

A THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION BETWEEN ELDER JOHN R. DAILY OF THE OLD BAPTIST CHURCH AND ELDER W. P. THROGMORTON OF THE MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

FIRST PROPOSITION: THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT ALL FOR WHOM CHRIST DIED WILL BE ETERNALLY SAVED.

MR. DAILY'S FIRST SPEECH

ELD. THROGMORTON'S FIRST REPLY

ELD. DAILY'S SECOND SPEECH

ELD. DAILY'S THIRD SPEECH

ELD. THROGMORTON'S THIRD REPLY

ELD. DAILY'S FOURTH SPEECH

ELD. THROGMORTON'S FOURTH REPLY

ELD. DAILY'S SIXTH SPEECH

ELD. THROGMORTON'S SIXTH REPLY

ELD. DAILY'S SEVENTH SPEECH

SECOND PROPOSITION—THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT GOD EMPLOYS THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL AS A MEANS IN THE REGENERATION OF SINNERS

ELD. THROGMORTON'S SECOND SPEECH

ELD. DAILY'S SECOND REPLY

ELD THROGMORTON'S THIRD SPEECH

ELD. DAILY'S THIRD REPLY

ELD. THROGMORTON'S FOURTH SPEECH.

ELD. DAILY'S FOURTH REPLY

ELD. THROGMORTON'S FIFTH SPEECH

ELD. DAILY'S FIFTH REPLY

ELD. THROGMORTON'S SIXTH SPEECH

ELD. DAILY'S SIXTH REPLY

ELD. THROGMORTON'S SEVENTH SPEECH

ELD. DAILY'S SEVENTH REPLY

A THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION BETWEEN ELDER JOHN R. DAILY OF THE OLD BAPTIST CHURCH AND ELDER W. P. THROGMORTON OF THE MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

Held at the Missionary Baptist College in Ewing, Ill.,

August 13, 14, 15, 16, 1912.

MODERATORS

Eld. C. W. Radcliff; Eld. G. W. Danbury

REPORTED BY

Miss Carrie L. Parish, Harrisburg, Ill.

Indianapolis, Ind.

DAILY & SONS

1912.

PROPOSITIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

PROPOSITION I. The Scriptures teach that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

Affirmative, JOHN R. DAILY,

Negative, W. P. THROGMORTON.

PROPOSITION II. The Scriptures teach that God employs the Preaching of the Gospel as a Means in the Regeneration of sinners.

Affirmative, W. P. THROGMORTON,

Negative, JOHN R. DAILY.

RULES OF DISCUSSION.

I. The two propositions agreed cussed by the disputants at Ewing, Ill, beginning August 13, 1912, and continuing four days, two days to be given to the discussion of each proposition.

II. There shall be two sessions each day, of two hours each, occupying from 10 o'clock a. m. to 2 o'clock p. m.

III. In the opening of each subject the affirmant shall occupy one hour, and the respondent the same time: and thereafter half hour alternately to the dose of the subject.

IV. On the final negative no new matter shall be introduced except in reply to what shall have been introduced in the closing affirmative for the first time.

V. There shall be chosen a board of three Moderators, the disputants to choose one each and they to choose a third*, who shall be Moderator of the board and President Moderator of the debate.

VI. Hedge's Rules of Logic shall be the Rules of Decorum of the speakers, which are as follows :—

1. The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the point at issue, should be clearly defined, that there could be no misunderstanding respecting them.
2. The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality, in respect to the subject in debate. Each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge, and a desire for the truth with himself. And that it is possible, therefore, that he may be in the wrong and his adversary in the right.
3. All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect, in regard to the subject in debate, should be carefully avoided.
4. Personal reflections on an adversary should, in no instance, be indulged.
5. The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.
6. As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever argument may be advanced on either side should be examined with fairness and candor; and any attempt to answer an adversary by arts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit, cavilling, or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy.

*It was mutually agreed 'to conduct the debate' without a President Moderator.

FIRST PROPOSITION: THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT ALL FOR WHOM CHRIST DIED WILL BE ETERNALLY SAVED.

MR. DAILY'S FIRST SPEECH

Gentlemen Moderators, Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Our continued existence as living beings under the protecting and supporting hand of God, and the blessings that fall to us incessantly from his bountiful hand bear testimony to the riches of his mercy and obligate us to confess with humility that these favors on our part are wholly unmerited.

We have met this morning for the purpose of entering upon the investigation of the sacred word of God, relative to some points of doctrine about which we honestly differ, and I trust we have met in the spirit of our Divine Master. As I approach the duty of delivering the first address of this debate and thus introducing it, I am not insensible of the great weight of responsibility that attends this undertaking. Were it not for the confidence I have in the strength of my cause, I am sure I would tremble as I approach this important task.

There are two considerations, however, that give no room for fear on my part. One is, if I am right, which; of course, I sincerely think I am, I have no need to fear. The other is, if I should be wrong and my opponent succeeds in convincing me that I am, he confers a favor upon me, for which I am sure I shall ever remain thankful.

The proposition we have agreed to discuss is, as read in your hearing: "The Scriptures teach that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved."

I had been informed that the atonement was one subject that it was desired we should discuss, and I insisted in our correspondence that the word atonement should be in the proposition. To this, my worthy opponent objected and worded the proposition as it now stands. I accepted the wording of this proposition because my opponent

said in the correspondence that, in the sense of propitiation or expiation, he believes that Christ died for all the human race. That affords a key to the position he is expected to take on the negative of this proposition, and so assists us in determining its meaning, as worded by him.

One of the rules by which we have agreed to be governed in this discussion requires that I define the terms of my proposition so that there may be no misunderstanding respecting them.

By the Scriptures I mean the Bible, the Sacred Word of God, the books that go to make up what we denominate the Old and New Testaments. I shall depend upon that sacred volume to prove the proposition and all the arguments that I shall make in support of it. Any reference that I may make to other writings will be merely as argument and not as proof.

By the Scriptures teaching that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved, I mean that the Scriptures taken as a whole, when properly interpreted, teach that idea.

By all for whom Christ died, I mean, of course, those for whom he suffered on the cross, for whom he made propitiation on the cross, or expiation.

The term propitiation is a Bible term. It is found three times in the New Testament: [1Jo 2:2; 4:10; Ro 3:2-4](#).

The idea expressed by this word is taught, however, in many places. That word is from the Greek word *hilasmov* (*hilasmos*) which means the extinguishing of guilt. The Greek verb is *ilaskomai hilaskomai*. Expiate is from *kaqairw kathairo* which means a cleansing. I want to remark here that my pretensions in regard to languages are humble; that whatever reference I may make to Greek or Hebrew words will be made in order that the original idea intended to be expressed may be brought out more clearly, if possible, than the English words express. From the original of the word atonement, propitiation and expiation, the point at issue is, as expressed by the proposition and the statement of my opponent: The Scriptures teach that all for whom Christ died, for whom he made reconciliation by extinguishing their guilt on the cross, purifying and cleansing them by his death, his blood and his sufferings for them, will be eternally saved. That the death is in no sense a failure, but that it will ultimately accomplish the design of the Father who sent him to live and to die for sinners.

