth I am willing to offer positive affirmative proofs of my proposition (paragraph 52a).

76a Brother Rogers assumes (paragraphs 52 and 53a) that all instances of appealing to the Greek are instances of leaving the Bible. He knows better than that. I hope that he has been consistent in this matter and not appealed to the Greek in any sermon, article, or prior debate. No man deserts the Greek until it deserts him. Remember, most of my grammar arguments are also established by the English grammar (cf. paragraphs 49a, 53a, etc.). Please reread paragraph 71a as a summation of this debate.

**Proposition: The Scriptures teach that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is the same as the miraculous gift of apostleship.** Affirms: Marion R. Fox, denies: Reg Rogers

1b Probably the first thing which I should do is to define the proposition. By the word Scriptures I refer to the sixty six books known as the Bible. The original versions (Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek) are infallible and are the only source of authority in spiritual matters. The word teach means: "To impart instruction to; to guide the studies of, to instruct." (Webster) The Scriptures teach in two ways: (1) By implication (by inference, that is, implicitly) and (2) By an explicit statement of a fact (explicitly). By baptism in the Holy Spirit I mean that which was discussed in Matthew 3:11, Mark 1:8, Luke 3:16, John 1:33, Acts 1:4-5, and 11:16. By the same as I mean alike in all respects. By apostleship I mean that office discussed in Acts 1:20-25. There were only fourteen apostles (counting Judas Iscariot and Paul). There are no modern day apostles. Since Judas fell from his office he was not a recipient of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Judas never received the fullness of the office of apostleship.

2b In order to prove my proposition it will be necessary to prove the following points: (1) That the baptism in the Holy Spirit and apostleship were both miraculous gifts. (2) That these two gifts imparted the same powers. (3) That these two gifts came at the same time. (4) That these two gifts came upon the same persons. (5) That these two gifts came in the same manner. (6) That these two gifts had the same sender. This was denied by brother Rogers in paragraph 52. (7) That these two gifts had the same purposes. This proof will be of the form: If points 1 AND 2 AND 3 AND 4 AND 5

AND 6 AND 7 are true; then the gifts are the same. It is clear that these events did not have to come at the same time in order to be identical, but the fact that they came at the same time helps to prove my point.

3b The first matter to be proven is that apostleship and the Holy Spirit baptism were both gifts of the Holy Spirit. Paul lists apostleship as one of the gifts of the Spirit in I Corinthians 12:28. In fact, he reveals that the first gift given in the church was apostleship. The gift of apostleship was given after the ascension of our Lord (Ephesians 4:8-12). If the position taken by brother Rogers is correct; then the baptism in the Holy Spirit is a gift (Acts 11:16-17). Therefore, he cannot consistently oppose my argument that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was a gift. That which was received at the household of Cornelius was called a gift (Acts 10:45). It is something that was received (Acts 10:47) which makes it a gift. By definition a gift is something that is given (Webster). Hence, since the Holy Spirit baptism is something that was given it must be a gift. Paul calls apostleship a gift (Ephesians 4:8 and 11).

4b The second matter to be established is that these two gifts were both given after the ascension of our Lord. Paul reveals this in I Corinthians 12:28 where he teaches, by implication, that apostleship was the first gift given in the church. Since the church was not established until Acts 2 it is implied that apostleship was not given until Acts 2. Paul plainly states that the gift of apostleship was not given until after the Lord's ascension (Ephesians 4:8-12). Of course He did not ascend until Acts 1:9-11.

5b The third matter to be established is that these two gifts came in the same manner. Brother Rogers has agreed that the baptism in the Holy Spirit came directly from heaven without the imposition of the

hands of an apostle (paragraphs 25 and 42). The gift of apostleship did not come by the laying on of the hands of anyone. This is proven by the words of the apostle Paul in Galatians 1:1 and 12. This was discussed in paragraphs 33a, 40a, and 50a.

6b The fourth matter to be established is that these two gifts had the same results. The Holy Spirit baptism brought all gifts to all people (Joel 2:28-32 and Acts 2:17-21). The gift of apostleship brought the same gifts (Acts 8:18). Only by the laying on of an apostles' hands could gifts be given. There were special signs that only an apostle could work (II Corinthians 12:12). It is apparent that the apostles possessed all the miraculous gifts and that they could impart them to others. The events at the house of Cornelius were special with no parallel. The fact that these events were special does not make them a baptism in the Holy Spirit, it merely makes them special. While it is true that a negative writer or speaker does not normally answer questions brother Rogers should tell us how Paul received the gift of apostleship. I could not get him to deal with Paul while he was in the affirmative. If Paul received apostleship directly from heaven; then it was a baptism in the Holy Spirit. This follows because according to brother Rogers there were only two ways the Spirit was given: (a) by a direct means, that is, a baptism (b) or by the laying on of the hands of an apostle. Brother Rogers is more consistent than some brethren in that he denies that Paul received the baptism in the Holy Spirit. If Paul and Cornelius received the baptism in the Spirit; then there were three instances of the Holy Spirit baptism. Therefore, all arguments about all flesh being Jews and Gentiles would be unsound unless God needs to confirm a matter twice (to the Jews twice).

7b The fifth matter to be established is that the Holy Spirit baptism is equated to being endued (clothed) with power. Jesus reveals this in Acts 1:4-8 which is parallel to Luke 24:48-49. This is a divine

commentary on the meaning of the Holy Spirit baptism. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is the same as being clothed with power. The word “clothed” (endued) carries the same meaning as the word baptized. To clothe is “to envelop in, to hide in” (Thayer, page 214) to baptize is to cover or bury (Romans 6:4 and Colossians 2:12).

8b The sixth matter to be established is that the Holy Spirit baptism and the promise of the Father had the same sender. Brother Rogers has already agreed that the promise of the Father was the same as the coming of the Comforter and that He was sent by Jesus (paragraph 52). John tells us that Jesus would be the administrator of the Holy Spirit baptism in Matthew 3:11, Mark 1:8, etc. Certainly Jesus is divine (God) and Joel 2:28-32 could be referring to Him. It could be that Joel was telling the reader that Jesus would be an intermediate agent for the Father. In either case Jesus was the administrator of the Holy Spirit baptism.

9b The seventh matter to be established is that the Holy Spirit baptism is the same as the coming of the Comforter. The Comforter enabled the apostles to be infallible witnesses (John 15:26-27). The special work of witnessing was for those who ate and drank with Jesus after His resurrection (Acts 10:39). Since the Holy Spirit baptism enabled the apostles to be infallible witnesses (Acts 1:8) and the Comforter also did the same thing these must be the same gift. Brother Rogers has already agreed that apostleship came in Acts 2 (paragraph 31). However, some may think that the twelve were apostles prior to Acts 2. Therefore, it is important to discuss this matter more. The twelve were usually called “the disciples” prior to Acts 2. When they were called “apostles” it is a figure of speech called “prolepsis.” Moses used this figure of speech in Genesis 3:20.

10b The eighth matter to be established is that the promise of the

Father is the same as the Holy Spirit baptism. In order to do this I will write a commentary on Acts 1:4-5, 8, and Luke 24:47-49. This is important since brother Rogers has asserted that the promise of the Father was for the apostles only (paragraph 60). I certainly agree with brother Rogers that the promise of the Father was for the apostles only. The promise of the Father was discussed in paragraphs 7, 43, 46, 50, 55, 57, and 60 by brother Rogers. In paragraph 50 he set forth that the immersion in the Holy Spirit and the promise of the father were fulfilled at the same time. Reg said “The apostles would receive the promise of the Father when the prophecy of John should be fulfilled concerning the immersion in the Holy Spirit.” This comes very close to stating my proposition. The following commentaries of Acts 1:4-5, 8, and Luke 24:47-49 will help to understand these points: Acts 1:4-5: **and, being assembled together with** (“crowded in a mass ...” [Thayer, page 600].) **them, he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but** (“an adversative particle ... properly, other things sc. than those just mentioned ...” [Thayer, page 27]) **to wait for the promise of the Father,** (The promise of the Father is only mentioned here and in Luke 24:49.) **which, said he, ye heard from me: 5 for** (ὅτι “the reason why anything is said to be or to be done ... a causal conjunc.; ...” [Thayer, pages 459-560] Dana and Mantey agree with this interpretation: “... It is very common as a causal particle meaning because or for” [page 252] Therefore the following statement is an explanation of the promise of the Father.) **John indeed baptized with** (The absence of a preposition before the word “water” probably gives emphasis to the Spirit baptism.) **water; but** (δε “It is used 1. univ. by way of opposition and distinction; it is added to statements opp. to a preceding statement ...” [Thayer, page 125] The water baptism is opposed to the Spirit baptism.) **ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit** (In contrast to John baptizing in water you will be baptized in the Holy Spirit.) **not many days hence** (This

was to occur in Acts 2) ... 8 **But ye shall receive power,** (This word frequently refers to miracles cf. Acts 2:2. It is the same word used in Luke 24:49.) **when the Holy Spirit is come upon you:** (literal - "having come the Holy Spirit upon you ...". The translators interpreted the aorist participle translated "having come upon you" to be antecedent action relative to the main verb [cf. Dana and Mantey, page 230]) **and ye shall be my witnesses** (The action of being a witness was part of the work of being an apostle-Acts 1:22, 2:32, etc. cf. paragraph 11b) **both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.** (This is a parallel to Luke 24:48-49.) Luke 24:48-49: **Ye** (the apostles) **are witnesses** (Special witnesses) **of these things** (The death, burial, and resurrection.) 49 **And behold, I send forth** (This is the verb form of the noun translated "apostle." Joseph Thayer says: "... suggests official or authoritative sending." [page 499] Which implies that the Lord was sending them in an official capacity or as apostles.) **the promise of my Father** (This expression is only found here and in Acts 1:4. It has already been defined in the prior discussion.) **upon you: but tarry in the city, until ye be clothed** ("... [prop. to envelop in, to hide in], to put on..." [Thayer, page 214]) **with power** (This is literal language, in that He is saying that they would be clothed or baptized with power. Whereas Acts 1:4-5 is figurative language, a metonymy. The Spirit was the source of the power.) **from on high.** (It should be clear to the reader why I established that the language is figurative and not literal in my negative arguments.)

11b The ninth matter to be established is that these two gifts had the same purposes. The coming of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles caused them to be infallible witnesses (Acts 1:8). The coming of the Comforter was for this same purpose (John 15:26-27). The gift of apostleship was for this same purpose (Acts 10:39-43).

12b These gifts were promised to the same persons. In order to establish this I will set forth a principle which brother Rogers has already accepted as sound (paragraphs 21a, 33, and 60). This principle is the law of exclusion. The first thing I will do is to illustrate this principle. In Genesis 12:1-3 and 17:7 God made the seed promise to Abraham. This promise excluded all persons who were not his descendants. This is the same as His excluding all woods except gopher wood (paragraph 33). Later, in Genesis 17:18-21, God reveals that Ishmael was excluded from this promise. Later, Esau was excluded from this promise in Genesis 25:33 and 28:14. Then the other tribes (sons of Jacob) were excluded in Genesis 49:10 when the promise was made to Judah. Later, God singled out the family of David (Psalms 89:3-4) to be recipients of this promise and excluded the remainder of the tribe of Judah. Last, Peter and Paul reveal that the seed was Christ (Acts 2:30 and Galatians 3:16).

13b The principle established in paragraph 12b will be applied to the baptism in the Holy Spirit in this paragraph. First, the promise was made to Jews only (Matthew 3:9 and 11). Second, it is manifest that this promise was limited to obedient Jews (John 14:16-17). Third, it is clear that it was limited to the apostles: John 14:16, Acts 1:4-5, and 19:1-7.

14b The pouring of the Spirit is discussed in Proverbs 1:23, Isaiah 32:15, 44:3, and Ezekiel 39:29 in addition to Joel 2:28-32. The pouring of the Spirit brought about prophesying (Acts 2:18). Since the only method of impartation of the gift of prophesying was by the laying on of the hands of an apostle (Acts 8:18-19) it is evident that apostleship was included in Joel's pouring of the Spirit. In fact, the pouring was upon the servants and handmaidens (Acts 2:16-19). Therefore apostleship was the heart of Joel's prophesy. Brother

Rogers claims that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was the heart of Joel's prophesy. I agree with this because apostleship and the Holy Spirit baptism are the same.

15b I have used the expression "these two gifts" in an accommodative sense. I have assumed that they are not the same for arguments' sake. I have then proven that they are, in fact, only one gift. I have proven that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is the same as the gift of apostleship. The reader should be aware that the words **baptism in the Holy Spirit** or an equivalent expression is not found in either Acts 2 or Joel 2. The only way these two passages can be linked to the baptism in the Holy Spirit is by equating pouring and baptism or by linking them by cause, effect, and time as I have done in the prior paragraphs of my first affirmative. I have demonstrated the total lack of validity of any attempt to link these passages by means of the words pouring and baptism in my negative arguments.

#### REFERENCES

Thayer, Joseph. (1970). *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Dana, H. E., & Mantey, Julius R. (1957). *A manual grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Toronto, Ontario: The Macmillan Co.

*The new Webster encyclopedic dictionary of the English language (Vol. I & II)*. (1965). New York: Grolier Inc.

## FIRST NEGATIVE - Reg Rogers

1c The proposition, again, is THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT IS THE SAME AS THE MIRACULOUS GIFT OF APOSTLESHIP.

2c The proposition is brother Fox's. I Reg, do not believe it, and therefore I shall tell you why.

3c The expression, "immersed in the Holy Spirit" is a quotation from Scripture, and therefore the Bible discusses it. "The miraculous gift of apostleship" is not a quotation from Scripture. A thing might be true that is not a quotation from the Bible. We shall see how well Marion does with his proposition.

4c His paragraph 1b, he devotes to defining the terms of his proposition.

5c In his paragraph 2b. These two gifts came at the same time, he says. This statement is simply not true for these reasons: The apostles were given that office during the personal ministry of Christ, and the immersion in the Holy Spirit did not come until the day of Pentecost for the Jews, and the house of Cornelius about a decade later, as we shall see.

6c Turn to Matthew 10. "And he called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of disease and all manner of sickness. Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: ... ", you can read the list. The word "apostles" here is the same word used in Acts 2:42, on Pentecost after they were immersed in the Spirit. The word

“apostleship” was used before Pentecost to describe the office already held by the twelve, (Acts 1:25).

7c “These two gifts imparted the same powers”, Marion said. He uses the expression “These two gifts” eight times in his first paper, only to conclude that these two gifts are really only one. In the former debate he concluded that there really wasn’t any baptism in the Holy Spirit at all---just a figure of speech. That leaves him to establish that “miraculous gift of apostleship.” I don’t know that the giving of the job of being an apostle was a miraculous gift. When Jesus selected them and named them apostles in Matthew 10, he gave them spiritual gifts. He gave them additional spiritual gifts at Pentecost.

8c God gave more gifts than the apostleship. The apostles were the first to be set in the church, but not the last: “And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers.” (I Corinthians 12:28). This says all these were set in the church. All these were given, “And he gave some to be apostles, and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers.” (Ephesians 4:11). There were more gifts given than the apostleship. The apostles were given long before Pentecost; they were not set in the church when they were made apostles for the church was not there yet. The stones were quarried long before the building was erected in a day (Isaiah 66:8), “Shall a land be born in one day?”

9c Still on 3b. Is the baptism in the Holy Spirit a gift? I don’t remember a text that says so, but I know that it showed that a gift was for those that received it, that is the gift promised from the time of Abraham: “And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed” (Genesis 12:12). Paul spoke of the promise: “Now I stand here to be judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our

fathers.” (Acts 26:6). Connect these with this, on Pentecost, you know: “And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit----*for unto you is the promise, and to your children, and to ALL THAT ARE AFAR OFF, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him*” (Acts 2:38, 39).

10c What was offered? That which was promised. What was promised, The gift of the Holy Spirit. Was the gift the Holy Spirit? It doesn't say so. The gift is eternal life (Romans 6:23).