I have three questions which I wish to submit in the beginning to which I invite the attention of my worthy opponent.

My first question is: What does the [death of Christ](#), apart from everything else, accomplish in the salvation of sinners for whom he died? For instance, what does the death of Christ for sinners, who never hear the Gospel preached, accomplish in the work of their eternal salvation?

My second question is: Did Christ die for sinners *really* and *absolutely* as a *substitute*; that is, did he take the place of sinners in dying for them? Was his death for them vicarious or not? The answer that I desire to this question is either Yes or No. If Brother Throgmorton does not believe that Christ died for sinners as a substitute, he is expected to say No in answer to the question. If he does believe that Jesus Christ died for sinners as a substitute, he is expected to say Yes to the question. If he thinks the question will get him in a close place, he is expected to give an evasive answer.

My third question to which I invite my opponent's attention is: Did Christ die for sinners in order to make the eternal salvation of all he died for possible on condition of faith?

Now my purpose in asking these three questions is that we may bring out early in the discussion of this important proposition some issues clearly before the people.

My first argument in support of my proposition is that the [death of Christ](#) was necessary in order to the eternal salvation of sinners, and, being necessary to that end, it was designed to accomplish it. For whatever is necessary to an end is designed to accomplish that end. To ascertain the design of the Saviour in any undertaking of his, we have but to ascertain the final results of that undertaking. As God is all-wise, and as God

is all-powerful we are forced to the conclusion that whatever he designed in any undertaking of his will be accomplished; and that therefore, to ascertain his design we have but to ascertain the final results. Now to ascertain the design of the death of Christ on the cross for sinners, we have but to ascertain the final results of his death for sinners.

If his design for sinners was not their eternal salvation, what was it? I maintain that the design was the eternal salvation of the sinners for whom he died. So that when we ascertain the final results of his death we will have ascertained the design.

When I think of God, whose name is "I am," the self-existent one, who is from everlasting to everlasting, the Almighty God, as knowing all things, I cannot associate with such an idea of God any idea of a failure upon his part. The design of Christ's dying was the salvation of sinners and their final deliverance from this present evil world according to God's will.

[Mt 18:11](#). "For the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost."

[1Th 5:9-10](#). "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him."

[Ga 1:3](#) "Grace be to you and peace from [God the Father](#), and from our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God our Father."

God's design in Christ's dying for sinners was their eternal salvation from sin and their deliverance according to his will. His design is to be measured by its final results. Therefore, all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My second argument is founded upon the annunciation of the coming birth of Christ by the angel to Joseph:

"Thou shalt call his name Jesus for he shall save his people from their sins" [Mt 1:21](#).

Since he will save his people from their sins, he will not save more than his people; he will not save fewer than his people. He will save just that many. All whom he will save are reckoned as his people before they are saved before he died for them, even before he came into the world. Since his people is a class synonymous with the very people that will be eternally saved, to determine the former will be to ascertain definitely the latter and vice versa. It was not his mission to try to save them, or to give them a chance to save themselves, or to enable someone else to save them, *but to save them himself*. He is the *only* Saviour of sinners. To save them, it was necessary that he should die for them. In dying for them, he saw them, all of them, all for whom he died, as his seed or people.

Isa, 53:10. "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands."

Mark you, my friends, it is declared here that Jesus in dying on the cross should see his seed as he died. He saw all he died for as he was dying for them. Then all he died for are his seed. The pleasure of the Lord, the Almighty Father, in regard to his death, shall prosper in his hands. What is that pleasure? It is expressed in the language of the angel that heads this argument: "He shall save his people from their sins." It follows as a conclusion that all for whom he died, all whom he saw as his seed or people, all meant by the angel announcing his coming birth, whom he came to save, will be eternally saved. Jesus came down from heaven, he tells us, on the great mission of doing the will of his Father. Now he either did the will of his Father or he did not the will of his Father. We can but conclude that he did the will of his Father. He declares the will of his Father to be that of all he has given me I should lose nothing but should raise it up again at the last day. In the tenth chapter of St. John he says:

"My Father which gave them me is greater than all. None shall be able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."

He says: "I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of my Father that sent me; that of all he hath given me I shall lose nothing." He declares that he laid down his life for the sheep. Therefore, all he laid down his life for will be eternally saved.

My third argument is based upon the love of the Father that sent Christ to die, that caused Christ to die for sinners, and that caused God to quicken them and put his love in their hearts, from which love nothing shall ever separate them. I want you to get that argument. I want to impress it upon your minds. It was God's love for the sinners for whom Christ died, all of them, that caused him to send Christ to die for them. It was the love that Christ had for those very sinners whom the Father loved that caused him to die for them, and that same love that God has for those sinners for whom Christ died causes God to quicken those sinners, and from that love nothing shall ever separate one of them. It was the Father's love then for all for whom Christ died, for each one of them he died for, that caused him to send Christ to die for them.

[1Jo 4:9-10](#). "In this was manifest the [love of God](#) toward us, because that God sent his [only begotten Son](#) into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

Now what caused God to send him to be a propitiation for our sins? This text informs us that it was God's love that caused him to do that. Is there any discrimination here? Does not God love all for whom he sent Christ to die, alike? If not, my Opponent will tell me how the discrimination appears.

[Ro 5:8](#). "But God commendeth his love toward us, In that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

How did God commend his love? By Christ dying. What love was commended toward us?

I [John 3:16](#). "Hereby perceive we the [love of God](#), because he laid down his life for us."

This is the love that God had for the "children of the promise."

[Ro 9:8](#). "That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed."

They are represented by Jacob in the lesson Paul gives us, in which he quotes the language of Jehovah: "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." [Ro 9:13](#). This proves that when Jesus said God so loved the world that he sent his only begotten Son, he did not mean all the people in the world, all the members of the human family. Universalism and Conditionalism are both answered by the Apostle in this declaration. The theory of Universalism falls before this argument. The theory of Conditionalism falls where Universalism falls. Both go down before what my opponent will never be able to answer.

This same love which the Father had for those for whom Christ died was the love which Christ had for them himself, which caused him to consent to die for them, and moved him to suffer in their stead.

[Eph 5:25](#). "Husbands, love your wives even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it."

Jesus' death is the effect of the overflowing, infinite love on the Father's part, for the ones for whom he died. It was the gratuitous outflow of that love. That love also swelled the bosom of Christ as he took their nature upon himself and came down here to live and die for them. As he suffered upon the cross he loved them, every one of them exactly alike, for whom he was dying. If not, my friend will show where the discrimination comes in. This same love caused the Father to quicken them by his Holy Spirit.

[Eph 2:4-5](#). "But God who is rich In mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ."

When did he quicken them? Was it when they repented of their sins and believed in Christ? No, it was when they were dead in sins, when they were as far from him as they could be. It was not any merit in them but his love for them while they hated him, that caused him to quicken them. As it is his love while they were dead

sinners, while they hated him, that caused him to quicken them, and as he loved all for whom Christ died it follows that he will quicken all for whom Christ died; if not, my friend will tell us why. I insist upon his telling us why. I repeat the question: If God by his love does not quicken all for whom Christ died, having loved all of them alike, why doesn't he quicken all, since when he quickens them they were dead, had been dead to that very moment in trespasses and in sins, and therefore enemies of God in their affections.

Summary of the argument: Love for all for whom Christ died caused the Father to send Christ to die for them. This shows he loved them all alike. The love Christ had for them was the cause of Christ dying for them. This love is the cause of God quickening them by his Spirit. As he loves them, all of them alike, he will quicken all of them. Nothing shall ever separate those whom God loves from that love. To prove, this I call your attention to [Ro 8:35-39](#):

“Who shall separate us from the love of Christ; shall tribulations, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; We are accounted as sheep for the slaughter, Nay in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus the Lord.”

Nothing shall separate those for whom Christ died from the love of God which is in Christ; therefore, they shall be eternally saved.

My fourth argument is based on the work of Christ as Mediatorial Priest. As Prophet, Priest and King, Christ stands as a Mediator between God, the offended party, and man, the offender. The word mediator is from the Latin word mesos, which means middle, one that acts between two adverse parties to reconcile them. The High Priest of the Mosaic Priesthood, who was a type of Christ, was a mediator admitted from among men to stand before God to make a propitiation for them by sacrifice and then intercede for those for whom sacrifice was made. So Christ, the anti-type, was the High Priest of those he represented and for whom he offered himself a sacrifice and for whom he makes intercession at the right hand of God.

[Heb 1:1-3](#). “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.”

In purging those for whom he died, the purging” of those for whom he died was when he offered himself a sacrifice for them. This, my friend will not dare dispute. After offering himself a sacrifice for them and at that time purging them from their sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, for them. This I dare my worthy opponent to dispute.

He purged those for whom he died when he died for them and then sat down to intercede for them.

A priest in making his priestly offering could not sit down until the offering was accomplished. Jesus Christ could not have sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high if he had not purged the sins of those for whom he died. His death as a purging for their sins was accepted by [God the Father](#), at whose right hand he sat down to intercede for them. This purging stood in the mind and purpose of God as a satisfaction for their sins by God, his being received as their intercessor being proof of the satisfaction thus rendered.

Offerings under the Jewish economy were always sanctified or set apart for the ones for whom they were offered, whether for an individual or a nation. So Christ sanctified himself as an offering for those for whom he died, those the Father had given him.

[Joh 17:19](#). “And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth,”

“Through the truth” is not from *dia alhqeiv* but from *en alhqeia*. It is *en* with the dative, not *dia* with genitive. The meaning according to the original is not through the truth as a means but in a true manner. That is, Christ sanctified himself and offered himself, that those for whom he died might be sanctified truly and not typically, as under the Levitical Priesthood.

Having given himself for those for whom he died, he has entered into the Holy Place to represent them as an intercessor, those for whom he died.

[Heb 9:12](#). “Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.”

[Ro 8:33-34](#). “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justified his elect. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died—for his elect. Yea, rather, that is risen again—for his elect. He represents them at the right hand of God, his elect; who also maketh intercession for his elect.”

In reading that text I put the proper interpretation upon it, which I defy him to dispute.

As Aaron bore the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, those he represented, making sacrifice for them and acting as their intercessor, thus purging them typically, so Christ, the glorious anti-type, bears the names of all for whom he died as a sacrifice, on the breastplate of his love and intercedes for them continually as their High Priest above, while as King he sends the Holy Spirit to quicken them and assure them of his success as their Mediator who obtained eternal redemption for them on the cross.

Christ and the Holy Spirit act with one consent together, the work of one being a complement to that of the other. Christ intercedes for those for whom he died, as an advocate in heaven, and the Holy Spirit quickens them and becomes an advocate within to bear witness with their spirits that they are the children of God. The atonement and intercession of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit cannot fail. Therefore, all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My fifth argument is based on this: That the death of Christ for sinners was in order to the forgiveness of their sins, being designed to that end. In dying for sinners, he gave up his life for their sins, and the intention must have been to procure the forgiveness of those sins.

The typical offerings made by the Levitical Priest hood invariably secured the temporal forgiveness of those for whom they were made, whether the offerings were for the whole congregation or for individuals. In every case of the offering of the beast or bird, by slaying it, an atonement was made by its blood for the very person or persons for whom it was slain, be they one or many; and by this means forgiveness was, under the old law, invariably secured.

[Le 4:20](#). “And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for a sin offering, so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them.”

This was for the sin of the whole congregation of Israel; so it should be forgiven the whole congregation of Israel because the offering was made for the whole congregation of Israel.

[Le 4:26](#). “And the priest shall make an atonement for him a concerning his sin, and It shall be forgiven him.”

This refers to the sin of a ruler. The same statement is made in the thirty-first and thirty-fifth verses of this chapter and the tenth and sixteenth verses of the fifth chapter, and in every place where offerings made for sin are mentioned. I argue that as it was in the type, so it is in the anti-type. Jesus said, when he instituted the Supper, “For this is my blood in the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.” [Mt 26:28](#).

Will the shedding of his [precious blood](#) fail? No! a thousand times *No*! It cannot fail. As certain as the offerings of the Jewish priests secured the forgiveness in a figure for all for whom those offerings were mad as God

declared they should, that certain is it that the sufferings Jesus endured in dying shall result in the forgiveness of all for whom he died, as in the quotation just made. In confirmation of this the Apostle declares, "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." [Eph 1:7](#) and [Col 1:14](#).

Here the forgiveness of sins is placed in apposition to redemption through his blood, signifying the same thing. So in Christ's redemption of those for whom he died he obtained forgiveness of their sins.

Now the sweet experience of this forgiveness is felt by the sinner when the love, the forgiving love of God, is shed abroad in his heart. The blessing of Christ is the unmistakable evidence of that fact. Christ obtained forgiveness of sins for all for whom he died. All for whom forgiveness was obtained will be eternally saved. Therefore, all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My sixth argument is that the death of Christ was a ransom paid for sinners intended to redeem them. That ransom price was God's own provision for the redemption of the sinners for whom Christ died, and therefore it cannot fail.