11c 4b “These two gifts (immersion in the Holy Spirit and apostleship?) were both given after the ascension of our Lord.” Were they? The apostles were called and made apostles early in the ministry of Christ. “And the apostles gathered themselves together unto Jesus; and they told him all things, whatsoever they had done, and whatsoever they had taught” (Mark 6:30).

12c In Ephesians 4:8-12, I could wish the passages were partly quoted. Marion said “Paul plainly states that the gift of apostleship wasn't given until after the Lord's ascension,” but I didn't get that out of the text cited. We have shown that “the apostleship” was in existence before the ascension, and called that, (Acts 1:25).

13c 5b These two gifts, which Marion says was one gift, came in the same manner, without the laying on of hands. The text cited shows that all the apostles were made such by selection and not by the immersion in the Holy Spirit (Galatians 1:1). Paul was selected after Pentecost, all the others before Pentecost.

14c 6b “These two gifts, which are but one, (he says), had the same

results.” “The Holy Spirit baptism brought all gifts to all people” it was said. Did it? No. I am a part of “all people” and I do not have the gift of tongues. Did the “gift of apostleship bring the same gifts to all people?” No. All people do not have, and never had all the spiritual gifts---nine in number. “For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge ...” (I Corinthians 12:8). I like to quote Scripture. I am requested to tell how Paul received the gift of apostleship.” I can tell how he was “called to be an apostle” and that he was “ordained” to be an apostle, Look at it: “Go thy way, (Ananias, to where Saul prays) for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles” (Acts 9:14,15). And, “thou shalt be a witness for him unto all men of what thou has seen and heard” (Acts 22:15). On the road Saul saw Jesus in a vision; that qualified him as an eyewitness of the resurrection---all the rest of his becoming an apostle was placed in the hands of a man, Ananias. Then the Lord gave him the gospel by revelation. Jesus sent Ananias to Saul that Saul might be filled with the Holy Spirit, (Acts 9:17). Paul was not set in the church as were the other apostles, he was baptized into it, “For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body” (I Corinthians 12:13).

15c “If Paul received apostleship directly from heaven; then it was a baptism in the Holy Spirit.”---Marion. It would be a baptism in the Holy Spirit if God said it was. The rest of the apostles didn’t receive their apostleship directly from heaven. According to your own rule, they were not immersed in the Holy Spirit. It is best to stick with exactly what the Bible says. Paul did not receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit; he was not present in Jerusalem nor at Cornelius’ house when these immersions came. Marion, you claim you could not get me to deal with Paul in the former debate. I did deal with it. You are devious. A just cause thrives on honesty. It has not surfaced yet why this notion of yours is being set forth. It will before this discussion is

ended. I promise.

16c 7b Holy Spirit baptism is the same as being endued with power. Power to do what? Holy Spirit baptism did not make witnesses for Christ of the house of Cornelius.

17c 8b The promise of Holy Spirit immersion and the promise of the Father are not the same. The promise of the Father, Jesus, said to the apostles, "Ye have heard of me." (Acts 1:4). The promise of the immersion in Spirit was heard from Joel and John also. But only Jesus told them of the promise of the Father. It was to come with, or after, they were baptized in the Spirit. Cornelius heard nothing from Christ as did the apostles.

18c 9b "Holy Spirit baptism is the same as the coming of the Comforter." Not so, unless we hear an inspired man say so. Ananias came to Saul that he might be filled with the Holy Spirit, (Acts 9:17). That was long after the first immersion in Spirit on Pentecost, and before the instance on the house of Cornelius. The making of the apostles infallible witnesses has nothing to do with the immersion in Spirit. Else Cornelius would have been an infallible witness. He is more so than a modern false teacher. Ananias knew more about the apostleship of Paul than Paul did. The Holy Spirit immersion was at once, the Comforter was to abide forever (John 14:16). "Rogers has already agreed that apostleship came in Acts 2." Did I say that? If I did I erred. Let me look. Ah, again, Marion, you misrepresented what I said. You are devious again. Who said, "The apostleship came in Acts 2?" You did. The apostles had the apostleship since Matthew 10. They had additional blessings and gifts at Pentecost. David was king and exercised some regal power before his coronation. The coronation did not make him king, the anointing did, (I Samuel 16:1-12).

19c It is erroneous to conclude that there were no apostles (with apostleships) before Pentecost, because of Matthew 10 and other passages showing the apostles at work.

20c Marion thinks it is a figure of speech that Jesus used when he called his “apostles”, apostles, as when Adam called Eve “the mother of all living.” Isn’t Eve the mother of all living, literally? If she isn’t who is?

21c 10b Marion’s attempt to prove that the promise of the Father is the same as Holy Spirit baptism?--the promise of immersion in the Holy Spirit was given prior to the promise of the Father, as noted above several times; once again: “All things the Father hath are mine, therefore said I that he shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you” (John 16:15). Remember that Jesus told the apostles that they had heard the promise of the Father of him. “I said that he shall take of mine and show it.”

22c 11b “These two gifts had the same purpose.” He means apostleship, and the baptism in the Holy Spirit. He boiled them down to one gift. We have abundantly shown that the apostleship was appointed long before the immersion in Spirit came. They were not for the same purpose. The apostleship was to have twelve to go into all the world to preach the gospel to every creature and to confirm it with signs (Mark 16:14-20). The immersion in Spirit was to confirm the announcement of a new covenant, “And when they (men of the church in Jerusalem) heard these things, (the acceptance of the Gentiles into the covenant), they held their peace, and glorified God saying, Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life” (Acts 11:18).

23c 12b “These gifts (apostleship and baptism in Spirit) were promised to the same persons.” Not so. John was the first to mention the baptism in Spirit. He promised it to “All the country of Judea, and all they of Jerusalem” (Mark 1:5). Luke lets us know that the multitudes received the promise of immersion in Spirit; listen, “And the multitudes asked him saying, What must we do? ... I indeed baptize you with water; but there cometh he that is mightier than I ... he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit *and in fire* (Luke 3:10-16). Alright, look at whom John promised the baptism in Spirit. What did he say to those multitudes about the “gift of the apostleship?” What?

24c John promised that When Jesus should baptize, in addition to immersing in Spirit, he would also immerse some in fire. They would not all be baptized in fire, only the wicked who would not repent, “And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, even the lake of fire. And if any was not found written in the book of life, he was cast into the lake of fire” (Revelation 20:14,15). So, not all in those multitudes would be immersed in the lake of fire, even so, not every individual in that audience would be immersed in the Spirit, and some that were not present would be immersed in the Spirit- --Gentiles.

25c 13b “The promise (of immersion in the Spirit) was made to Jews only.” Not so; it was made to *all flesh*. That’s what God told Joel to say, “This (in answer to the question of the Jews on Pentecost---the speaking in tongues of the apostles, and the cloven tongues like as fire that sat upon them) is that which was spoken by Joel the prophet, and it shall come to pass in the last days that I will pour *out of my Spirit upon all flesh*.” (Acts 2:16, 17).

26c 14b “The pouring of the Spirit is discussed in Proverbs 1:23.”

Misapplication--not H. Sp. "Since the only method of impartation of the gift of prophesying was by the laying on of the hands of an apostle ... it is evident that apostleship was included in Joel's prophecy." True? No, (Ephesians 4:11), "and gave some to be ... prophets."

27c 15b "The reader should be aware that the words 'baptism of the Holy Spirit' or an equivalent expression is not found in either Acts 2 or Joel 2." Yea, neither in Genesis 49, so what? You employ subterfuge, a thing unbecoming a Christian. Why didn't you tell the readers that Jesus spoke of being immersed in the Holy Spirit, in the opening part of the book of Acts, preparing the apostles for the fulfillment of it not many days thereafter, a record of which is also in the opening part of Acts? There were no chapters, then, you know. Repent of that right soon.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE - Marion R. Fox

16b Reg claims that “The apostles were given that office during the personal ministry of Christ.” (paragraph 5c) If I prove that apostleship came after the ascension of Christ; then I have proven that the references to the disciples being called apostles are examples of “prolepsis.” (paragraph 9b) It was established that apostleship came after the ascension of our Lord (paragraph 4b). They are almost always called “disciples” prior to Acts 2 and almost always called “apostles” after Acts 2. They are only called “apostles” 10 times before Acts 2. Matthew only calls them “apostles” one time (Matthew 10:2) with John not calling them apostles at all, in the book of John. Jesus does not call them apostles. He prophesied that they would be persecuted (Luke 11:49).

17b Brother Rogers has continued his assertion that for one to say that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is figurative is to say that it is not real (paragraph 7c). Reg says: “In the former debate he concluded that there really wasn’t any baptism in the Holy Spirit at all---just a figure of speech.” Reg is really saying that: If baptism in the Holy Spirit is a figure of speech; then there really wasn’t any baptism in the Holy Spirit. But since Reg has said that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is figurative (paragraphs 6, 1a, 30, 33, 30a, 34a, 36a, 46a, 51, and 65a) he must also be saying that there really wasn’t any baptism in the Holy Spirit at all---just a figure of speech. The following syllogism is Reg’s argument:

Major Premise: All things that are figurative are things that are non-real.

Minor Premise: The assertion that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is a metonymy is a thing that is figurative.

Conclusion: The assertion that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is a metonymy is a thing that is non-real.

Webster does not list the word “really” as a synonym of the word “literal” or as an antonym of the word “figurative.” This is what you are saying, Reg.

18b Brother Rogers has failed to tell the reader what figure of speech he claims the baptism in the Holy Spirit to be (paragraph 65a). Will the reader read this whole discussion without this being answered? He must give up part of his argument if he allows this to be a metonymy. Reg, I will ask this question in every one of my affirmatives or until you answer it. The argument made by brother Rogers is:

Major Premise: All \_\_\_\_\_ are \_\_\_\_\_.

Minor Premise: Marion Fox is one who says that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is figurative.

Conclusion: Marion Fox is one who is teaching error on doctrine X.

The major premise can be easily constructed from the minor premise and conclusion. The major premise that would make this syllogism valid (properly constructed) is: All those who say the baptism in the Holy Spirit is figurative are those who are teaching error on doctrine X. This is the basic argument made by brother Rogers in paragraphs: 30, 36, 37, 39, 40, 51, and 53. He says, I am wrong because I say Holy Spirit baptism is figurative.

19b As a further response to paragraphs 7c and 19c the reader should note: He gave the same gifts to the 70 (Luke 10:1-20). Therefore, these gifts prove nothing about apostleship. Apostleship was demonstrated by the signs of an apostle (II Corinthians 12:12 and I Corinthians 9:2). Since only the apostles could impart gifts by the laying on of hands (Acts 8:18) this was one of the signs, or the seal, of an apostle.

20b Reg denies that apostleship is a gift (paragraph 7c). Paul says that Jesus “**gave gifts unto men...**” (Ephesians 4:8) What gifts did he give? “**And he gave some to be apostles;...**” (Ephesians 4:11) Reg, this is a plain passage of Scripture that says that one of the gifts given after the ascension of our Lord was apostleship.

21b Reg claims that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was not a gift (paragraph 9c). This was proven in paragraph 3b. My proof was from the law of identity. The following illustrates this law: If  $3 + 1 = 4$  and  $2 + 2 = 4$ ; then  $3 + 1 = 2 + 2$ . If that which Cornelius received was called a gift (Acts 10:45 and 11:17) and that which Cornelius received was called a baptism in the Holy Spirit (Reg Rogers); then a baptism in the Holy Spirit was called a gift. Paul lists it with the spiritual gifts (I Corinthians 12:28). But one thing that disappoints me is that Reg has already agreed that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is a gift. Reg said: “ ... ; when the apostles were given the gift of the immersion in the Holy Spirit,...” (paragraph 12)

22b Reg, you seem to be saying that the gift of Acts 2:38 is the baptism in the Holy Spirit (paragraph 10c). Please clarify what you mean in this paragraph. Is the gift of Acts 2:38 the same as the gift of Acts 10:45 and 11:17? If not, why bring up Acts 2:38?

23b Reg says “ ... all the apostles were made such by selection...” (paragraph 13c) Where does the Bible use the word “selection?” Please define this term. Galatians 1:1 merely states that Paul did not receive apostleship by the laying on of hands (paragraph 5b).

24b It appears that I was not clear enough in paragraph 6b from your response in paragraph 14c. “No person today has received the Holy Spirit baptism or any miraculous gifts.” (paragraph 1a) All those who received miraculous gifts after the ascension of Jesus, except the

apostles and the household of Cornelius, received those gifts through apostleship. Now then, insert this between the second and third sentences of paragraph 6b and please respond to paragraph 6b again. The 70 (Luke 10:1-20) may have retained their gifts after Pentecost, without the laying on of hands.

25b Reg claims that he responded to my points on Paul (paragraphs 14c and 15c). Paul was mentioned by Reg in: paragraphs 3, 20, and 54. The reader can judge for himself if Reg answered my questions. I ask you again, did Paul receive the power to work miracles (apostleship or whatever) by the laying on of hands or by a direct impartation of the gifts from heaven? Reg, you can not answer this without getting into a dilemma. Reg, either Paul received his miraculous gifts by: (1) a laying on of hands, (2) by a direct impartation of the gift (cf. paragraph 40a), or (3) by some unnamed third method. Tell the reader which one it is. If you choose this third method, tell us what it is and give Scripture. Did Ananias lay his hands on Saul of Tarsus and impart to him the abilities to work miracles? Is this a third kind of falling of the Holy Spirit (paragraphs 54 and 57a)? Did Paul receive the ability to work miracles by a falling of the Holy Spirit?

26b Reg says: “The rest of the apostles didn’t receive their apostleship directly from heaven.” (paragraph 15c) Reg, tell us how Matthias received his apostleship (Acts 1:21-26). Jesus had already ascended before he was chosen (Acts 1:9). Paul and Matthias will haunt you throughout the remainder of this debate. Were Paul and Matthias second rate apostles (behind the other apostles-II Corinthians 11:5 and I Corinthians 12:11)?

27b Brother Rogers has still failed to give the earmarks (tell what was unique) of the baptism in the Holy Spirit (paragraphs 20a, 32,

33a, 44, 45, 50a, 54, 59a, and 15c). By *unique* I mean: unequaled, different, unlike, diverse, or distinct. What was the difference (unequal, unlike, diverse, or distinct) between Acts 10 and Acts 19 that made Acts 10 a baptism in the Holy Spirit? Please do not give me your stock reply that God made it different. You beg the question with this reply. Prove that God made it different, and tell the reader in what way He made it different. If (hypothetically) one saw a baptism in the Holy Spirit, what would he see, or what would happen? How can I make my question clearer to you? If you persist in rewording this question I will reword it for you, but the readers will draw their own conclusions about why you are avoiding my questions! The reader is invited to compare how brother Rogers and I deal with questions. If your argument is strong, you deal with questions openly (paragraph 18b etc.). I hope you do not do this same thing with paragraph 6b (cf. paragraph 14c).

28b Reg says: “According to your own rule, they were not immersed in the Holy Spirit.” (paragraph 15c) What rule? Are you assuming that a figurative usage of the word baptize means that they were not immersed in the Holy Spirit? Remember you said it was figurative first (paragraph 6). I refer you to my categorical syllogism in paragraph 17b.

29b Reg now has the coming of the Comforter, Apostleship, and the baptism in the Holy Spirit to be three different things. (paragraph 16c) I certainly agree that Cornelius was not made a witness for Christ (paragraph 16c). I established that apostleship and the work of the Comforter are the same work in paragraph 9b.

30b Reg, you remind me of a Baptist when you claim that the expression “Ye have heard of me” (paragraph 17c) means “heard from me only.” Baptists see the word “faith” and want to add the

word “only” to it. You “beg the question” in this argument. The burden of proof is upon you to prove that the word “only” is implied in this passage.