Ransom is, a word corrupted from the Latin *redemptio*. It is the price paid by a prisoner of war, or a price paid by others in his behalf, on consideration of his being granted freedom to be able to return to his own country. And promise of the freedom of the person to be ransomed must be understood before the ransom is paid. In early times, when armies received little or no pay, the soldiers looked for their reward in the booty they might capture, and this booty included the bodies of the persons as well as the chattels of the prisoners. We have some notable instances in history. King Richard I was ransomed by the payment of 100,000 pounds, King John of France for 500,000 pounds, David Bruce of Scotland by payment of 100,000 marks. The payment of the ransom insured the release of the captive. The Greek word is [lutron](#) from *luo*, to loosen, unbind, unfasten, set free, set at liberty. The [life of Christ](#) was given as a ransom for all those for whom he died.

[Mt 20:28](#), "And to give his life a ransom for many." Ransom is here from [lutron](#) (*lutron*) the accusative form. The preposition *for* is from *anti* (*anti*). Many is from the Greek word *pollwn* (*pollon*), *anti* (*anti*) signifies over against, answering to, in place of, in retribution for or return for. *Lutron* means a ransom paid to release from bondage or captivity.

The death of Christ for sinners, the shedding of his blood, is the ransom price paid, by which those for whom he died are said to be purchased or redeemed.

[1Co 6:20](#). "For, ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's."

What is the price? It is the priceless shed blood of the blessed Jesus. That is the full price. That is God's accepted price, to which there needs be no addition, to which there can be made no addition, which satisfies God in behalf of those for whom Christ died.

[Ac 20:28](#). "Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

[1Pe 1:18-19](#). "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot."

Redeemed. how? Not with corruptible things, as silver and gold. What does God care for your money? Then what with? With the precious blood of Christ. In accordance with that the saved hosts sing a new song, as declared in [Re 5:9](#). "And they sung a new song, saying: Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."

Consider the greatness of the price. It was the giving up of the life of the [Son of God](#), whose personal dignity as the “Ancient of days,” gave transcendent merit to his death. When Paul says, “Who shall condemn?” and immediately answered: “It is Christ that died,” the great stress of the argument lies in the absolute certainty of redemption as a necessary result of the payment of such a price as a ransom of infinite merit. If the payment of such a price should fail to secure the everlasting salvation of any for whom it was paid, the failure would be to the everlasting shame and disgrace of the omnipotent one who proposed to accept the prize and of the obedient one, the suffering one who paid it. There can be no more God-dishonoring doctrine than that which teaches that some for whom Christ died will be eternally lost. It says his blood was spilt in vain. It charges him and the everlasting Father with both failure and falsehood. It says the law demands two payments for the same offense. It treads the [Son of God](#) under foot, counts the blood of the everlasting covenant an unholy thing, and does despite to the Spirit of Grace. That the redemption of what was purchased follows the payment of the price as a ransom is clearly declared by the Apostle:

[Tit 2:13-14](#). “Looking for that blessed hope, and the [glorious appearing](#) of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.”

Can redemption be for anyone who is never redeemed? Can a price be paid as a ransom and the ransom not be consummated? These are important questions to which I demand an answer. Can such a price be paid for sinners and yet only a part of those sinners be redeemed? To that question I would like for my opponent to answer yes or no. Can the judge be satisfied, justice be met, and the prisoners, any of them, remain forever enthralled?

Christ obtained this redemption when he died, because he then paid the price by which it was obtained.

[Heb 9:12](#). “Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.”

How did they obtain eternal redemption? The ransom price was paid by the death of Christ for all for whom he died, by which he obtained eternal redemption for them. All for whom the ransom price was paid will be eternally saved because that was paid as the price of their eternal redemption. Therefore, all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

“Dear dying Lamb, thy precious blood
Shall never lose its power,
Till all the ransomed church of God
Be saved to sin no more.”

My seventh argument in support of my proposition is: That salvation by the [life of Christ](#) is sure to follow reconciliation by his death.

Now, if I can prove that salvation, by Christ, insures our reconciliation, and that salvation was accomplished at the time he died, proved my proposition beyond dispute, and my brother will forever fail to meet the argument.

[Ro 5:6-10](#): “For when we were yet without strength, In due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, In that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.”

The act of reconciling is here ascribed to the death of Christ. It was declared to be done when the sinners for whom he died were enemies, ungodly ones, and sinners without strength. It does not say they were reconciled when they became God’s friends, when they repented and believed on Christ, but when they were enemies. All for whom Christ died were reckoned sinners, they were reckoned ungodly, and enemies to God. These enemies

were all for whom Christ died, who lived in the ages before he lived, at that time, and who would live in subsequent ages. They were all reckoned without strength, sinners and enemies. God is the offended party and these are the offenders, who, as such, needed to be reconciled to God or restored to his favor, and the price of such reconciliation is the death of Christ, which is paid to God and not to them. Thus God's wrath was turned from them and his just anger toward them removed.

There is an illustration of this in Christ ordering the offending ones to be reconciled with each other.

[Mt 5:23-24](#). "Therefore If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."

The obvious meaning is that he should satisfy the offended one for any wrong he may have done him, so God's satisfaction in the death of Christ for sinners for whom he died was the reconciliation of them to him. They could not bring about their own reconciliation by furnishing an expiation or propitiation, so God provided it for them. So Christ is said to reconcile both Jews and Gentiles for whom he died, by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby. [Eph 2:16](#).

As direct and positive proof that this is the reconciliation referred to, and that it was accomplished at the time he died, I call attention to [Da 9:24](#):

'[Seventy weeks](#) are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, anti to make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.'

To make reconciliation for iniquity, when was that to be? In [seventy weeks](#) after this prophecy or 490 years? This was when Christ died. So reconciliation was made when Christ died, according to this prophecy.

Of this reconciliation Paul speaks in [Heb 2](#) :17:

"Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people."

For the people for whom he died of course.

When Christ cried, "It is finished," sin was condemned in the flesh, and the handwriting that was against those for whom he died was canceled and torn, being nailed to the cross. This is unanswerable proof that the reconciliation effected by the death of Christ for those for whom he died was made when he died for them. Christ's death fur sinners for whom he died was the propitiation or satisfaction for them which reconciled them to God when he died for them, they being then reckoned as enemies.

All who were reconciled to God by the death of his Son will be eternally saved by his life. Therefore, all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My eighth argument is that the [blood of Christ](#) is covenant blood, the blood of the everlasting covenant. [Heb 13:20](#).

It was shed for those only who were embraced in the covenant of grace, who will be eternally saved in Heaven, according to that covenant. The term covenant is equivalent to the Hebrew word bereeth of the Old Testament, and the Greek word diaqhka (diatheka) of the New.

There are two kinds of covenant which relate to mankind, the covenant of works or conditional covenant, and the covenant of grace or unconditional covenant. This argument relates to the covenant of grace. If my friend contends for the conditional covenant he may contend for that, but this argument relates to the covenant of grace, which is unconditional.