31b Is the Spirit baptism the same as the Comforter (paragraph 18c)? Reg says: “Not so unless we hear an inspired man say so.” (paragraph 18c) Reg, are you saying that the only proof that you will accept is an explicit statement? Are you saying that a thing has to be a quotation from Scripture before you will accept it? Reg begs the question (assumes his points) when he argues that the Holy Spirit baptism is not the same as the coming of the Comforter. His argument is based upon the following incorrect assumptions: (1) Paul did not receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit and (2) Cornelius did receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit. He recognizes that this would force Cornelius to be an infallible witness (paragraph 18c). Since these two assumptions are the questions to be decided in this debate Reg is guilty of begging the question. Did the apostles remain immersed in the Holy Spirit all their lives? If “yes” why the problem with John 14:16?

32b Reg claims that I misrepresented what he said (paragraph 18c). Reg said: “Your statement, ... , should have read, in Acts 2, recipients of baptism in the Holy Spirit were ALSO, that day, given apostolic powers.” If you are not admitting that apostolic powers came in Acts 2 what are you saying? Webster says that the adverb *also* means: “ ... in addition to ... .” Reg says: “ ... that the apostles received something in addition to it,...” (paragraph 31) Reg says that apostolic powers came that day, which in the context refers to Acts 2. The reader can read it for himself. My case is not dependent upon the consent of Reg Rogers, I have proven my case without your assent. By equivocating on this point you have given up some of your affirmative arguments (paragraph 31).

33b Reg attacks my argument that the passages referring to apostles prior to Acts 2 are figurative (prolepsis). Reg asserts that Adam called Eve the mother of all living (paragraph 20c). Adam did not say this, Moses did. Eve was not the mother of Adam or Eve. No, she was not the mother of all living in 4,000 B.C., but she was in 1,500 B.C., when Moses wrote Genesis. The 12 disciples were apostles when Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were written, not before. Another good example of prolepsis is John 3:13 who is in heaven, Jesus was in heaven when John, by inspiration, wrote the book of John.

34b I proved that the promise of the Father was the same as Holy Spirit baptism in paragraph 10b. Reg mentioned my argument, but did not deal with the points.

35b In paragraphs 23c and 24c Reg comes close to asserting that all Jews who repent were promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Reg says that: "John ... promised it to 'All the country of Judea, and all they of Jerusalem.'" (paragraph 23c) He is driven to this by my arguments on the law of exclusion (paragraph 12b). Reg if I establish that Holy Spirit baptism is apostleship; then I prove that John preached apostleship (paragraph 23c). Reg, did all those who repented receive the promise of baptism in the Holy Spirit?

36b Reg, are you saying that some became prophets by a means other than through the laying on of the hands of an apostle (paragraph 26c)? Those of Ephesians 4:11 received their gifts after the ascension of Christ, and other than Cornelius and the Apostles, each one received his gift only by the laying on of the hands of an apostle. Are you saying that Joel 2:28-32 did not include apostleship, yes or no (paragraph 26c)?

37b In your response to 15b (paragraph 27c) you say “so what?” My point in 15b is that the only way these two passages (Joel 2:28-32 and Matthew 3:11) can be linked is by equating pouring and baptizing or by linking them by: cause, effect, and time. One has to take the position that baptism is a pouring, as you did, or take my position. Reg, the only way you can answer this point is to set forth a third method of linking these passages or cling to your “pouring equals baptism” argument. You tacitly give up many of your affirmative arguments, if you offer a third alternative.

38b Reg wants me to at least partially quote Ephesians 4:8-12 (paragraph 12c). The following commentary on Ephesians 4:8-14 will help to explain my arguments on this passage: 8 **Wherefore** (διό “This is the strongest inferential conjunction.” [Dana and Mantey, page 245] This relates the fact that each was given a gift from Christ [verse 7]) **he** (God, since he is quoting Scripture, the subject is elliptical.) **saith, When he** (Christ) **ascended** (Literal *having ascended*. The aorist participle demonstrates that the ascension preceded, or was an antecedent action to, the distribution of the gifts. [Dana and Mantey, page 230]) **on high,** (The place where he ascended is “high.”) **he** (Christ) **led captivity captive** (quotation of Psalms 68:18), **And gave** (Literal *he gave*, that is Jesus gave. Peter taught the same thing in Acts 2:33.) **gifts** (refers to miraculous gifts in Matthew 7:11 and Luke 11:13) **unto men.** (unto mankind) 9 **Now this,** (Verses 9 and 10 are a parenthetical statement) **He** (Christ) **ascended, what is it but that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth?** (In order to ascend he had to descend to the earth, or be incarnated.) 10 **He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens, that** (The purpose of his ascension was to fill or fulfill all things. Jesus had to ascend in order to send the Comforter [John 16:7].) **he might fill** (This word is often

translated “fulfilled.” It often refers to fulfilling the Scriptures. This, no doubt, refers to Joel 2:28-32.) **all things.** (This probably refers to fulfilling the Scriptures, such as Psalms 68:18.) 11 (This ends the parenthetical statement.) **And he** (Christ) **gave** (same word as in verse 8) **some** *to be* (the words *to be* are in italics) **apostles;** (Apostleship was given as a gift. This is in the accusative case which depicts the direct object. The other gifts follow because they were received by the laying on of the hands of an apostle [Acts 8:18].) **and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; 12 for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body (church) of Christ:**

39b Reg has the last days beginning in Acts 2 (paragraph 58) and Joel’s prophecy was to be fulfilled in the last days. Therefore, apostleship cannot be a part of Joel’s prophecy, according to Reg. This follows because Reg has apostleship beginning several years before the beginning of the last days. This is why Reg cannot allow apostleship to begin in Acts 2. It is evident that apostleship is the very heart of Joel’s prophecy (Joel 2:28-32). Most who received gifts did so through the laying on of the hands of an apostle.

#### REFERENCES

Dana, H. E.; Mantey, J. R. (1955) *A manual grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Toronto: The MacMillan Co.

## SECOND NEGATIVE - Reg Rogers

28c “Reg claims that the apostles were given that office during the personal ministry of Christ.” False. God makes that claim. I’ll show it again: “Now the names of the twelve *apostles* are these ... these twelve Jesus sent forth.” (Mt. 10:1, 5) Marion, you dodged this by saying this was written after Pentecost. The account of the birth of Christ was written after Pentecost but that didn’t make it happen after Pentecost. Your reasoning is singular.

M, you contend that the apostleship didn’t come before Pentecost, but Acts 1 has the appointment of Matthias “to take part in this ministry and apostleship from which Judas by transgression fell.” (Acts 1:15-26) Marion, you’re dead. Before Pentecost Judas fell from apostleship. You caused him to fall from something that wasn’t there.

The apostles were the same men before Pentecost as after. They were called the same thing before Pentecost. What sort of argument is it to say “These men were only called apostles ten times before Pentecost?” Wouldn’t one time have made it so?

M, you said the apostles were “almost always called disciples before Pentecost.” Were they therefore disciples only, and not apostles? Agrippa was almost persuaded to be a Christian; was he therefore altogether a child of God? M said, “Jesus does not call them apostles before Pentecost.” The Holy Spirit did; does he count? His very words are: “And when the hour was come (for the Lord’s supper), he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him (Luke 22:14).

29c M, in 17b you said “The Holy Spirit was not poured forth,” also in 30a p 15. I am compelled to teach that the phenomena of Acts 2,

10 and 11 were the fulfillment of this: “And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh.” (Acts 2:17) Jesus understood that to include “Ye shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit not many days hence.” That prophecy referred to at the least Pentecost, and at the most, the house of Cornelius. (Acts 10, 11) M, this should settle the figure business: John baptized with water, and one to come would baptize with the Holy Ghost. Your understanding is that the Father would pour out the apostleship. Now, Marion you may dismiss your futile discussion of my saying that immersion with the Holy Spirit was figurative, for *all* baptisms are figurative. What figure of speech is the baptism in the Holy Spirit? Why, it’s the same figure as employed in Acts 2:38, Mark 16:16. You know that. Marion, your defense of one item of error will undermine your ability to reason. Close your mind to one point, and you close it to all truth. The syllogism on p. 41 which you attribute to me is not of me; it is subterfuge.

30c Remember, M that all baptisms are figures, but that does not make them less real. You are saying that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is the same as the giving of the apostleship. You are saying, if I understand you, that Joel’s prophesy was fulfilled on Pentecost when the apostleship came. But Joel said that there would be a *pouring*, so now you are saying that the apostleship was given in a *pouring*, and that that *pouring* was the baptism of the Holy Spirit. You have been so turned off it, and now you are saying that the apostles were poured on Pentecost. It is easy for you to tell me what I as saying: what are you saying? You can reply to that of which you are the author, but not that which I present. Have a good time. M, why are you further concerned about the baptism with the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as you said that the gift of apostleship is the same thing? *Are* they the same? No. Your contention is about nothing.

31c In 19b “He gave the same gifts to the seventy.” Yes, but he only made apostles of the twelve. The apostleship didn’t change when they were set in the church. You can’t set something into a place without having it to set. The farmer sat eggs under the hen, but they were eggs before the setting. When the apostles were set in the church they were given more and greater gifts upon being set in the church. (John 14:21). M, you misquote me in 20b, why? M, you misquote me in 21b, why?

32c What makes me seem to be saying that the gift of Acts 2:38 is the baptism with the Holy Spirit? Answer: I made it as plain as I can. Think, M, This isn’t what I seem to be saying. The gift of Acts 2:38 is not baptism with the Holy Spirit. If you affirm that it is, say so.

33c 33b and 34b “Selection” is used as a synonym of “choice” “Did I not choose you the twelve and one of you is a devil?” (John 6:17) Jesus told Ananias that “He (Saul) is a chosen vessel unto me.” (Acts 9:15) The dictionary defines “choose” this way: “To select freely after consideration.” Matthias was also chosen. (Acts 9:15)

34c How did Matthias receive his apostleship? Don’t you know? He received it in the upper room in Jerusalem before Pentecost. (Acts 1:15-26) Two were put forth: Barsabas and Matthias. They prayed the Lord to show his choice by their casting lots. The lot fell on Matthias and he was numbered with the eleven apostles. Now you know. Notice that while they were eleven, the Spirit call (sic) them apostles. That was before Pentecost.

35c M, in 21b you misrepresent me. Why?

36c Yes, M, I did answer you on what the Bible says about Paul’s receiving apostleship. Jesus appeared to Saul toward Damascus

saying to him “I have appeared unto thee ... to appoint thee a minister and a witness both of the things wherein thou has seen me, and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee.” (Acts 26:15, 16ff) There he had his apostleship, but without, as yet any gifts, yet without being filled with the Holy Spirit, yet before he was a Christian, and yet before he had his sins washed away. Would you care to hear more?

37c “Paul and Matthias will haunt me?” Well! Ghost Busters!

38c “Earmarks of baptism in the Holy Spirit?” What was unique about the two instances? I failed to give the earmarks? I gave them in my first affirmative and numerous times since.

M, blindness has overtaken you of your own choice. I am in the affirmative, not by choice, but I love it. Yea, over and over I detailed the earmarks, and if necessary I’ll be glad to give them over and over again. I never tire of the divine testimony; it is my glory. I would that you would make it yours. The baptism with the Holy Spirit came twice.

The first time upon the Jews at Pentecost (Acts 2), the second time upon the Gentiles. (Acts 10, 11) This immersion came twice, and no more. Those who claim that the baptism of the Holy Spirit came upon the apostles only deny the Scriptures. Now I know why they say what they say. I wait for them to state it themselves before I make reply. Out with it, Marion. Baptism in the Spirit affected for the Jews and Gentiles alike. It showed that the covenant of the blood offered repentance unto life for all men alike: “Then hath God *also* to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life” (Acts 11). What a blessing the baptism in the Holy Spirit proved to be; what assurance through the ages of time!

39c By your own rule, M, nobody was baptized with the Holy Spirit.

“The Spirit was *not* poured forth.” P. 15, 30a. I quote you faithfully, for I am faithful. It becomes more and more clear why you said nobody was baptized in the Holy Spirit; you believe that the gift of the apostleship was it. If you would have it your way, try.

40c M, don't credit *me* with three things (29b) Comforter, Apostleship, and baptism with the Holy Spirit---God did it as noted, and abundantly. You think you have established the apostleship and the work of the Comforter to be the same work. Not so, as noted already. The apostleship came in Matthew 10. The Comforter came on Pentecost. Update your doctrine, please.

41c You say 31b reminds you of a Baptist. I don't doubt it, for I am about as much like a Baptist as I am like a Buddhist. You hallucinate. Jesus said: “The promise of the Father which *ye* heard of *me*.” (Acts 1:4) If you think the apostles heard it of another, cite the passage.

42c All Israel heard of the Promise of the baptism in the Holy Spirit before Jesus began to preach.

43c You ask: “Did the apostles remain baptized in the Holy Spirit the rest of their lives? Foolish questions will be answered: did you remain under the water when you were baptized for the remission of your sins? (Romans 6:4) Get it?

Must I have a quotation for everything? No. But I have to have its equivalent. You ignored what I said about this in my first negative. I beg? I assume my points? Don't you wish I did? I have given book, chapter and verse for every argument I have made, and you chafe at the Scriptures. Be converted. Holy Spirit baptism is not the same as the coming of the Comforter, for the Gentiles had the former, but not

the latter. (Acts 10) Proof of this has been cited over and over. You are not searching for answers. Your talk of my begging the question is nonsense. I have no problem with John 14:16, as noted, *you* have the problems. Look for solutions.

44c On Pentecost the apostles were given power (Acts 1:8) to work miracles in addition to those of their limited commission. (Acts 2:43) “And fear came upon every soul, and many wonders and signs were done through the apostles.” After the Comforter came to the apostles on Pentecost they were enthroned to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. (Matt. 19:28) All that they spake and wrote by inspiration thereafter was bound in heaven. (Matt. 18:18) Treasured brother, you don’t read the Bible enough, and carefully enough. Your statement that the twelve disciples were apostles when Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were written and not before, is irresponsible; according to that, they were not disciples either.

45c “I proved in 34a, that the promise of the Father was the same as Holy Spirit baptism, and Reg didn’t deal with the points.” You did nothing of the kind. The promise of the Father was made to the apostles. (John 14:25) Baptism with the Holy Spirit was promised to, well, hear John. (Mark 1:5,8) “And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river ... There cometh one mightier than I after me ... I indeed have baptized you in water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.” Now, Marion, to whom was the promise of the baptism of the Holy Ghost made? By whom was this promise of the baptism of the Holy Ghost made? You seek to deceive the people by telling them that Reg did not deal with your argument on this. Your statement is inanity.

46c John spoke to the multitudes promising the Holy Spirit baptism,

but it took Jesus to reveal who among the multitudes would receive such an immersion on behalf the multitudes. When they would be thus immersed is spoken of in Acts 1:5, and it was fulfilled in Acts 2. This shows that the immersion of a few of the Jews in the Holy Spirit would suffice to assure the rest that the blessings of the new covenant were for all of them, God being no respecter of persons. (Acts 10:34). At least that is what it did. “And they were all amazed (the Pentecost multitude), and were perplexed, saying one to another, What meaneth this?” (Acts 2:12). They got their answer. The figure used by John promising the immersion in the Spirit to the multitudes is synecdoche; in rhetoric, a figure of speech by which a part is put for the whole. This is a common figure of speech.

47c M, you ask in 36 if I’m saying that the prophets came without the laying on of apostolic hands? I don’t recall any word from the Lord on that. Do you?

48c You ask in 37b “Are you (Reg) saying that Joel 2:28-32 did not include apostleship? Yes or no?” Not all questions can be logically answered with a yes or no. I can only tell you what you have already read in Scripture. The twelve apostles were already in the apostleship (Acts 1:15-26) *before the coming of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, before Peter said “this is that”---the fulfillment of Joel’s prophecy.*

49c Re your 27b, M, Aren’t you aware that all baptisms in our experience are the results of *pouring*? This is elementary. We should be ashamed. The pools of earth are all filled with downpours of rain. Even our baptistries are filled when the jets pour forth enough water for immersion. But you are now saying that the apostleship which is the baptism of the Holy Spirit was *poured*. You play it safe being on both sides of the fence.

50c As for your commentary on Ephesians 4:8-12, “He gave some to be apostles.” According to the American Standard, *to be* is interpolated. They were already in fact, and in reality, actually and truly apostles, as noted above numerous times.

51c “Reg has the last days beginning in Acts 2.” What does the Bible call the last days? I have shown above that the apostleship came before Acts 2. The apostleship came before the last days, but the baptism with the Holy Spirit didn’t. “Reg cannot allow the apostleship to begin in Acts two.” I’m not guilty, Jesus is. Straighten him out. M: “Joel said the apostleship is the heart of my prophecy.” You put words in Joel’s mouth. For that you will pay in the judgment.

### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE BY - Marion R. Fox

40b At this time I will restate the argument of paragraph 9b. The Comforter made the apostles infallible witnesses (John 15:26-27), apostleship made the apostles infallible witnesses (Acts 10:39), and the Holy Spirit baptism made them infallible witnesses (Acts 1:8). Therefore, since the coming of the Comforter and the baptism in the Holy Spirit came in Acts 2, apostleship must have come at that time. This follows because they are equal (law of identity, cf. paragraph 21b). Reg has not addressed this argument.

41b Brother Rogers has made much of his case on the “all flesh” argument (paragraphs 12, 20, 29, 36, 39, 46, 57, and 25c). I answered it in paragraphs (11a, 29a, 45a, 63a, and 74a). I demonstrated, from his proof text (Luke 3:6), that **all flesh** included social, age, and gender distinctions; as well as racial distinctions. This supports my basic argument. The pouring included Jewish daughters, who only received their gifts by the laying on of the hands of an apostle (apostleship); therefore apostleship was included in Joel 2. Since Joel 2 did not begin to be fulfilled until Acts 2 (paragraph 39b), apostleship did not come until Acts 2. The following categorical syllogism sets forth my basic argument:

Major Premise: All Jewish daughters who received miraculous gifts, in the Christian dispensation, are those who received their gifts by means of apostleship.

Minor Premise: All the Jewish daughters mentioned in Joel 2:28-32 are those who received miraculous gifts in the Christian dispensation.

Conclusion: All the Jewish daughters mentioned in Joel 2:28-32 are those who received their gifts by means of apostleship.

The only way Reg can answer this argument is to join with the Pentecostals and make the false claim that persons other than the

apostles could lay hands on people and impart miraculous gifts or allow a direct impartation of these gifts to others than the apostles and Cornelius. Reg, either accept this point or give the reader a third alternative.

42b The following commentary on Acts 2:17-18 will help to explain the doctrine of the Holy Spirit baptism. **And it shall be** (Future tense) **in the last days** (The end of the Jewish age or Jewish system.) **saith God,** (God inspired the prophet Joel.) **I will pour forth** (This word is translated “shed forth” [KJV] in Acts 2:33. This verb is compounded with the preposition εκ. Dana and Mantey say “Verbs compounded with απο, εκ, and παρα in the very nature of the case take the ablative where these prepositions bring to the verb the idea of separation.” [page 201] Therefore, this is introducing an ablative case noun [Spirit].) **of** (απο The preposition απο takes only the ablative case.) **my Spirit** ([The Holy Spirit]. The word “Spirit” is in the ablative case or case of the origin. Therefore, the Spirit is the origin of what was poured forth. This confirms the prior proof that this is figurative language and not literal language. The reader should be aware that this is not the ablative case because of the usage of the preposition απο, but the ablative forces the usage of this preposition. This same argument proves that Acts 2:33 and 10:45 are the ablative case. It would have been the ablative case without the preposition απο but it would have been more difficult to prove it. Davis says: “ ... the case calls in the preposition to aid in expressing more sharply the meaning of the case. It is the case which indicates the meaning of the preposition, and not the preposition which gives the meaning to the case.’ Then, strictly speaking, prepositions [in Greek] do not ‘govern’ cases.” [page 44]). **upon all flesh:** (This refers to: all races, both sexes, and all social classes. This expression is used in a broader sense than just racial distinctions in Luke 3:6, Isaiah 40:5, James 1:10-11, and I Peter

1:24-25.) **And** (The word “and” is preceded by a colon which introduces “an explanatory clause or expression.” [Brewton, and others, page 395] It was; therefore, the opinion of the translators that this begins an explanation of the expression “all flesh.”) **your sons** (Jewish sons) **and your daughters** (Jewish daughters) **shall prophesy**, (This only came through the laying on of the hands of the apostles [Acts 8:18].) **And your young men shall see visions** (Under the Old Testament very few young men and even fewer women prophesied or saw visions. This was God’s way of showing that these distinctions were broken down.) **and your old men shall dream dreams:** (The colon introduces an explanation.) 18 **Yea and on my servants and on my handmaidens** (Few slaves were empowered to work miracles in the Old Testament. Under the New Testament they would have the same rights as free men.) **in those days** (Last days of Israel.) **Will I pour** (This is a verb compounded with the preposition εκ; therefore, this introduces an ablative case noun.) **forth of** (απο which introduces an ablative case noun. This should be translated “from.”) **my Spirit;** (The Holy Spirit) **and they** (The male, female, young, old, rich, poor, slaves, free-men, Jews, and Gentiles.) **shall prophesy.** (Miraculously speak for God)

43b In reply to 28c I point out that God does not say that the 12 were apostles before Pentecost. If I prove that Matthew 10 is prolepsis your assertion is disproven. You completely ignore my proof of prolepsis.

44b In reply to 28c I point out that Reg has admitted that Acts 1 and 2 were not divided originally (paragraph 27c). The very next verse (Acts 2:1) has the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Reg, prove that these (Acts 1:26 and Acts 2:1) did not happen at the same time. Prove that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was not God’s answer to their prayer. Reg cannot prove this and will not prove it.

45b Judas had apostleship in prospect (paragraph 28c), just as we have eternal life in prospect (I Corinthians 9:27). Our eternal life is conditional (Revelation 2:10) as was his apostleship.

46b Reg, I did not say that they were called apostles 10 times before Pentecost. (paragraph 28c) I said they were called apostles 10 times before Acts 2 (paragraph 16b). The difference in these may seem negligible but it is important since Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were written after Pentecost. Again, I point out that Jesus NEVER calls them apostles except in prophecy of something that was to transpire after Pentecost (Luke 11:49). The Holy Spirit used prolepsis when He inspired men to write and call them apostles. I quote my 16b again: "If I prove that apostleship came after the ascension of Christ; then I have proven that the references to the disciples being called apostles are examples of 'prolepsis.'" Did they work the signs of an apostle before Pentecost (I Corinthians 9:2 and II Corinthians 12:12)? What were the signs of an apostle, if not the ability to lay on their hands and impart gifts; and the power to work all types of miracles? Reg has to deny that apostleship enabled these men to work all miracles (paragraph 44c).

47b The reader should notice that Reg has still not set forth what figure of speech he affirms the baptism in the Holy Spirit to be (paragraph 29c). He is now making the assertion that all baptisms are figurative (paragraphs 29c and 30c). Reg, I was literally immersed (baptized) in water when I was baptized in accordance with Acts 2:38 and Mark 16:16 (nothing figurative here). Reg, what figure of speech is the baptism in the Holy Spirit? Please answer another question; what figure of speech is the baptism of Acts 2:38?

48b Reg has made some headway in that he now admits that

something can be a figure (nonliteral) and still be real (paragraph 30c). Unfortunately he does not apply this truth to my argument (the Spirit was not literally poured forth does not imply that “the Holy Spirit was not poured forth.” [paragraphs 29c, 30c, and 39c]) Perhaps he got the point of my paragraphs 17b, 18b, and 28b.

49b With your reasoning in paragraph 31c we could conclude that the prophets that were set into the church (I Corinthians 12:28) were prophets before entering the church. You have everything all scrambled up with your illustration of setting eggs under a hen. You should know that an illustration does not prove anything. Your basic argument is:

Major Premise: All A are B

Minor Premise: The apostles are those who were set into the church.

Conclusion: The apostles are those who were in that office before being set into the church.

In order to make your syllogism valid (properly constructed) your A term must be: “those who are set into the church.” and your B term must be: “those who were in that office before being set into the church.” This makes your major premise: All those who were set into the church are those who were in that office before being set into the church. This is a classic example of begging the question.

50b Your reply in paragraph 34c completely misses the point of my question (paragraph 26b). I will now ask you the same questions I asked concerning Paul (paragraph 25b). You never did answer these questions about Paul. Please answer them along with these concerning Matthias. Did Matthias receive the power to work miracles (apostleship) by the laying on of hands, by a direct impartation from heaven, or by some third method. Please tell the reader which one of these three is true. I predict that you will not

answer this question. Please reread paragraphs 25b and 26b for additional points on this.

51b Reg makes another series of assertions in paragraph 36c. He has a non-miraculous apostleship, an apostleship without the Holy Spirit, and apostleship without the signs of an apostle (I Corinthians 9:2 and II Corinthians 12:12), an apostleship for a non-Christian, and for one who is not in the church. Who can believe this assertion? Prove that such an apostleship existed!

52b In reply to paragraph 47c you should be aware that when a New Testament prophet or apostle spoke or wrote it was the same as if Jesus (the Lord) spoke (I Corinthians 14:37). So the Lord **did** say (implicitly) that prophets came **only** by the laying on of the hands of an apostle (Acts 8:18, Acts 19:1-7, etc.).

53b Reg has misunderstood my question in 48c, when he replied to my 37b. Reg this question **can** be answered with a simple “yes” or “no!” This question is not a complex question (one with three or more answers)! My argument is a disjunction of the form: Either p or ~p (either p or not p). This disjunction has only two possible answers (law of the excluded middle). Reg, either Joel’s prophecy included apostleship or it did not include it. Which is it? Reg has a dilemma: (1) if he says that Joel 2 includes apostleship he must take my position and (2) if he says it does not include apostleship he implicitly teaches Pentecostalism. This follows because he must accept that Jewish daughters received their gifts from Joel 2 and not from apostleship. Jesus placed the Jews into a dilemma (Matthew 21:27), we shall see how Reg deals with my dilemma. If you leave out apostleship you have them getting their gifts by a direct impartation from heaven. Reg calls a direct impartation (a pouring) a baptism. Reg what figure of speech is this?

54b In reply to paragraph 49c I must point out that Reg makes at least two errors in this paragraph: (1) All baptisms are not the result of pouring and (2) even if you could prove that all baptisms are the result of pouring it would not prove that pouring equals baptism.

55b In reply to paragraph 50c I must point out that I did not make any argument based upon the words in italics in paragraph 38b. My main argument was that the gifts, including apostleship, were given after His ascension. Reg did not address this argument at all. Please address my arguments in your next negative.

56b In reply to paragraph 51c I call the readers attention to the fact that if apostleship came before the last days, then it cannot be part of Joel's prophecy. You misquote me in paragraph 51c. Certainly apostleship is the heart of Joel's prophecy, but it is implicitly taught in the Scriptures. I did not say that Joel said it explicitly.

57b Reg you should have made the following argument in answer to my question of what the earmarks of a baptism in the Holy Spirit are (paragraph 38c):

Major Premise: All \_\_\_\_\_ are instances which prove that the event is a baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Minor Premise: Acts 2 is an instance of \_\_\_\_\_.

Conclusion: Acts 2 is an instance which proves that the event is a baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Reg should be able to insert his argument into the blank of the following syllogism.

Major Premise: All \_\_\_\_\_ are instances which prove that the event is a baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Minor Premise: Acts 10 is an instance of \_\_\_\_\_.

Conclusion: Acts 10 is an instance which proves that the event is

a baptism in the Holy Spirit.

My basic argument was of the following form: If \_\_\_\_\_ was manifested by someone who was not baptized in the Holy Spirit; then \_\_\_\_\_ was not an earmark of the Holy Spirit baptism. Tongue speaking was manifested by someone who was not baptized in the Holy Spirit (Acts 19:1-7). Therefore, tongue speaking was not an earmark of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. This basic argument can be applied to several possible earmarks of a baptism in the Holy Spirit (paragraph 33a). The following cannot be earmarks of a baptism in the Holy Spirit: (1) Tongue speaking (Acts 19:1-7), (2) healing (Acts 8:7), (3) casting out demons (Acts 8:7), (4) prophesying (Acts 13:1), (5) being an evangelist (Acts 21:8), etc. Because Reg has claimed that Paul did not receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit he must also reject the following as earmarks of a baptism in the Holy Spirit: (1) the ability to impart gifts by the laying on of hands (Acts 19:1-7), (2) a reception of miraculous powers directly from heaven (Acts 9), (3) a pouring of the Holy Spirit (Titus 3:5-6), and (4) raising the dead (Acts 20:10). I hope that this debate will not end without brother Rogers listing the earmarks of a baptism in the Holy Spirit. Reg claims that he has listed these earmarks in prior paragraphs (paragraph 38c), but I cannot find them. Reg for the benefit of an old country boy, please list them again in plain English. If Reg says that it is a direct impartation from heaven of the Holy Spirit without the laying on of the hands of an apostle that is the earmark of a baptism in the Holy Spirit he has opened a can of worms that will eat him alive. If he says this he has only two options: either Paul received the baptism in the Holy Spirit or he did not. If not, then Paul received apostolic power by the laying on of hands. He could make the wild assertion that there were two kinds of direct impartation of the Holy Spirit, one a baptism and the other something else. He has already made this kind of assertion on the falling of the Spirit (Paragraphs 27a, 42,

46, 40a, 50a, 53, 57a, 72a).

58b Reg claims that I misquote him (paragraphs 31c and 35c) the reader can determine for himself if I misquote him. I paraphrase him when I do not use quotation marks and quote him when I use quotation marks.

#### REFERENCES

Brewton, J. E.; and others. (1962) *Using good English*. River Forest, Illinois: Laidlaw Brothers Publishers.

Dana, H. E.; Mantey, J. R. (1955) *A manual grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Toronto: The MacMillan Co.

Davis, William H. (1923) *Beginner's grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York: Harper & Row Pub.

### THIRD NEGATIVE - Reg Rogers

52c Because the Holy Spirit and baptism in the Holy Spirit came on the same day, at the same time “Apostleship must have come at that time” (M. F.). Because two things come at the same time doesn’t mean they are the same thing. The locomotive and the caboose arrive at the station at the same time. If the switchman thought they were the same, he would get laid off. The baptism in the Holy Spirit and the day of Pentecost came at the same time but that didn’t make them equal. The affirmative has declared that the apostleship did not come until the day of Pentecost. We have shown several times that the apostleship was present before Pentecost. We shall show it again, and again. Hold on.

53c I have made much of “all flesh”? Not I, but the Holy Spirit. “All flesh” as used by Joel meant (1) the Jews and (2) the Gentiles. I have asked, is there more flesh in “all flesh” than the Jew and the Greek? The gospel was ordered preached “to the Jew first and also to the Greek” (Romans 1:16). That’s all. Is that all flesh? Marion said he showed that “all flesh” included social, age, and gender distinctions as well as racial distinctions” (41b). Does “racial distinctions” means Jews and Gentiles? Now, Marion, are you contending that in the baptism of the Holy Spirit “racial distinctions” meant both Jews and Gentiles? What do you mean? If you mean that “all flesh” means Jews and Gentiles, your social, age, and gender contentions are gratuitous.

54c Marion declares that the only way Reg can answer his argument on Jewish daughters is to join the Pentecostals. His words re Jewish daughters are unclear. Joel said “Your sons and your daughters.” Also old men, servants and handmaidens were mentioned. But you appear to be saying that Joel excluded Gentiles. Is that what you

say? The prophecy of Joel covers the whole Christian age to the end of time: “Before the day of the Lord come, that great and notable day.” Marion, you keep comparing me with the Pentecostals; they believe more truth on the baptism of the Holy Spirit than you do. They believe that there were two instances of the baptism of the Spirit, at least, while you don’t believe there were any. I confess to being more like them on this proposition than like you. The Pentecostals think that everybody receives the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and you think that nobody received it. No error has any merit. I would as soon have that of the Pentecostals as that of Fox.