In the original scheme of the covenant of grace the Almighty Father, representing the entire Godhead in divine sovereignty, made choice of his Son to be the mediator for his people whom he chose in him as children of the covenant.

[Isa 42:1-7](#). “Behold my servant, whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth Judgment to the Gentiles. I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles: To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit In darkness out of the prison house.”

Christ recognizes this covenant in coming into the world.

[Heb 10:5-7](#). “Wherefore, when he cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, body hast thou prepared me; in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo I come (in the volume of the book It is written of me) to do thy will, O God.”

In this covenant a people was given to Christ, whom he engaged to lay down his life for and finally bring to glory.

[Joh 6:38-39](#). “For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise It up again at the last day.”

Again:

[Joh 10:11](#). “I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.”

[Joh 10:29](#). “My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand.”

[Joh 17:1-2](#). “These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.”

[Heb 2:10-13](#). “For it became him, for whom are all things and by whom are all things, in bringing many Sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both he that sanctiflesh and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren. Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me.”

This covenant is eternal in its origin and nature.

[Isa 23:5](#). “He has made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things sure.”

This covenant is absolute and cannot fail.

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON’S FIRST REPLY

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to come before you this morning and to look into your faces as I begin my part of this discussion: I was somewhat afraid a few weeks ago that I would not be able to be here. But through the kind Providence of the good Father, I am before you, for which I thank him.

I appreciate the kind remarks which were made by my Brother Moderators in introducing the service. That was a fine discussion we had a year ago. I never was in one I enjoyed better. Brother Daily and I met friends and we parted better friends. And we meet here this morning as friends and I have no doubt that this discussion will be conducted in a friendly manner all the way through and that when we close we will be better friends still than we have been heretofore.

I also appreciate and reciprocate the kind words that were spoken by Brother Daily in his opening remarks. I want to return them to you, Brother Daily, with good interest and at the same time thank you for them.

Now, I have no doubt that Brother Daily is perfectly sincere in his proposition and in his argument. I don't question that for one moment. He thinks he is right and it was a noble statement he made when he said because he thought he was right he didn't fear, and that other statement was still nobler, that if he was wrong and could be corrected he would receive great benefit. I want to apply the same remarks to myself as to this discussion.

Of course while we are debating this proposition it is my business to follow and answer my brother. It is my business to tear down, if I can.

I want to say this in the beginning: That Brother Daily's definitions of the terms of the proposition I can, in general accept as to the meaning of the words; and as to the arguments he has made, a great many of them, so far as the statement of them is concerned, with them I agree. I disagree with him in the conclusions which he makes from the statements and passages that he adduces and from the proofs which he quotes.

I believe that Christ died for his people. I believe that Christ died for every one of his elect. I believe that every one of these will be saved, but I contend in this discussion that he died for others besides these, who will *not* be eternally saved and if I succeed in finding *just one*, I don't need to follow Brother Daily in all his arguments and statements. If I find *just one* person in all the history of the race that Christ died for who will not be eternally saved, my opponent's proposition falls. Isn't that right Brother Daily? He says it is right. You see I have an easy task, if I can find such a person. Watch me and see if I find one such person, as we proceed with the discussion.

As to Brother Daily's questions, it is a little early for him to begin giving me questions, until we get fairly into the discussion. I will, however, get to them in due time. By the way, I shall have a few for him. I may give him some of them in this speech possibly. Possibly not.

His first argument was stated this way: "The death of Christ was necessary for the salvation of sinners and was designed to accomplish that end."

But before I enter upon the work of answering this. I have something else I want to present to you—a point or two I want to make clear. By the way, this debate is to be published, and we mustn't try to go too fast.

I want to call your attention to this fact: My opponent's proof texts in support of his proposition *must* contain the terms to be proven or their equivalents. The *passages* he *quotes* must contain the terms to be proven or their equivalents, he has not quoted a single passage that conforms to that rule. The reason is, there is no such passage. If it was in the Book, Brother Daily would find it. But it is not in the Book.

If I show you that Christ died for *the whole human race* and then show that *some members* of the human race will be eternally lost, my opponent's proposition fails. He agreed awhile ago that it is enough if I show this as to one. If I show you there has ever been a *moment* when any one for whom Christ died, was lost, I show that, logically, there may be such a moment to all eternity. God can as well afford in justice and mercy to have one for whom Christ died punished for his sins in eternity as he can in time. So my friend's proposition is lost.

I shall examine my opponent's proof texts as best I can and show that, fairly interpreted, they do not prove his proposition. I shall bring forward proof texts and facts which, fairly interpreted, prove the truth of *my denial* of that proposition. I hope you will all read the proposition until you get it burned into your memories. It is what John R. Daily affirms: "All for whom Christ died will be eternally saved." Elder Daily affirms that all those for

whom Christ died are certain of eternal salvation, and that all those for whom Christ *did not die*, are certain to suffer endless punishment.

And the fact that Christ did not die for them is not their fault. If there is a man here this morning for whom Christ did not die, it is not that man's fault; it is his awful misfortune.

It is true that God takes no pleasure in the death of any of them; [Eze 18:32](#), "For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; wherefore turn yourselves and live ye."

God is kind to the wicked: [Lu 6:35](#), "But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest; for *he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil.*"

God is not willing that any should perish. [2Pe 3:9](#), "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long suffering to usward, *not willing that any should perish*, but that all should come to repentance." That is the word of God, as sure as you live, Brother.

But not one, according to Brother Daily, not one for whom Christ did not die, can possibly escape an endless hell. Christ's death has infinite value and could have furnished a covering for all as well as for one. It would not have caused him a pang of suffering more to die for all than for one, because it took measureless suffering to provide that which would make atonement even for one. Oh, why should measureless love leave one out? The love that makes the sun to rise on the evil and on the good and sends rain on the just and unjust! Without the death of Christ for him, no sinner can be saved: by the one [sin of Adam](#), unless Christ died for him, he is lost forever. Not for his own sin, but for Adam's sin. No hope! No way of escape for any child of Adam race for whom Christ did not die.

The infant in its mother's arms may be doomed to endless punishment, if my friend's proposition be true. It was just as true of men when they were infants that Christ had not died for them as it will be when they are in hell! They were born into the world with not the remotest chance for heaven! Not their fault; but their misfortune! Born sure of hell, without any possible remedy because Christ didn't die for them, according to my friend's proposition.

If Christ did not die for them, they cannot be saved. Yet God *wants* them to repent. God *commands* them to repent; but if my friend's doctrine is true, they *cannot* repent; and if they *could*, according to his doctrine, they could not be saved, because there is no salvation for them without the death of Christ for them. God commands them to believe on his Son, but they *cannot*, according to my brother's doctrine; and if they *could*, they cannot be saved. For you to believe on Christ is to believe that Christ died for you, and if a man should believe that Christ died for him when he did not die for him, he would believe a lie.