55c Marion, you resort to a commentary to prove your proposition. Is this a confession that the Bible is deficient to do the job? Also you go into an unknown tongue (for the most part Greek) to prove your proposition. Is that a confession that your proof is not in the English Bible?

56c You chide me before our readers that I did not tell them what figure of speech baptism in the Holy Spirit is. You yourself declared that baptism in the Holy Spirit is a figure of speech. Why didn’t you say which figure it is? Baptism in water is declared by the text to be a figure (I Peter 3:21); the text, however, did not tell us what figure it is. Was the Holy Spirit deficient then? Your quibble makes no sense. Whence comest thou, Marion? Let me put it this way: Where are you coming from? The Bible as it reads does not suit your proposition, so you doctor it up with your own commentary. Also, you changed my argument into your paraphrase; have you been reading The Living Bible Paraphrase? I don’t change what you write. I can answer your arguments without altering what you actually say.

57c In your paragraph 42b you attempt to make all flesh, Jewish sons

and daughters. I think you failed. I understand you to be saying that the term “all flesh” in the Bible means Jewish daughters, and other Jews but no Gentiles. But the word of the Lord says: “A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; a controversy with the nations; he will enter into judgment with all flesh: as for the wicked, he will give them to the sword, saith Jehovah” (Jeremiah 25:31). Then: “Behold, I am Jehovah the God of all flesh” (Jeremiah 32:26). You think “Jewish daughters” don’t you? “Is God the God of Jews only? is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yea, of the Gentiles also” (Romans 3:30). Actually, Marion, every time the Bible uses the phrase “all flesh” it means Jews and Gentiles. The wool you are pulling over our eyes is half cotton. Marion, you make “the last days” the “last days of Israel” (p. 51). I quote you faithfully. You have added to the word of the Lord. That doesn’t put you in happy company. You embellish the text of God. Joel and Peter said “last days.” But after all, Joel and Peter spoke by the inspiration of God.

58c In your paragraph 43b you say “God does not say that the 12 apostles were apostles before Pentecost ... prolepsis (my) assertion is disproven. (I) completely ignore (your) proof.” Marion, let me show you the sophistry of your prolepsis again. The apostles were called (Note carefully, Marion) apostles, in a direct quotation before Pentecost. This is exactly what was said before the coming of Pentecost: “And they prayed, and said. Thou Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show of these two the one whom thou hast chosen to take the place in this ministry and apostleship from which Judas fell away that he might go to his own place” (Acts 1:14). Marion, you are affirming that the apostleship was non-existent before Pentecost. A faithful quotation before Pentecost speaks of the apostleship being in existence. Marion, your contention is dead. This is no more the figure prolepsis than the saying of Jesus to the dying thief, “Today shalt thou be with me in paradise” (Lk. 23:43). If you

don't know that, you know less than those who will read these pages, and you should be ashamed of that. It will be said of you, "Darkness hath blinded his eyes."

59c You said, "If I prove that apostleship came after the ascension of Christ; ... I have proved that the references to the disciples being called apostles are examples of 'prolepsis'." You are changing your tune in this statement. Above you stated "God does not say that the 12 apostles were apostles before Pentecost." Now you are going back of Pentecost. Where do you stand? You will have to decide sometime. We have thoroughly abolished your groundless assertion re prolepsis, above in paragraph 58c. Come alive. The words that declare that the apostleship was in existence before the New Testament were spoken before Pentecost and declared factual at the speaking. "This ministry and apostleship," Peter said to the multitude; one had to be chosen to take the place of Judas who fell from it. What did he fall from? The ministry and apostleship. M. Fox preaches that Judas did not fall from the apostleship because the apostleship was not there for him to fall from. M. Fox preaches that Judas fell from a figure of speech. M. Fox preaches nonsense. The multitude thought, because of what Peter preached before Pentecost that another was chosen by the Lord to take Judas' place before Pentecost, because he did. M. Fox preaches that Judas was never an apostle; he preaches that because he prefers to preach more than the gospel. Peter recommended Paul's preaching, and Paul said that if any should preach something else he would be cursed. I believe it. Marion, who will follow you when they see you leading them from what is written? You are telling them that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the gift of the apostleship. There's not a word of truth in that. John was the first to tell of the promise of baptism in the Holy Spirit, in the N. T., and it did not come upon the apostles because they held that office. I have shown this several times above. The

immersion in the Holy Spirit did not come upon the apostles for their benefit, but for the benefit of those who saw and heard it. I've shown this numerous times, but I never tire of doing so, for my love of the text of God. "Judas had apostleship in prospect"---Marion Fox. And why did Marion write that? Because it is not written in Scripture.

60c If Judas fell from where he never was, he didn't have far to fall. In fact, he didn't fall at all. If he fell from that which wasn't there, he didn't fall from anything. Your contention, Marion, is nonsense. "And when it was day he called his disciples; and he chose from them twelve, whom he named apostles" (Lk 6:13). Regardless of when Luke was written, it tells when Jesus opened his mouth and said the name of that office. Applying the name of a figure of speech to this is washed away in Acts 1 which shows that the apostles, including Judas, were in that office from the time of Luke 13. Marion said that Judas had the apostleship in prospect. Jesus said he had "woe" in prospect: "For the Son of man goeth even as it is written of him but woe unto that man through whom the son of man is betrayed! Good were it for that man if he had not been born" (Mr. 14:21). That's what Judas had in prospect. Marion said he had the apostleship in prospect. Who is right?

61c Marion: "Judas had the apostleship in prospect." But Judas was dead before the apostleship came, according to Marion. Prophecy said Judas would be dead before (according to Marion's contention) the coming of the apostleship, but this doesn't faze Marion in his headlong plunge into what is not written.

62c Did the apostles do the signs of an apostle before Pentecost? What does that have to do with the proposition? When they went as Jesus commanded, they were given power and used it to "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons" (Mt. 10:8). These were the

signs needed to go among their own people, but after Pentecost they would go into all the world and greater powers would be needed. God gave as the need arose. You know that. Why don't you preach it? Why don't you admit it, Marion? There isn't enough in the Bible to furnish you enough to preach; you have to deny what it says, and supply what it doesn't say. "Reg has to deny that the apostles had power to work all miracles." It is the Bible that tells what powers the apostles had. Jesus didn't have all power until he was raised from the dead (Mt. 28:18) but he was the Christ before the power (Mt. 16:16); or is that the figure of prolepsis meaning that he had the office of the Christ in prospect?

63c Marion, you, yourself, stated that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was a figure. I stated the same. What figure of speech is it? You find fault with my statement that all baptisms are figurative. You counter that your baptism was: "I was literally immersed (baptized) in water when I was baptized in accordance with Acts 2:38 and Mark 16. Nothing figurative here." The reader should notice, saith Marion, that Reg has still not set forth what figure of speech he affirms the baptism in the Holy Spirit to be. Let Reg say that: the reader should notice that Marion said the baptism in the Holy Spirit is figurative, and that he has not told us which, or what figure he means.

64c "What figure of speech is the baptism of Acts 2:38, Reg?" Answer: The same figure of which Peter spoke, saying: "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us" (I Peter 3:21). Marion thinks his flesh was cleansed when he was immersed in water. Peter said "figure" and the Holy Spirit didn't allow him to tell which or what figure. Should I? Marion doesn't. The baptism of which Peter spoke is a figure, and because Fox was immersed in water, he thinks the removal of dirt from the body, in baptism is good enough for him. You have your

wish, sir.

65c Marion, if your contending that Joel's prophecy included the choosing, and the appointment of the apostles before Pentecost, you are in error; for Jesus chose, selected, and appointed the apostles (save Paul) before the day of Pentecost, as I have shown numerous times. I am just saying that the prophecy of Joel does not mean, include, or hint at your doctrine on apostleship. No, an illustration doesn't prove an argument, but one can make the point plain with illustrations; all preachers do so. You can't set a hen without the brooding eggs. God did set the apostles in the church; they had to be there to set in else he couldn't have done it. You know that. Only you think they were not apostles at all. Joel told what the apostles would do, and they did it.

66c "All those who were set into the church are those who were in that office before being set into the church", has to be Reg's major premise? I haven't said so. It isn't so. Marion attributes to me that which implies sophistry. I teach the truth. The apostles were all apostles before they were set in the church---that's the truth of the Bible as I have shown fifty times. If Marion's saying were my major premise I would change it to the language of the text. That which he attributes to me, which I didn't say, he says is a classic example of begging the question. All the stones of the temple built by Solomon were prepared ahead of time, then they were all set in the building without the sound of a hammer. Were they all stones before being set in the building? This is not just an illustration; the church of Christ is his building (I Cr. 3:16). "Ye (Christians) as living stones are built up a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (I Pt. 2:5). John prepared all those who were the first members of the church, and they were set in. Then, "And there were added unto them in that day

about three thousand souls” (Acts 2:41). Marion, you ought to spend more time in the Scriptures and less time smattering in Greek. You ought to spend more time reading the Scriptures and less time smattering in Coti. This, because something is getting you out of the Bible, far out and away.

67c As for the horns of a dilemma I am supposed to face: I see nothing but muley cows. Joel’s prophecy did not foretell the coming of the apostles on the day of Pentecost. He didn’t deal in fiction. You, Marion, are obligated to show that Paul was baptized in the Holy Spirit. You haven’t. You won’t. Paul had all apostolic gifts without the baptism in the Holy Spirit, therefore did not need the baptism in the Holy Spirit. All the apostles had those gifts without that immersion. Baptism in the Holy Spirit was to show that the salvation promised to Abraham and his seed---all flesh---all the families of the earth was fulfilled in Christ. Marion, you can see the promise was to all flesh, else you are without sight. Baptism in the Holy Spirit at Pentecost showed the multitude of Jews assembled there that the promise made to Abraham was fulfilled to some of the families of the earth. They could not see, right then, that the Gentiles were in the promise also. That was about ten years up the road. But in due time they were ready to be shown that the Gentiles also were to share in the blessing. therefore Peter was called to the house of Cornelius. Peter saw by a vision and by other things that in every nation those that fear God and work righteousness are acceptable with him. All flesh. Yes, sir. the witnesses with Peter returned with him to Jerusalem and made known all these things. The Jews were convinced that God had granted repentance also unto Gentiles (Acts 11). You know that.

68c Marion, you deny that the Gentiles were immersed in the Holy Spirit, but Peter declared that they were. He said in his report “And

as I began to speak (to the Gentiles), the Holy Spirit fell on them even as on us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit” (Acts 11:16). Peter said the Holy Spirit fell on the Gentiles. Enough fell on them to immerse them, for it was “as on us at the beginning.” The promise of the baptism was that it should be upon all flesh. That the events that took place in the house of Cornelius upon Peter’s visit to them fulfilled the promise of immersion in the Spirit of all flesh, there is no doubt. There hasn’t been an instance since, except in the imaginations of Pentecostals.

69c Marion, you keep saying I teach Pentecostalism. I keep in touch with the Pentecostals, and they say they don’t believe anything I teach about Pentecost. They claim, as you, that their women are baptized in the Holy Spirit.

70c You make out like I haven’t given the earmarks of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I have, more than once. You attempt to deflect the attention of our readers from what I write, don’t you? I gave some of the earmarks in paragraph 68c above. You confess to blindness. Bless you, and buy eye-salve of the Great Physician.

71c You attribute to me things of the Holy Spirit (53b). Marion, you keep talking about Jewish daughters. Didn’t they have any sons? At Pentecost the apostles whom Jesus had ordained, and whom the Lord would ordain, by lot received power from on high---the promise of the Father. In that power lay the power to impart the spiritual gifts already mentioned. Marion thinks I implicitly teach Pentecostalism. Does he say this because both the Pentecostals and I teach the truth on the baptism in the Holy Spirit for both Gentiles and Jews (Acts 2, 10 and 11)? I am pleased that the Pentecostals teach that Cornelius was baptized in the Holy Spirit. To that extent they are fighting on

my side.

72c Marion wants to know if I am saying that Joel included apostleship? Answer: Not as Fox teaches apostleship! He thinks all questions can be answered “yes” or “no”. If it is not clear what the querist is asking, a “yes” might mean something of which you are not aware. Marion wants to know if I deny that Joel taught what Marion is teaching? Answer: Yes! Joel, for instance, said his prophecy would be fulfilled in “the last days.” Marion said “the last days of the Jewish nation” or some such thing. The text of God does not please Marion, so he doctors it up to suit himself. That comes with a price, too. Does Acts 2:38, “And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit” mean the apostles should receive the gift of the apostleship? No. Does it mean they should receive the person of the Holy Spirit? No. What does it mean? It means that they (the multitude that should obey), Jews out of every nation under heaven, upon immersion and repentance for the remission of sins, would receive the gift that was promised from the time of Abraham: all the spiritual blessings that Christ would bring. And, looking to the time of the conversion of the Gentiles Peter added, “For the promise is to you and to your children and to them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him.” God called none save Jews and Gentiles (all flesh).

73c I am accused of teaching that pouring equals baptism. To that I plead guilty if enough of the element is poured out. Marion is thinking of the “baptisms” at the hands of some sectarians who pour three spoonfull of water on babies. They don’t pour on enough, but God did when he poured out his Spirit upon all flesh. God was like L. R. Wilson, who said, “I have no objection to pouring for baptism if you pour on enough to bury them.” But what does this have to do with the proposition? Marion said: “THE SCRIPTURES TEACH

THAT THE BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT IS THE SAME AS THE MIRACULOUS GIFT OF APOSTLESHIP.” Cornelius was immersed in the Holy Spirit but that didn’t put him into the apostleship. I have given the Scriptures so many times that show Cornelius, his kinsmen, and friends were immersed in the Holy Spirit that I consider it superfluous to go over them again except to say, quoth Peter: “As I began to speak (to the Gentiles) the Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning” (Acts 11:15). What was the effect of the speaking in tongues at the beginning? (on Pentecost). This: “We, (Jews from every nation) hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God” (Acts 2:11). What was the effect of the Gentile’s speaking in tongues when the Spirit fell on them as on the Jews (apostles) at the beginning? This: the witnesses, believing Jews that came with Peter to the Gentile house, “We hear them speak with tongues and magnify God (Acts 10:46). I quote Scripture because I believe it furnished the man of God completely unto every good work.

74c Did Joel’s prophecy include the apostleship? Marion, you stated “The apostleship must have come at that time (Acts 2). If you mean, did Joel’s prophecy include the coming of the apostleship in Acts 2, the answer is no. It was present before the coming of the events of Acts 2. It was diminished by one, and one was added to it before Acts 2, as I have shown abundantly. Jesus didn’t call them by that name after Pentecost except by the Holy Spirit, and he did that before Pentecost also (Acts 1:20-28). Marion your contention is as pointless as the flat side of a pancake. The figure of speech prolepsis means “the representation of a future act, as if presently existing or accomplished.” Let us try that definition out of the case before us: Acts 1:23-25, “And they put forward two, Joseph called Barsabbas who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And they prayed and said, Thou Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show of these two the

one whom thou wilt someday choose to take the place is this ministry that will come at some future time, and this apostleship which shall come at some future time, from which Judas shall fall at some future day.” Perverted Scripture never teaches the truth. Prolepsis is as far from Acts 1:23-25 as the east is from the west. East is east, and west is west and Fox has brought the twain together.

## FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE - Marion R. Fox

59b Reg has completely overlooked my arguments and missed many of my points. I agree that it took more than coincident events to make these events a baptism in the Holy Spirit (paragraph 52c), please refer to paragraph 2b. Joel 2:28-32 does not exclude Gentiles (paragraph 54c), it includes them through the laying on of hands and Cornelius' household. There were two instances of baptism in the Holy Spirit (Acts 2-the 12 apostles and Acts 9-Paul, paragraph 54c). One can have more than one thing in prospect (paragraph 60c). No women were baptized in the Holy Spirit (paragraph 69c).

60b When Reg says: "If you mean that 'all flesh' means Jews and Gentiles, your social, age, and gender contentions are gratuitous." (paragraph 53c) This argument is unsound. The expression includes, but is not limited to, racial distinctions (paragraph 57c). If God broke down the racial distinctions that does not mean that he has broken down gender, socioeconomic, or age distinctions. For example, he might not allow either Jewish or Gentile women to serve as priests. In the New Testament dispensation both Jewish and Gentile Christian women serve as priests.

61b Reg is now reasoning like a Pentecostal. When we prove that miracles ceased at the close of the apostolic age, from I Corinthians 13:8-10 and Ephesians 4:1-13, they retreat to passages like John 14-16, Acts 2:1-4, Acts 19:1-7, etc. as if these passages somehow negate our arguments from I Corinthians 13 and Ephesians 4. Reg retreats from my arguments (commentaries, paragraph 55c) on Acts 1:4-5 (paragraph 10b), Acts 2:17-18 (paragraph 42b), Ephesians 4:8-12 (paragraph 38b). Unfortunately the Pentecostals reason like Satan (Matthew 4:6) in that they pit one verse against another, but Jesus harmonized all passages of Scripture (Matthew 4:7). Reg, I

KNOW that Matthew 10:2, Mark 6:30, Luke 6:13, 9:10, 11:49, 17:5, 22:14, 24:10, Acts 1:2, and 1:26 are all prolepsis, because Paul said that apostleship came after the ascension in Ephesians 4:8-11 (paragraphs 40a, 3b, 4b, 20b, 36b, and 38b). It would pose a contradiction to interpret these passages literally, therefore they must be figurative (prolepsis). But Reg replied to this argument in paragraphs 8c, 12c, and 50c. His replies did not address my point that apostleship came after the ascension. Reg cites Acts 1:25 as proof that Paul must be wrong in his inspired teaching that apostleship came after the ascension (paragraph 12c). When confronted with Ephesians 4:8-11 Reg runs to Acts 1, but does not answer my argument on Ephesians 4, why did he not reply to it? It is too late to reply now, it would violate the rules of debate to introduce new arguments to which I cannot have an opportunity to give an answer. My Ephesians 4 argument thoroughly devastated his position, as evidenced by his total lack of reference to it in his last negative, if Reg could answer it he would have done so.

62b Reg does not like my appealing to the Greek (paragraphs 52, 62, 55c, and 66c), but he has done so in this debate (paragraph 21). In addition he typed part of a letter to me in Greek when we were corresponding, before the debate. Reg, if you deny this, I will print the letter when I print the debate. If you do not reply to this assertion, the reader will know it is true. The problem is, Reg cannot handle my arguments from the Greek.

63b Reg has totally overlooked my responses (cf. paragraphs 30a, 37, 39, 39a, 58a, 65a, 10b, 17b, and 18b). He makes the assertion: "You yourself declared that baptism in the Holy Spirit is a figure of speech. Why didn't you say which figure it is?" (paragraph 56c) He again makes the assertion: "... the reader should notice that Marion said the baptism in the Holy Spirit is figurative, and that he has not

told us which or what figure he means.” (paragraph 63c) Reg, I will answer you again, the baptism in the Holy Spirit was a metonymy where the cause (the Holy Spirit) was put in place of the effect (miraculous gift of apostleship). Reg, I respectfully request that you explain why you have made these assertions in light of what I have written in paragraphs 30a, 39a, 58a, 65a, 10b, 17b, and 18b, and with your responses in paragraphs 37 and 39. If you do not do anything else I request that you explain it for me and the readers. Reg, what figure of speech was the baptism in the Holy Spirit? Why are you afraid of answering this question?

64b Reg, your “all flesh” argument (paragraph 57c) assumes a vital part of one of my arguments. You assume that there is a consistency in the language of Scripture. That is, you assume that once you define an expression that definition will apply to other passages in which the same expression is found. I agree with this assumption (principle of hermeneutics). I have used this same principle in paragraphs 8a and 48a. I have shown that the expression “all flesh” means more than racial distinctions (paragraphs 45a, 63a, 41b, and 42b). You did not even reply to my linkage of your proof text (Luke 3:6) to James 1:9-11. I challenge the reader to find a single reference to James by Reg.

65b The principle of hermeneutics you assume (paragraphs 57c and 64b) also destroys another of your arguments. When you link Acts 11:16 to Acts 1:5 you tacitly admit that the ones being addressed are the same, that is the apostles (Acts 1:1-5). Since the apostles are the ones being addressed in Acts 1:5 you have been obligated to prove that Acts 11:16 does not refer exclusively to the apostles (paragraphs 8a, 21a, 26a, 36a, 48a, and 13b). You did not even try to prove this.

66b Reg, if Judas was promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit, then he should have gotten it, according to your line of reasoning (paragraph 58c).

67b Reg does not even understand a hypothetical syllogism because he totally misunderstands mine in paragraph 59c where he quotes my paragraph 46b. Reg, I used the word “if” in the same way the Jesus used the word “if” in John 15:20. There is no intention to convey any doubt. Reg, If I prove (AND I HAVE) that apostleship came after the ascension of Christ; then I have proven that the references to the disciples being called apostles are examples of ‘prolepsis (cf. paragraph 46b).’ The New Testament is replete with hypothetical syllogisms (cf. I Corinthians 15:12-19 etc.). In fact, I have proven it so completely that Reg has given up trying to answer my affirmative arguments. Reg, it is too late to answer arguments to which you have not already replied. The rules of debate do not allow you to introduce any new arguments, including answers to my arguments you have overlooked. You took 50 percent more space than we agreed to in your last negative, and most of it was irrelevant.

68b Reg, water baptism has nothing to do with the removal of dirt from the body of the Christian (paragraph 64c). Reg says: “Baptism in water is declared by the text to be a figure (I Peter 3:21); the text, however, did not tell us what figure it is.” (paragraph 56c) Reg the text **does** tell us what figure of speech is employed in I Peter 3:21. Peter said: “The like figure ἀντιτυπον” (antitype). Thayer says ἀντιτυπον means: “... In the N. T. language ἀντιτυπον as a subst. means 1. a thing formed after some pattern ... something in the Messianic times which answers to the type (see τυπος, 4 γ.) prefiguring it in the O. T...” (page 51) Reg, the figure is the salvation of Noah by the flood waters, the real thing is baptism. Water baptism is not a figure, it is the reality. Reg, are you saying

that Holy Spirit baptism is the antitype (paragraph 29c)? If so, the antitype of what?

69b The reasoning of brother Rogers is unsound in paragraphs 65c and 66c when he says that the disciples were apostles before being set into the church. I pointed out, in paragraph 49b, that the prophets were also set into the church (I Corinthians 12:28). Were they prophets prior to being set into the church? Certainly not. The Greek word  $\tau\iota\theta\eta\mu\iota$  is translated **hath set** in I Corinthians 12:28. Paul said **the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops ...** (Acts 20:28). The word translated **hath made** is  $\tau\iota\theta\eta\mu\iota$ , the same word translated **set** in I Corinthians 12:28. Were these men bishops (overseers KJV) before being set into that office? Certainly not! Paul was **appointed to his service** (I Timothy 1:12), **appointed a preacher and an apostle** (I Timothy 2:7), and **appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher**. (II Timothy 1:11). The word translated **appointed** is the Greek word  $\tau\iota\theta\eta\mu\iota$ , which is translated **hath set** in I Corinthians 12:28. There were more than the apostles and prophets set into the church in I Corinthians 12:28, but Reg has already admitted this (paragraph 8c). Reg said: “Paul was not set into the church as were the other apostles, he was baptized into it, ‘For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body.’” (paragraph 14c) Paul **was** set  $\tau\iota\theta\eta\mu\iota$  into apostleship (I Timothy 2:7 and II Timothy 1:11). Many of that very group being addressed, in I Corinthians 12:13, had been set  $\tau\iota\theta\eta\mu\iota$  into the body (I Corinthians 12:18). Remember, the body is the church (Ephesians 1:22-23).

70b Reg admitted several things in paragraph 71c which damage his position. Reg said: “ ... by lot received power from on high---the promise of the Father. In that power lay the power to impart the spiritual gifts already mentioned.” I demonstrated that Luke equates the Holy Spirit baptism to being endued with power (paragraphs 7b

and 10b). In paragraphs 49a, 53a, and 10b I inextricably linked the promise of the Father with the baptism in the Holy Spirit. If Joel 2:28-32 does not include apostleship and most gifts were received by the laying on of the hands of the apostles (apostleship, Acts 8:18), then most who received gifts did not do so by means of Joel's prophecy. Charts 7 and 13 explain my arguments on this point.

71b In paragraphs 16b and 46b I set forth that Jesus did not call the 12 disciples "apostles." I did not set this forth as a sufficient argument for my proposition but as a necessary argument. In order for my proposition to be true it is necessary for Jesus not to have called them "apostles" before Acts 2. Reg had made the erroneous assertion that the 12 "... were called and made apostles early in the ministry of Christ." (paragraph 11c) My argument was in answer to his error of paragraphs 11c, 18c, 19c, and 29c. Since Reg did not challenge this point it stands as being accepted by him. This follows because it is his duty to follow me and refute any error I might teach. This leaves the door open to my argument of prolepsis (paragraphs 11b, 20c, 16b, 33b, 43b, and 46b). My argument for prolepsis (figurative language) is from the principle that a passage must be interpreted as figurative language if it would pose a contradiction to interpret it literally. Since it would contradict the plain words of Paul (Ephesians 4:8-14) to interpret it literally it must be a figure of speech (prolepsis). I gave another argument for apostleship coming in Acts 2 (paragraph 41b). Where was the reply to paragraph 41b, certainly not paragraph 54c?

72b I hope that brother Rogers has not asserted that a Pentecostal who claims that the only evidence needed for a baptism in the Holy Spirit is tongue speaking and magnifying God is teaching error. If he has, then he is inconsistent. The only evidence of Acts 10 was tongue speaking and magnifying God, and since he has rejected

apostolic powers being granted by the Holy Spirit baptism, in Acts 2, he has accepted this error in the case of the apostles. We are guilty of the fallacy of inconsistency when we demand that Pentecostals demonstrate a gift which we are not willing to say that Cornelius received as a result of the events of Acts 10. This is one reason that we have trouble convincing the Pentecostals of their error. The position set forth by brother Rogers implies that the only evidence needed to prove that one has received a baptism in the Holy Spirit is tongue speaking and magnifying God. This is why I asked Reg what were the earmarks (what was unique) of a baptism in the Holy Spirit (paragraphs 20a, 33a, 37a, 50a, 59a, 27b, and 57b). Reg, charts 7 and 13 clarify my arguments on this point.

73b The reader should note how Reg replied to my question of 25b in paragraph 36c. The reader should also note how he replied to my question of 26b in paragraph 34c. He replied to my question of 31b in paragraph 43c. In addition, note his reply to my question of 35b in paragraphs 42c, 45c, and 46c. He did not answer any of these questions directly. If the reader would read my questions it is clear that Reg did not answer them. This is how some of my questions have been answered by Reg, and this makes it harder to debate.

74b If Jews did not need a confirmation that they were accepted of God; then the baptism in the Holy Spirit (Acts 2) could not be for the purpose of confirmation that the Jews were accepted of God. The Jews were arrogant in their attitude toward the Gentiles. John told them that God would punish them for their sins (Matthew 3:7-12). Jesus often warned them of the punishment of God for their sins (Matthew 21:33-46, 23:35-36, etc.). The reader should ask himself if Reg has proven that the Jews needed a confirmation that they were accepted by God. This is critical to his position. He has neither proven this, nor is he able to prove it. Please refer to chart 13.

75b Reg has now invented some new ways of replying to a dilemma: (1) call it a muley cow (paragraphs 53b and 67c), (2) ignore it (paragraphs 6b, 14c, 15c, 25b, and 26b), and (3) call it a complex question and refuse to set forth the alleged third answer when asked to do so (paragraphs 37b, 41b, 34c, 36c, 37c, 48c, 41b, and 50b). Reg, these new ways will not be in logic textbooks, except in the section entitled “Fallacies.”

76b Another objection is that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was promised to all of the converts of John (Luke 3:16). This could have been a promise to the apostles since they were disciples of John. This could have been a specific promise as those to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, and David. Later promises could limit the recipients, as those to Abraham, Isaac, etc. (paragraphs 12b and 13b). This would concern all faithful Jews because the work of apostleship was the means by which the gospel was preached. The following categorical syllogism proves that the assertion that John promised baptism in the Holy Spirit to all Jews is false:

Major Premise: All those who were baptized in John’s baptism are those who were promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Minor Premise: Those of Acts 19:1-7 are those who were baptized in John’s baptism.

Conclusion: Those of Acts 19:1-7 are those who were promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

It is evident that this conclusion is false (Acts 19:2-3). Since the syllogism is valid, the minor premise is true, and the conclusion is false; the major premise must be false. When I pressed Reg to tell the reader who was promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit (paragraph 35b) he did not give me a direct answer (paragraphs 23c, 24c, 42c, 45c, 46c). Reg, I would still like to know who was promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

77b I have repeatedly asked Reg to list the earmarks of (tell what was unique about) a baptism in the Holy Spirit (paragraphs 20a, 27, 33a, 37a, 44, 47, 50a, 53, 59a, 27b, 38c, 57b, and 70c). He has not done so. If he would list the earmarks he would be in a dilemma. Even now he cannot list them because the reader will know that his position is weak. I ask the reader to read this debate and list the earmarks, if you can. I have asked several gospel preachers to read it and list the earmarks, and they confessed that they could not determine what he was saying. Reg, for the benefit of an old country boy, please list them again for me. Fill in the blanks, the earmarks of a baptism in the Holy Spirit are: (1)\_\_\_\_\_, (2)\_\_\_\_\_, (3)\_\_\_\_\_, (etc.)\_\_\_\_\_. Reg will not fill in the blanks, for to do so would devastate his position. Reg could have silenced my question by merely answering it again and citing the paragraphs where he previously answered it. I cannot find them in paragraph 68c, as you claim (paragraph 70c). I answered his questions of paragraphs 56c and 63c (cf. paragraph 63b) even though I had already answered them and he acknowledged it (paragraphs 37 and 39). Reg, your failure to list them again proves that your position is weak. Reg, we could have saved a lot of space in this debate if you would have simply said the earmarks of a baptism in the Holy Spirit are: \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, etc.\_\_\_\_\_. Refer to charts 7 and 13.

78b Reg tacitly admitted that the apostles did not work the signs of an apostle (I Corinthians 9:2 and II Corinthians 12:12) prior to Acts 2 (paragraphs 46b, 62c, and 71c). Reg can escape this by claiming that they had an inferior apostleship before Acts 2 (they could not work all miracles or impart gifts to others). Reg gave me a necessary point in my argument by doing this. He gave me the point that the

twelve did not work the signs of an apostle prior to Acts 2. This opens the door to my prolepsis argument even wider.

79b My assertion that the twelve were apostles when Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were written, and not before (paragraph 44c) should have read: were apostles when Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were written and not before Acts 2.

80b Reg claims that my resorting to a commentary to prove my proposition is a confession that the Bible is deficient to do the job (paragraph 55c). Reg, your argument is:

Major Premise: All A are B.

Minor Premise: Marion is one who resorts to a commentary to prove his proposition.

Conclusion: Marion is one who confesses that the Bible is deficient to do the job.

The major premise that would make the argument valid (properly constructed) is: All those who resort to a commentary to prove a proposition are those who confess that the Bible is deficient to do the job. But Reg has repeatedly resorted to commentaries in this debate, and in other writings, therefore Reg is one who confesses that the Bible is deficient to do the job. Reg, do you own any commentaries? Do you own any books that have commentaries in them? Have you ever preached expository sermons?

#### REFERENCES

Thayer, Joseph. (1970). *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House.

## FOURTH NEGATIVE - Reg Rogers

75 c For Marion's 59b: He said "I agree that it took more than coincident events to make these events a baptism in the Holy Spirit ... does not exclude Gentiles." Paragraph 59b. Now we have an agreement that both Jews and Gentiles were immersed in the Spirit. I am elated at our meeting of minds. And I also remember that Marion has said a dozen times that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is the same as the apostleship. On the manner of Gentiles receiving the baptism of the Holy Spirit (by the laying on of hands of an apostle) there is no scripture.