No repentance for them, that is, for those for whom Christ did not die. No faith for them. No forgiveness for them. Not the remotest chance of salvation for them. Born sure of hell with no possibility of missing it! Some of your children may be born with no ghost of a chance for heaven, if Christ didn't die for them. Half or more of the prattling boys and girls in Franklin County may have no ray of hope for happiness [hereafter](#); for my friend agrees there are many for whom Christ did not die. Pull down the curtain! Too bad to look at. If it is true we ought to take it of course. It is an awful thing, but let the truth prevail if the heavens fall." But I don't believe it is the truth.

I have a few things I want to show you before I proceed to the direct answer of Brother Daily's arguments. Now we are talking about Christ's death. Christ's death for men. I desire to make a few statements, a number of which Brother Daily has already made; for instance, [Mt 20:28](#). Certainly that is right. I desire to mention some of the purposes of Jesus' death.

Jesus Christ died a ransom for many. [Mt 20:28](#), "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." That doesn't say how many.

He died for the sins of his people. “He died for our sins according to the Scriptures.” [1Co 15:3](#) We agree on that all right. I believe that as much as Brother Daily does. He died to redeem his people from the curse of the law. [Ga 3:13](#), “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written: Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” I agree to that. I believe that. But it doesn’t prove the proposition. The *term* to be proven is not in it.

Christ died for his *church*, as Brother Daily says. [Eph 5:25](#), “Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.” That doesn’t prove the proposition. Paul doesn’t say here whether he died for any one besides the church or not.

He died for the individual believer. Now! [Ga 2 :20](#), “I am [crucified with Christ](#); nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” That doesn’t mean that he didn’t give himself for anyone else! Of course not. Why say, when he says that he gave himself for the church, that he died for nobody else but the church? Anybody can see that point.

He died for the ungodly. [Ro 5:6](#). “For when we were without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.” How many of them? My opponent says, only a part of them, and that only a part of them will be eternally saved. That is not in this passage.

He died for the unjust. [1Pe 3:18](#), “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us God,” etc. How many of the unjust? The passage doesn’t say.

He died to be a ransom for all. [1Ti 2:6](#), “He gave himself a ransom for *all*.” How many were “all?” Does it say all the elect? We will discuss that further when we come to the full passage. But this says he gave himself a ransom for *all*.

My opponent teaches that Christ didn’t die for all men, but only for the elect; but if he gave himself a ransom for *all*, which I prove, it must then follow that some for whom he died will not be eternally saved.

But further still. He died to take away the sin of the world. [Joh 1:29](#) “The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the [Lamb of God](#) which *taketh away the sin of the world*.” What sin? Just of the church? No, sir! Just of individuals like Paul? No, sir! But *the sin of the world*. I challenge Brother Daily to find a passage in the book of John’s Gospel, or in 1st John where the word “world” ever means only the elect.

There is another passage which says he died for every man. [Heb 2:9](#), “But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor”—What for?—“That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.” So, if there is a single man lost, where is my friends proposition? And he, himself, says some will be lost. Yet Paul says Christ tasted death for every man. There is no exception.

Now! He died to remove the guilt of the Adamic sin from the race! [Ro 5:12-19](#). “Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation (That is scripture, and is in the 18th verse), even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” Brother Daily has got to take the ground of the Universalist, that everybody will be eternally saved, or surrender his position, because he has said himself, that it is the most God-dishonoring doctrine under the sun to say that any one for whom Christ died would not be eternally saved. But I show you in the words of the Apostle that he tasted death for every man! Good-bye, Brother Daily. I would rather you would come this way; but if you are going to be a Universalist, good-bye.

Christ died for the Jewish nation. [Joh 11:49-52](#), “And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all (This is what the High Priest said) Nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this, spake he

not of himself; but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in. one the children of God that were scattered abroad.” Now haven’t I proven, that Jesus died for the Jewish nation? And if I show that some of the Jewish nation will be eternally lost, what have you got? You have some whom Christ died for that will not be eternally saved; and so my friend’s proposition is lost. Good-bye!

I want now to make a statement or two which may seem somewhat like, a repetition: All true believers for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. We are agreed on that. He quoted John and [Joh 10:28](#), both “I will give unto them eternal life.” That is Jesus died for them, and they live eternally—all of them. Of course there is no discrimination. But it is true, further, that all who die not having actually sinned, for whom *he* died, will, be eternally saved. There is nothing against them. And Christ did die for all of them. “As by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.”

We read of one weak brother for whom Christ died that *perished*. [1Co 8:10-11](#), “For if any man see thee which hast knowledge, sit at meat in the idol’s temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols? And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother *perish, for whom Christ died?*” In the Revised Version, American, it reads: “For through thy knowledge he that is weak *perisheth*, the brother *for whom Christ died*. It doesn’t mean a brother in Christ, because we have seen that those in Christ will never perish, but here is a brother in *Adam* for whom Christ died, who perishes. The Greek word *apoleitai* (*apoleitai*) is the same as in [Joh 3:16](#), where the word *perish* occurs.

Certain of the Jewish Nation for whom Jesus died will not be eternally saved. Judas, for instance. The language is this: “The Son of man indeed goeth as it is written of him; but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born,” [Mr 14:2](#). Did Christ die for him? The high priest by prophecy speaking not of himself, said that Christ should die *for that nation*.

Another member of the Jewish nation condemned: See [Lu 16:22-23,26](#): “And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom; the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.” Here is one for whom Christ died in hell; in *torments*, and, if there is no way to get out, lost forever. The [Restorationists](#) tell us there is a way to get out! But read this: “And besides all this,” this rich man in hell is told,—“between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.” In torment! In hell! Character fixed forever! and yet Christ died for him. And yet Brother Daily says, in the face of all these Scriptures, that to say that any man will be finally lost for whom Christ died is the most God-dishonoring doctrine that could be proposed! The issue is between you and the Bible, Brother Daily. I would hate to make such a charge against those who uttered the language I have quoted.

Still others—Jews for whom Christ died. [Joh 8:21](#), “Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come.” Yet he died for them! What does my friend’s proposition say? That they would be eternally saved. But Jesus says to them: “Whither I go ye cannot come.” “Ye shall die in your sins.” Whom shall we take? Brother Daily, a nice Christian gentleman or Jesus? The High Priest *by prophecy*, in so many words tells us that Jesus *died for that nation!* and these were members of that nation. And they *cannot* go to Christ where he is.