75c (\*Reg had two paragraphs numbered 75c) For Marion's 60b, p. 62: Marion admits that the expression "all flesh" "includes ... racial distinctions." Well that's settled now. Our minds have met. But Marion continued: "that does not mean that he has broken down gender, socioeconomic or age distinctions." Then the slave is an inferior brother. Females, then, are also second class, are they?

76c For M.'s 61b. Marion: "Reg is reasoning like a Pentecostal." They don't think so. Do you know how they reason? Have they become members of the church of Christ since I last debated with them? I do agree with the Pentecostals in all they preach for which they cite book, chapter and verse in the Bible, rightly divided. "Reg retreats from my arguments." Marion has "retreat from" confused with "charges at." Marion says I reason like Pentecostals, and that they reason like Satan. Am I offended by the oblique insult? Not at all. Desperate straits call for desperation. Christ's enemies said he was a Samaritan, and had a demon, but he wasn't, and didn't.

77c For M's 61b: "Paul said that the apostleship came after the ascension, in Ephesians 4:8-11." Did Paul say that? No. If he had,

Marion would have quoted Paul instead of Marion. Marion, you have arrayed Acts 1:25 against Eph. 4:11, that shows the apostleship was present before Pentecost, as I have shown ten times. The apostleship was ready to be set in the church, and was set in after the ascension of Jesus, as noted numerous times. Grandma, as noted before, had her setting eggs ready when the first hen set, and set the eggs under the settin' hen. John, as noted before, prepared a people for the Lord and they were as ready as they could be made, and they were set in the church to all these, in the same day were added about 3,000 souls. Remember?

78c For M's 62b: I have no objection to your use of the Greek to clarify the text, but I do object to your use of it to deny the text. You aren't worried about my not handling your arguments from Greek, but rather my handling them in English. Do you feel more secure in Greek? As for commentaries, have I quoted from any? my own or those of others?

79c For M's 63b: I didn't settle my mind on what figure of speech baptism in the Spirit is, until the last negative. I cannot be absolutely sure because the Holy Spirit didn't see fit to tell us precisely what figure he was using anywhere but in a few instances. It's too late to tell you the figure I came up with. I confess to having a lot to learn. Wait! Marion! I do have the right to tell you the figure I came up with, for you said, p. 63 (56c), lines 8, 9 "If you do not do anything else, I request you to explain for me, and the readers, Reg, what figure of speech was the baptism in the Holy Spirit? Alright, here it is: Meiosis. Meiosis is the representation of a thing that is less than it actually is, in order to compel greater esteem for it. The Spirit descended in a bodily form as a dove, as noted before, upon Jesus, and a voice came out of heaven, Thou art my beloved son ... (Lk. 3:22). In Acts 2:2, 3) the Spirit was manifested in the sound of a

mighty wind, and by cloven tongues like fire. These manifestations fill the room there, immersing those present. The Holy Spirit himself, present on these occasions said so. Marion, why did you force me to say that? Thank you. You can't reply in your summation without breaking the rules, you know. That's settled!

80c For M's 64b: No, I didn't reply to your linkage of Luke 3:6 to James 1:9-11, for there is no linkage.

81c For M's 65b: I have shown numerous times that Acts 1:5, John's promise of Holy Spirit immersion, and immersion in fire applied to more than the apostles. It was not made to apostles, but to Jews. You have been saying that the promise of baptism in the Spirit was to apostles. Marion, you don't know what you believe. The fact that the apostles were anon to be immersed in the Spirit was not announced in Acts 1 because they were apostles but because they were a part of all flesh, Jews. As for your 66b: Judas should have gotten the baptism of the Holy Spirit but for the fact that he fell and died before it came upon Peter, John and the others. You grasp straws. Your contention that the apostleship came upon the twelve at Pentecost, goes to pieces upon Judas who was before declared to have fallen from the apostleship.

82c For M's 67b I "don't understand a hypothetical syllogism." I don't deal with hypotheses (guesses). Try again. I don't believe our readers care what you think. You said, "Reg, If I prove (AND I HAVE), that the apostleship came after the ascension of Christ, then I have proven that the references to the disciples being called apostles are examples of 'prolepsis'." I refuted your prolepsis several times. I showed from a quotation that Judas fell from the apostleship before the day of Pentecost. You have him falling from something he was never in, and that wasn't even there. You work magical arts.

You tamper with the Bible. You conclude that the readers cannot judge for themselves what you have accomplished in this debate so as to brag yourself, as a toad puffeth: “I PROVED,” “ I have proven so completely that Reg has given up.” I didn’t know that. Don’t you wish it were so? I am yet swinging the sword. Now you know of its sharpness. Bless you.

83c For M’s 68b “Reg, water baptism has nothing to do with removal of dirt from the body.” I know that. I read it in the Bible, but you said your baptism was literal. So what other conclusion could we draw? Then you tell us what Thayer said. Why didn’t you look it up before the body-bath scene?

84c For M’s 69b: My reasoning is unsound when I say the disciples were apostles before being set in the church. Again, here, Marion, you add a word to what I said. The word “disciple” is not in paragraphs 65 and 66. Are you adding to be a crooked little man? We are supposed to be speaking to God first in this debate. You force me to take up my space replying to what I didn’t say. Just so you’re happy, I guess. I quote myself to justify myself. God did set the apostles in the church; they had to be there to set in, else he couldn’t have done it.

85c For Marion’s 69b: You call my reasoning unsound when I say the disciples were apostles before being set in the church. Not my reasoning, Marion, but that of the Holy Spirit, for it was he who said, before Pentecost: “Lord, thou who knowest the hearts of all men, show of these two the one whom thou hast chosen to take the place in this ministry and apostleship from which Judas fell away ... .” (Acts 1:24-25). I showed this before and you put it under a figure of speech for no reason at all. Prolepsis is “the representation of assumption of a future act or development as if presently existing or

accomplished.” That makes you say, Marion, that at some future time the place of Judas would be vacant, and that at some later date, the Lord would show which of two men he had chosen would show after Pentecost.

86c Your guess is shot full of holes. The prayer quoted for a replacement was for one to take the place of Judas from his ministry and apostleship. The ministry and apostleship was spoken of as existing when the prayer was made, and the casting of lots determined the choice of the Lord and he be put into place with the other apostles. You keep bringing up these arguments that were answered early on. Prolepsis calls for a future act or development; you apply it to developments and past acts. Must we conclude that you cannot tell the past from the future? You make the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the making and installation of the apostles the same thing, then at last you declare the Gentiles were baptized in the Holy Spirit. Are you putting Cornelius into the apostleship? This is your own trap; now try to extricate yourself. You cited a passage for Paul’s being baptized in the Holy Spirit, but it doesn’t say so. No passage says Paul was baptized in the Holy Spirit. I have answered this several times.

87c I blundered when I said the Holy Spirit baptism is the same figure as all baptisms. I don’t believe that at all. It is obvious that the merest tyro knows that baptism in the Holy Spirit is not the same figure as immersion in water. Brother F. E. Wallace Jr. put these merest tyros on notice, and I don’t wish to be numbered among them. I beg the pardon of our kind readers. Marion, you say “past perfect tense is not in Greek”, I am debating in English. Do you deny that the English Bible used the past perfect?

88c I have not space to say more, and lest I exceed again the limit, I

bring my portion of this discussion to an end. I am most thankful for the privilege of standing to defend the cause of Christ. I hope I have pleased him. I know that in a multitude of words there wanteth not sin. I have undoubtedly, however inadvertently, transgressed. Whoever is impartial, if they will point out to me where I have fallen short, I shall rejoice and make whatever corrections are called for. I send this forth in love.

89c Brother Fox now admits that the Gentiles were a part of all flesh, and that they were immersed in the Holy Spirit. I am thankful. I do not wish my words in this discussion to be construed as an attack upon the person of my treasured brother in Christ. I pray for his peace, prosperity, and good health as he spends his days in the service of Christ, the Father and the Holy Spirit. We can disagree without being disagreeable.

## AFFIRMATIVE SUMMATION - Marion R. Fox

81b In paragraph 2b I outlined the method of proving my proposition, the reader should reread that paragraph.

82b I proved that the baptism in the Holy Spirit and apostleship were both miraculous gifts in paragraphs: 2b, 3b, 20b, 21b, and 51b.

83b I proved that baptism in the Holy Spirit and apostleship imparted the same powers in paragraphs: 2b, 6b, 7b, 10b, 14b, 19b, 24b, 32b, 34b, 41b, 42b, 53b, 64b, 70b, and 78b.

84b I proved that baptism in the Holy Spirit and apostleship came at the same time in paragraphs: 2b, 4b, 16b, 33b, 36b, 38b, 39b, 40b, 43b, 44b, 46b, 49b, 55b, 56b, 59b, 61b, 67b, 69b, 71b, and 79b.

85b I proved that baptism in the Holy Spirit and apostleship came upon the same persons in paragraphs: 2b, 10b, 12b, 13b, 34b, 59b, 60b, 65b, and 76b.

86b I proved that baptism in the Holy Spirit and apostleship came in the same manner in paragraphs: 2b, 5b, 23b, 25b, 26b, 50b, and 57b.

87b I proved that baptism in the Holy Spirit and apostleship had the same sender in paragraphs: 2b and 8b.

88b I proved that baptism in the Holy Spirit and apostleship had the same purpose in paragraphs: 2b, 9b, 11b, 14b, 29b, 31b, 37b, 40b, 41b, 46b, 52b, 53b, 57b, 63b, 70b, 72b, and 74b.

89b In reply to your 75c I must note that you lifted my comments out of their context. I request that the readers read paragraph 59b for

themselves. We do **not** agree on this matter. Gentiles were **not** immersed in the Spirit.

90b Reg quotes me out of context in paragraph 75c (the second paragraph 75c). Reg was implying that the Lord did not need to mention other distinctions if he mentioned racial distinctions (paragraphs 53c and 57c). I merely pointed out that his assertion was not sound. I have repeatedly set forth that the Lord broke down all of these distinctions (paragraphs 11a, 29a, 45a, 57, 63a, 42b, 53c, 60b, and 64b).

91b Reg, Paul implicitly said that the apostleship came after the ascension, in Ephesians 4:8-11. Reg is the one who has arrayed Acts 1:25 against Ephesians 4:11, not Marion.

92b Reg it is not a matter of you quoting commentaries, it is a matter of your implicitly teaching that the usage of commentaries means that one is teaching that the Bible is deficient to do the job (paragraphs 55c, 80b, and 78c). In reply to your 78c (cf. paragraph 80b) I set forth the following: (1) Reg has published a commentary on the book of Romans, (2) Reg asserts that Marion is implying that the Bible is deficient, by writing a commentary, (paragraph 55c), (3) But Reg will steadfastly assert that his writing a commentary on Romans does not mean that he implies that the Bible is deficient. Reg is guilty of the fallacy of *special pleading*. The argument set forth by Reg in this debate has been an enthymeme of the first order (he has not explicitly stated his major premise). His major premise is: All those who write a commentary are those who imply that the Bible is deficient.

93b Reg waits until his last negative to inform the reader what figure of speech the baptism in the Spirit is (Meiosis-paragraph 79c). Reg

changed the punctuation of my 63b in order to justify his introduction of a new argument (79c). I will let this claim of meiosis slide by since it is so patently false that it does not need to be answered. Reg, this cannot be both a metaphor (John 3:5 and Romans 6:4 paragraph 83c) and meiosis (paragraph 78c). Reg said (paragraph 4) he was going to set forth the exact truth on the baptism in the Holy Spirit and admits (paragraph 79c) that he did not know the exact truth until his last negative.

94b In paragraph 81c Reg introduces a new thought which destroys his position. Reg says: "I have shown numerous times that Acts 1:5, John's promise of Holy Spirit immersion, and immersion in fire applied to more than the apostles." Reg admits that more than the apostles received John's promise. Reg, neither Cornelius nor other Gentiles were either baptized by John or preached to by John. Therefore Reg has taken the Pentecostal position on John's promise.

95b Reg again demonstrates his lack of knowledge of logic in paragraph 82c. Reg, hypothetical syllogisms are not "hypotheses (guesses)" as you assert (paragraph 82c). The New Testament is replete with hypothetical syllogisms (cf. the Greek conditional sentences).

96b Yes, Reg, I was literally immersed in water (paragraph 83c). Did they sprinkle you and call it baptism? Certainly not, you were literally immersed also, otherwise you are not my brother in Christ. Certainly the literal act of immersion (baptism) is metaphorically called a birth (John 3:5) and a burial (Romans 6:4), but the baptism is still a literal immersion in water.

97b Reg certainly has trouble with Paul (paragraph 86c). Paul has been a thorn in the side of Reg throughout this whole debate. I have

repeatedly made arguments with regard to Paul which he has not answered (paragraphs 3, 1a, 20, 25a, 33a, 50a, 54, 1b, 5b, 6b, 12c, 13c, 14c, 15c, 18c, 23b, 25b, 26b, 31b, 36c, 37c, 50b, 57b, 67c, 59b, 61b, and 69b). Reg, Paul either received apostleship by (1) a direct means (which you call a baptism), (2) the laying on of hands, or (3) a third method which you have failed to set forth when asked to do so. Tell us how Paul received apostleship and I will not write a reply to it. If Paul received his miraculous gifts from Ananias (Acts 9), then our *laying on of hands* argument is unsound. If there is a third method, what is it? A third method implies that the laying on of hands of an apostle was not the only way to receive miraculous gifts. Reg either has to make Pentecostal arguments or take my position on the apostle Paul. Therefore Reg **cannot** and **will not** answer this question!

98b Reg claims that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is the same figure of speech as the baptism in Acts 2:38 and Mark 16:16 (paragraph 29c), then he asserts that the baptism of Acts 2:38 is the same figure as I Peter 3:21 (paragraph 64c). This is the background of my reply of paragraph 68b. Reg is making progress when he admits that he is wrong (paragraph 87c). However he now admits that his arguments, in paragraphs 29c, 63c, and 64c, were wrong.

99b I will include a Scripture index at the end of this debate, when I print it. If the reader would make a list of the paragraphs which discuss a particular passage of Scripture and then follow them through the debate he will be able to easily follow the flow of the arguments.

## NEGATIVE SUMMATION - Reg Rogers

90c Paul did not say, explicitly or implicitly, that the apostleship came after the resurrection (except to him). I believe I have satisfactorily answered all the arguments offered by the affirmative. The reader may judge for himself.

91c I affirmed that there were two instances of immersion in the Spirit, and offered scripture in support; one instance on Pentecost, and the second at the house of Cornelius. There is no evidence that Paul was ever baptized in the Holy Spirit.

92c I am accused of lifting statements out of context. Did not Marion confess, in so many words that the Gentiles were baptized in the Holy Spirit? Hear him again "I (Marion) agree that it took more than coincident events to make these events a baptism in the Holy Spirit ... Joel 2:28 does NOT EXCLUDE GENTILES, it INCLUDES THEM through the laying on of hands (at) Cornelius' household."

93c For the sake of baptism in the Spirit, "all flesh" was sufficient; but for other considerations, other distinctions were made as pointed out, "there is neither male nor female, bond or free."

94c How could the apostleship come after the ascension when it came before? Acts 1:25? Marion has Christ giving apostles, prophets, teachers, evangelists, and pastors after the ascension; look at v 8. It was the gifts that he gave after the ascension. The men to whom he gave the gifts were already there and ready to go. Eph. 4:8-13.

95c Did not John include both Jews and Gentiles in the immersion in

fire for disobedience? Did he include Pentecostals?

96c I am supposed to have a lot of trouble with Paul. If he is a thorn in my flesh it is as a mosquito bite without a proboscis. He claimed that the account of Paul's receiving the apostleship is recorded in Acts 9. Not so. He is warm, though. He said "(Reg) tell us how Paul received apostleship, and I will not write a reply to it." I am delighted to do so.