In [2Pe 2:1](#), we are told of some Christ *bought*—false teachers that Christ *bought*, and it says concerning them: “Even denying the *Lord that bought them*, and bring upon themselves *swift destruction*.” Here are some that Jesus *bought*. Peter says so. And Peter says that these who deny the Lord that *bought them* “shall *utterly perish* (see the 12th verse) in their own corruption.” He says that the blackness of darkness is reserved to them forever. What are you going to do with that? Christ *bought them*. They *utterly perish*. They bring upon themselves *swift destruction*. And yet my friend’s proposition says that all that Jesus bought, all whom he died for, will be eternally saved. Will those men in [Second Peter](#) be eternally saved? Tell us that! Jude tells about those same men.

Those of whom Jesus speaks in [Joh 5:28-29](#), will not be eternally saved, because he says: “All that are in their graves shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.” Jesus died for these. He tasted death, I tell you, for every man. *Paul* says he did, and I don’t think he dishonored God when he said it.

Those of whom Paul speaks in [2Th 1:7-9](#), and for whom Jesus died and to whom the gospel was offered, will not be eternally saved: “And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.” Now those people were under the Gospel and they are going to be destroyed. According to Brother Daily the Gospel couldn’t make demands on them because it is only for those for whom Christ died! But Paul says Jesus tasted death for every man. Yet these shall he everlastingly destroyed.

We find some in [2Th 2:9-12](#), for whom Christ died and who will not be eternally saved: “Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.” They received not the love of the truth that they might be saved! “And for this cause (listen to this) *because they* received not the love of the truth *that they might not be saved*” “God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth but who had pleasure in unrighteousness.” Christ died for them. He died for *every man*. My opponent’s proposition is squarely against the word of God and fails, fails, fails!

Here is a stone wall that Brother Daily with all his ability and ingenuity, cannot climb over. He talks nicely; he quotes Scripture; but his passages do not contain the terms to be proven. You will see it. The book will show it. I glad this to go in cold type.

But now Brother Daily says that the death of Christ was necessary for the salvation of sinners and was designed to accomplish that end, and that its design must all be accomplished. The salvation of those for whom he died is sure! and he quotes [Mt 18:11](#) which says. “He came to seek and save that which is lost.” He also quotes 1 Thess. I want to look at [Mt 18:11](#). It is one of my brother’s proof texts and deserves examination. It is true of course but it doesn’t have in it what he thinks is there. “For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.” This passage proves conclusively that the mission of Jesus was for all men, because all men are lost. Aren’t they? Why, sure! In the first place, the race was lost because of Adam’s transgression. See [Ro 5:12](#). Listen to this: “Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men for all have sinned.” We all sinned in Adam. You and I. Then what? What has Jesus done, having come to save that which was lost? “Therefore as by the offense of one”—[Ro 5:18](#)—“judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men”—*the same all men*—“unto justification of life.” All right. So he saved all men from the Adamic sin. That is as plain as the nose on your face, and I see some are pretty plain. All plain enough. Jesus came to save all thus lost and did save them; that is, from the guilt of Adam’s sin. Not one child of Adam will ever go to hell for, Adam’s sin. Jesus took that away. [Joh 1:29](#), “Behold the [Lamb of God](#) that *taketh away the sin of the world*. In perfect harmony with this is the declaration of Paul in [1Ti 4:10](#), “For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of *all men*, especially those who believe.” What about the living God, Paul? “*He is the Saviour of all men.*” Of how many men? *All men*. What else have you to say? “Specially of those that believe.” You see Paul makes a distinction. And all men that believe are the elect. And unless *all men* he saved eternally there will be some for whom he died that will not be eternally saved. So my opponent’s proposition is gone. He is the Saviour of all men in that he has saved all men from the guilt of Adam’s transgression. He is the special Saviour of those that believe, because, *when* they believe, he pardons all their actual transgressions. Many for whom he died and whom he saved from Adam’s guilt, become actual transgressors and never believe and so are lost forever.

[Ro 3:25-26](#), “Whom God had set forth to be a propitiation”—and that word might well be rendered “[mercy seat](#).” Through faith in his blood” (those who have faith in his blood are saved—but those who don’t believe in

that blood are lost. Through him men are saved from the Adamic transgression and he is the mercy seat to whom any man can come who will. And he bids men to come? Yes sir; actual transgressors. Let me quote you the Scripture on that and see if you will take it: [Joh 3:17](#), “For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world” (the world was already condemned) “but that the world through him might be saved.” Not certainly *should* be, but *might* be. So Jesus says in [Joh 5:40](#), “And ye *will not come to me*, that ye might have life.” Seems plain enough.

Brother Daily quotes from [Mt 1:21](#). He says that Jesus won't save any more nor any fewer. The passage doesn't say it. I agree he will save his people, every one of them. Sure! But that doesn't prove he died for no one else. Paul says he tasted death for every man, and Paul says he is the Saviour of *all men*. What necessity is there for a brother to set himself squarely in the face of God's word? He says it wasn't Christ's mission to *try* to save them or to get anyone else to save them. That doesn't affect this truth.

He quotes from Is. 53:10, “He shall see his seed” and “be satisfied. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved! That doesn't follow. Why should my brother make that argument? I agree that the passage says that Christ in his death saw the final, eternal end. He saw John R. Daily. He saw me; and both of us after he saw us passed under the curse and were lost—but further on he saw us in him—saved. What about us when we were lost? What about this other man over here that hasn't yet been brought to him? If one of the elect may be lost today and is dead in sin, *after* Christ has paid his debt and there is nothing against him, what justice can there be in God imposing such a penalty?

He finds where Jesus came down from Heaven to do the will of his Father. And that it is the will of his Father that his people should be saved. [Joh 6:37-39](#), let us see if that is in it which Brother Daily thinks is in it “All that the Father giveth me shall come to me.” Correct. “And him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.” Correct. “For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will but the will of him that sent me.” Correct. “And this is the Father's will which hath sent me. That of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing but should raise it up again at the last day. Jesus said it. It must be true. It would be God-dishonoring for me to deny it. This passage teaches that some are specially given Christ: but it does not say that these were all for whom Christ died: that he just for these and none others. This passage teaches that all those given shall come to Christ, but it does not say that it was only for those he died. He died for those who do not come. This is my point. These shall be raised tin at the last day, but it does not say that it was only for these that Jesus died. The book plainly says in so many words that he tasted death for every man. See [Heb 2:9](#). Isn't that so? Why sure! It is not his will that any should perish. He would have saved Jerusalem but they would not. “Oh Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together (notice he *would* then) even as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings and ye would not!” See [Mt 23:37](#). God *would*. They *would not*. That is what Jesus Christ said. *Christ would. They would not*. So we see Christ's will is not always done with men; wasn't done with Jerusalem. He loves *you*. He wants you to live holy every day, but you don't do it. God's will of purpose stands as eternal and more so than the mountains, but his will of pleasure, his *desire*, is not always met. He *would* save all, but we may refuse him. See [Pr 1:20-33](#), I believe, I will read a part of it to show you: “Wisdom crieth without; she uttereth her voice in the streets; she crieth in the chief place of concourse, in the openings of the gates; in the city she uttereth her words, saying: how long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? And the scorers delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge Turn you at my reproof; behold, I will pour out my spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you.” That is gospel, isn't it? Yes, sir; that is gospel. Let us see how they do: “Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded; but ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh.” Man's *will*! God's *desire*!