#### WHEN, WHERE, HOW, AND WHY PAUL WAS MADE AN APOSTLE OF CHRIST?

97c An apostle is "one sent." In this case, one sent by Christ. The New Testament gives more space to the appointment of Saul (Paul), to the apostleship, than to all of the other eleven apostles. We shall see why. The Bible accounts are recorded in Acts 9:1-30; 22:3-21; 26:8-23. Jesus *sent* Saul from the wayside into Damascus to meet Ananias. There, Jesus told him, he would be told all things he must do, Acts 22:10.

98c Before he got to Damascus, all that Saul knew was that Christ had approached him to appoint him a minister and a witness of the things wherein thou hast seen me ... delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles to whom I send (look up "send", here, in your lexicon) thee". Notice the present tense of send---for there he was an apostle. That is how, when, and where he was made an apostle.

99c As to why he was made an apostle, the season of apostle-making having gone past, is made plain in the words of Jesus, on the road, "I send thee to open their eyes (the Gentiles) that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that

are sanctified by faith in me” Acts 26:16-18.

100c Marion, you invited me to tell how Paul received apostleship. An apostle is “one sent.” Paul was one, and he was sent, this is it: “I send thee” Jesus said. I told you not only how he was made an apostle, but when and where. Paul was yet in his sin, yet out of Christ, blinded in his eyes, and yet without being full of the Holy Spirit. He neither knew what to do to have his sins washed away, how to get his sight restored, nor anything else that he would learn from Ananias, till he got to Damascus. Look at it with me:

101c He was led by the hand by his companions to the city, to await arrival of Ananias and word from him. Jesus told Ananias, before the arrival of Saul, that Saul was a chosen vessel unto him to bear his name before the Gentiles, Acts 9:15. When Saul arrived, Ananias told him “Jesus sent me that thou mayest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. Scales, as it were, fell from his eyes and he arose and was baptized.”

102c The first glimpse of Saul, in this account, was that of a man with a company, going to Damascus to arrest Christians; our last glimpse of him is that of the apostle preaching Jesus. He was made an apostle by Jesus on the road near Damascus. This is where , and that is when. He received his sight when Ananias laid hands upon him, and his sins were washed away when he was baptized. He was added to the congregation of the Lord upon his immersion in water. He was filled with the Holy Spirit when his sins were forgiven. When Saul (Paul) was forgiven, and filled with the Holy Spirit, he received the gospel by revelation and straightway preached it. He continued to preach it and write it to the end.

## REJOINDER BY MARION R. FOX

Reg did not answer my question of how Paul received apostleship. The options I gave were: (1) By a direct means, (2) by the laying on of hands, or (3) by a third method. He spent one page writing on this (paragraphs 97c, 98c, 99c, 100c, 101c, and 102c) and did not answer the question. He did not choose either options 1, 2, or 3 (paragraph 97b). The questions of *when*, *where*, and *why* Paul received apostleship were not asked by me.

I respectfully request that the reader read paragraphs 59b, 75c, 89b, and 92c to consider the misrepresentation of me by Reg. This ends our debate, it is my desire that this vital topic be studied by honest Bible students, considering all the arguments carefully.

SCRIPTURES	PARAGRAPHS
Genesis 1:1	paragraph 18a
Genesis 3:20	paragraph 9b
Genesis 6:14	paragraph 33
Genesis 12:1-3	paragraph 12b
Genesis 12:12	paragraph 9c
Genesis 17:7	paragraph 12b
Genesis 17:18-21	paragraph 12b
Genesis 25:33	paragraph 12b
Genesis 28:14	paragraph 12b
Genesis 49:10	paragraph 12b
Deuteronomy 33:6	paragraph 79c
I Samuel 16:1-12	paragraph 18c
Psalms 68:18	paragraph 38b
Psalms 89:3-4	paragraph 12b
Psalms 139:7-10	paragraph 78c

Proverbs 1:23	paragraphs 14b, 26c
Song of Solomon 4:1	paragraphs 21, 22a
Isaiah 1:18	paragraph 70a
Isaiah 7:14	paragraph 18a
Isaiah 32:15	paragraph 14b
Isaiah 40:5	paragraph 42b
Isaiah 40:5-8	paragraphs 45a, 63a, 74a
Isaiah 44:3	paragraph 14b
Isaiah 66:8	paragraph 8c
Jeremiah 25:31	paragraph 57c
Jeremiah 32:26	paragraph 57c
Ezekiel 39:29	paragraph 14b
Joel 2:28	paragraphs 20, 36, 43, 46, 47, 49, 52, 54, 57, 59, 92c
Joel 2:28-32	paragraphs 21a, 44, 6b, 8b, 14b, 36b, 37b, 38b, 39b, 48c, 41b, 59b, 70b
Matthew 3:7-12	paragraph 74b

Matthew 3:9	paragraph 13b
Matthew 3:11	paragraphs 6, 36, 43, 50, 57, 58, 72a, 1b, 8b, 13b, 37b, 80c
Matthew 3:16	paragraphs 51, 54a
Matthew 4:6	paragraph 61b
Matthew 4:7	paragraph 61b
Matthew 6:23	paragraph 81c
Matthew 7:11	paragraph 38b
Matthew 10	paragraph 7c
Matthew 10:1, 5	paragraph 28c
Matthew 10:2	paragraphs 16b, 61b
Matthew 10:5-6	paragraphs 35a, 45a
Matthew 10:8	paragraph 62c
Matthew 15:24	paragraph 57
Matthew 16:16	paragraph 62c
Matthew 18:18	paragraph 44c

Matthew 19:28	paragraph 44c
Matthew 21:27	paragraph 53b
Matthew 21:33-46	paragraph 74b
Matthew 23:35-36	paragraph 74b
Matthew 28:18	paragraph 62c
Mark 1:5	paragraphs 23c, 45c
Mark 1:8	paragraphs 1b, 8b, 45c
Mark 6:30	paragraphs 11c, 61b
Mark 16:14-20	paragraph 22c
Mark 16:16	paragraphs 29c, 47b, 98b
Mark 16:20	paragraph 18a
Luke 3:6	paragraphs 39, 45a, 57, 63a, 41b, 42b, 64b, 80c
Luke 3:10-16	paragraph 23c
Luke 3:16	paragraphs 1b, 76b
Luke 3:22	paragraphs 51, 79c
Luke 6:13	paragraphs 60c, 61b, 86c

Luke 9:10	paragraph 61b
Luke 10:1-20	paragraphs 19b, 24b
Luke 11:13	paragraph 38b
Luke 11:49	paragraphs 16b, 46b, 61b
Luke 12:50	paragraph 6
Luke 17:5	paragraph 61b
Luke 22:14	paragraphs 28c, 61b
Luke 23:43	paragraph 58c
Luke 24:10	paragraph 61b
Luke 24:48-49	paragraphs 7b, 10b
John 1:1	paragraph 39
John 1:18	paragraphs 39a, 56a
John 1:33	paragraph 1b
John 3:5	paragraphs 83c, 93b, 96b
John 3:13	paragraph 33b
John 5:26	paragraphs 21, 22a, 37, 47a

John 6:17	paragraph 33c
John 14:16	paragraphs 18c, 31b, 43c
John 14:16-17	paragraph 13b
John 14:21	paragraph 31c
John 14:25	paragraph 45c
John 14:26	paragraph 50
John 15:20	paragraph 67b
John 15:26	paragraphs 50, 9b, 11b
John 15:26-27	paragraph 40b
John 16:5-15	paragraph 50
John 16:7	paragraphs 52, 38b
John 16:13	paragraph 44
John 16:15	paragraph 21c
Acts 1:1-5	paragraph 65b
Acts 1:2	paragraphs 61b, 77c
Acts 1:4	paragraphs 57, 17c, 41c

Acts 1:4-5	paragraphs 7, 8, 14, 1a, 8a, 21a, 24, 26a, 28a, 34a, 36a, 46, 48a, 49a, 50, 57, 53a, 1b, 10b, 13b, 61b
Acts 1:4-9	paragraphs 29a, 35a, 7b
Acts 1:5	paragraphs 15, 35, 36, 46, 56, 59, 46c, 65b, 94b, 81c
Acts 1:8	paragraphs 39, 10b, 11b, 44c, 40b
Acts 1:9	paragraph 26b
Acts 1:9-11	paragraph 4b
Acts 1:14	paragraph 58c
Acts 1:15-26	paragraphs 28c, 34c, 48c
Acts 1:20-25	paragraph 1b
Acts 1:21	paragraph 33
Acts 1:21-26	paragraph 26b
Acts 1:23-25	paragraph 74c
Acts 1:24-25	paragraphs 77c, 85c
Acts 1:25	paragraphs 6c, 12c, 61b, 77c, 84c, 91b, 94c

Acts 1:26	paragraphs 44b, 61b
Acts 2:1	paragraph 44b
Acts 2:1-4	paragraphs 30, 10b, 61b
Acts 2:1-13	paragraph 43
Acts 2:1-17	paragraph 6
Acts 2:2-3	paragraph 79c
Acts 2:7	paragraph 91c
Acts 2:11	paragraph 73c
Acts 2:12	paragraphs 46c, 89c, 91c
Acts 2:14-17	paragraph 12
Acts 2:16	paragraphs 17, 36
Acts 2:16-17	paragraphs 36, 46, 47, 25c
Acts 2:16-21	paragraphs 45a, 14b
Acts 2:17	paragraphs 29a, 39a, 43a, 49, 52, 57, 55a, 29c
Acts 2:17-18	paragraphs 42b, 61b

Acts 2:17-21	paragraphs 11a, 6b
Acts 2:18	paragraphs 45a, 14b
Acts 2:30	paragraphs 12b, 32c
Acts 2:33 42b	paragraphs 30a, 39a, 51, 57, 38b,
Acts 2:36-42	paragraph 19
Acts 2:38	paragraphs 9a, 21a, 45, 46, 22b, 29c, 47b, 63c, 64c, 72c, 98b
Acts 2:38-39	paragraphs 46, 9c
Acts 2:40	paragraph 84c
Acts 2:41	paragraph 66c
Acts 2:42	paragraph 6c,
Acts 2:43	paragraph 44c
Acts 8:1-25	paragraph 39
Acts 8:4-24	paragraph 29a
Acts 8:7	paragraph 57b
Acts 8:14-20	paragraph 29a

Acts 8:15-17	paragraph 9a
Acts 8:18	paragraphs 9a, 14b, 19b, 38b, 42b, 52b, 70b
Acts 8:19	paragraphs 10a, 14b
Acts 9:1-30	paragraph 97c
Acts 9:14-15	paragraph 14c
Acts 9:15	paragraphs 33c, 84c, 101c
Acts 9:17	paragraphs 14c, 18c
Acts 10:34	paragraph 46c
Acts 10:39	paragraphs 9b, 40b
Acts 10:44	paragraphs 14, 20, 32a, 44, 54
Acts 10:44-47	paragraph 43
Acts 10:44-48	paragraph 24
Acts 10:44-11:15	paragraph 58
Acts 10:45	paragraphs 11, 46a, 57, 64a, 3b, 21b, 22b, 42b
Acts 10:45-46	paragraphs 12, 37a, 75c

Acts 10:46	paragraphs 9, 37a, 73c
Acts 10:47	paragraphs 9, 21a, 3b
Acts 10:47-48	paragraph 9a
Acts 10:48	paragraph 46
Acts 11:1-19	paragraph 47
Acts 11:12-14	paragraph 89c
Acts 11:15	paragraphs 15, 12a, 13a, 20, 21, 25, 35, 22a, 46, 46, 47, 73c
Acts 11:15-16	paragraphs 8, 8a, 24, 25, 36a, 37, 42, 47, 54, 68c
Acts 11:15-17	paragraphs 24a, 46a, 3b
Acts 11:16	paragraphs 15a, 28, 33, 36, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48a, 50, 56, 54a, 1b, 65b, 80c
Acts 11:17	paragraphs 8, 36a, 46, 21b, 22b
Acts 11:18	paragraphs 19, 22c
Acts 11:46	paragraph 9
Acts 12:13	paragraph 84c

Acts 13:1	paragraph 57b
Acts 15:8	paragraph 10a
Acts 17:11	paragraph 66a
Acts 19:1-2	paragraph 91c
Acts 19:1-7	paragraphs 20a, 13b, 52b, 57b, 61b, 76b
Acts 19:2-3	paragraph 76b
Acts 20:10	paragraph 57b
Acts 20:28	paragraph 69b
Acts 21:8	paragraph 57b
Acts 22:3-21	paragraph 97c
Acts 22:10	paragraph 97c
Acts 22:15	paragraph 14c
Acts 22:16	paragraph 84c
Acts 26:6	paragraph 9c
Acts 26:8-23	paragraph 97c
Acts 26:15-16	paragraph 36c

Acts 26:16-18	paragraph 99c
Romans 1:16	paragraphs 39, 53c
Romans 3:30	paragraph 57c
Romans 6:4	paragraphs 7b, 43c, 83c, 93b, 96b
Romans 6:23	paragraph 10c
Romans 12:1-2	paragraph 70a
I Corinthians 3:16	paragraph 66c
I Corinthians 9:2	paragraphs 19b, 46b, 51b, 78b
I Corinthians 9:27	paragraph 45b
I Corinthians 12:8	paragraph 14c
I Corinthians 12:11	paragraph 26b
I Corinthians 12:13	paragraphs 14c, 69b
I Corinthians 12:18	paragraph 69b
I Corinthians 12:27-28	paragraphs 40a, 3b, 4b
I Corinthians 12:28	paragraphs 8c, 21b, 49b, 69b
I Corinthians 13:4-7	paragraph 5a

I Corinthians 13:8-10	paragraph 61b
I Corinthians 14:18	paragraph 50a
I Corinthians 14:37	paragraph 52b
I Corinthians 15:12-19	paragraph 67b
II Corinthians 11:5	paragraph 26b
II Corinthians 12:12	paragraphs 6b, 19b, 46b, 51b, 78b
Galatians 1:1	paragraphs 33a, 50a, 5b, 13c, 23b
Galatians 1:12	paragraph 5b
Galatians 1:19	paragraph 33a
Galatians 3:16	paragraph 12b
Galatians 3:27-28	paragraph 76c
Galatians 3:28	paragraph 45a
Ephesians 1:22-23	paragraphs 54a, 69b
Ephesians 4:1-13	paragraph 61b
Ephesians 4:8	paragraph 20b
Ephesians 4:8-11	paragraph 77c

Ephesians 4:8-12	paragraphs 40a, 3b, 4b, 12c, 38b, 50c, 61b, 91b
Ephesians 4:8-13	paragraph 94c
Ephesians 4:8-14	paragraphs 38b, 71b
Ephesians 4:11	paragraphs 8c, 26c, 20b, 36b, 77c, 91b
Philippians 1:20	paragraph 50a
Colossians 2:12	paragraph 7b
I Thessalonians 5:21	paragraph 66a
II Thessalonians 2:11-12	paragraph 11
I Timothy 1:12	paragraph 69b
I Timothy 2:7	paragraph 69b
II Timothy 1:11	paragraph 69b
II Timothy 2:24-25	paragraph 69a
Titus 3:5	paragraph 43a
Titus 3:5-6	paragraphs 17a, 45, 43a, 50a, 54, 58a, 57b

Titus 3:6	paragraphs 33a, 43a
Hebrews 1:3	paragraph 21
Hebrews 9:27	paragraph 69a
James 1:9-11	paragraphs 45a, 63a, 74a, 64b, 80c
James 1:10-11	paragraph 42b
I Peter 1:24-25	paragraph 42b
I Peter 2:5	paragraph 66c
I Peter 3:21	paragraphs 56c, 64c, 68b, 98b
II Peter 1:19-21	paragraph 18a
I John 4:12	paragraphs 30a,39a, 51, 54a, 56a
Jude 3	paragraph 14
Revelation 2:10	paragraph 45b
Revelation 20:11-15	paragraph 69a
Revelation 20:14-15	paragraph 24c
Revelation 21:8	paragraphs 6, 33, 80c