Now, as to the love that caused Christ to die and caused the Father to give him, we are told in 1 John 4 9-10 about this, “herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins. Truth. But does this use the terms of my friend's proposition as you see it on the chart? Not at all. Did God love no one but *us*? He loved the *world*. “God so loved *the world*.” Did he send his Son for anybody but us? See [Joh 3:17](#), “For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through

him might be saved.” Did God send his Son to be the propitiation for the sins of none but us? See [1Jo 2:2](#), “He is the propitiation for our sins”—Mine and Brother Daily’s; all God’s peoples’ sins. “He is the propitiation for our sins.” Brother Daily has it that this is all there is of it—just God’s People! John puts it this way: “He is the propitiation for our sins and *not for ours only*. What else, John are you going to say? Hear! Brother Daily says, “Dishonor God!” Let’s see. John goes on: “He is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only but *also for the sins of the whole world*.” Now can Daily ever climb that mountain? Can he tunnel through it? Can he get around it? Never! It is the word of God and it stands against his proposition everlastingly.

My friend tells us the word “world” in [Joh 3:16](#) just means those that Christ died for and that he died only for the elect; for those that will be saved, and that the rest are left out. Let us see if we can read that into it! “For God so loved the world, how much?—“that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him—should”—be no longer of the world—“should not perish, but have everlasting life.” “For God sent not his Son in the world to condemn the world but that the world through him might be saved.” “He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed.”

My brother called attention to [Ro 9:10-13](#); also to [Eph 5:2,25-27](#). I will pass Romans for the present. Let us see about [Eph 5:2,25](#) a little. I want to notice it still further later. [Eph 5:2](#), Brother Daily also quoted the first verse. “And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.” Certainly Christ gave himself for us as an offering. Nobody disputes that. I don’t dispute that he also gave himself for others. He died for others. I us Father sent him, as John says in so many words, to be the Saviour of the world. He tasted death for every man, as Paul says. But not all for whom he died will be eternally saved.

Now to the passage about the church: “Husbands love your wives, even as Christ loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious church not having spot or wrinkle,” etc. This is all about the church. This does not prove that Christ died for the church and no one else. He loved the church, but he also loved the world. [Joh 3:16](#), He gave himself for the church. He was also sent into the world that the world might be saved and he gave his flesh for the life of the world. See [Joh 6:51](#), “My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.” He *bought* some men who are to suffer the blackness of darkness forever. [2Pe 2:1,12-17](#). Here are those that Jesus bought; that bring on themselves swift destruction; that are to suffer the blackness of darkness forever. Christ loved the church and gave himself for it that he *might* present it to himself a glorious church. So God loved the world and Christ gave himself for the world that the world through him *might* be saved; that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

My friend proves, as he thinks, from the second chapter of Ephesians that Christ died for none except those whom God quickens through Christ. We are the beneficiaries of life through Christ’s death. [Eph 2:12](#): “You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world. Then on down about the 5th verse it is said: “For when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (By grace ye are saved),” and he says it follows that he will quicken only those for whom Jesus died and if not, why not? Suppose I can’t tell you? Just suppose I can’t tell you? I can; but suppose I couldn’t? What figure does that cut in the face of this passage?

When does he give us life? Let me quote the 8th verse of the same chapter, [Eph 2:8](#): “For by grace are ye saved.” *Before* faith? No! *Without* faith? No! “*Through* faith.” Quickened through faith. Life through faith. We will discuss that at some length on the next proposition, and we will see before this debate closes that it doesn’t follow that, because a sinner is *dead*, he may not take steps toward Christ. Just make use of that, if you want to, in advance.

Now Brother Daily says God’s love caused God to send Christ to die for his people, and that he loved them just alike, and that Christ, therefore, came and died. Where do you find that out? For the instruction of the audience, please tell us where you found out that God loved all his people *just alike*— the elect people. Christ had a favorite among the twelve, even.

Then he quotes from [Ro 8](#), which will be examined a little farther on.

But he says that Christ is a mediatorial priest and speaks of his entrance into the most holy place, where he purged our sins. See [Heb 1:1-3](#). I want to turn to something I have on that passage and give it to you. “God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.” That is the way it reads. The American revision says: “When he had made purification of sins, sat down.” The [Emphatic Diaglott](#) says: “Having made a purification for sins, sat down.”

This purging or purification was not done on the cross, Brother Daily. It wasn't done on the cross. In the tabernacle service the bullock was killed *outside* the tabernacle. Then the high Priest took the blood and went into the holiest of all—the Sanctum Sanctorium—and sprinkled the blood as directed, and made an atonement. *Where? In* the most holy place. Not where the bullock was killed. Made an atonement, first for his own sins and then for the sins of the people. So, Jesus as the goat of sin offering was *slain on the cross*. Afterwards Jesus as the High Priest, with our sins on him, so that they were as his—he was counted as the greatest sinner on earth—he took his blood and entered into heaven itself—the most holy place—and there first for himself, by the sprinkling of blood, “purged our sins,” as in the common version, or as in the [Diaglott](#), made “purification for sins”; and God accepted him as having made good, and placed him at his own right hand. But this does not mean that all for whom he died shall be eternally saved.

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY'S SECOND SPEECH

Gentlemen Moderators, Worthy Opponent, Respected Audience:

My Brother said he believed that Jesus died for his people, for the church, and that he also died for others. There were those then regarded by him when he died as his church, and for whom he died, and there were others, all the others that were not his church, not so regarded when he died. There was a distinction between his church and the "others." Now, suppose any of these "others" should be saved, will they constitute part of his church?

He says a passage to prove a proposition must contain the exact terms of the proposition or the equivalent. [Ro 5:8-10](#) certainly does contain the equivalent. "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we are yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by .his life." That proves evidently, as an equivalent of the terms of my proposition, that all for whom Christ die will be eternally saved, because when he died he made the reconciliation as I have proved.

He quoted from Ezekiel, where God says by the prophet, "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth; saith the Lord God; wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye." God is there addressing National Israel and speaking of the disobedient ones among National Israel. As his promises to that nation were conditional promises, if they obeyed God, under that National law, God preserved them; if they did not, God afflicted them. He had no pleasure in such affliction in case of disobedience under national law.

He referred to [2Pe 3:9](#), "God is not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance." It is God's work to save sinners. This, my worthy opponent will not deny. Since it is God's work to save sinners, and since he doeth according to his will as the Bible declares, he will save all he wills to save. Therefore if this passage means all mankind, all will be saved. To come to repentance is to come to Christ. Christ says no one can come to him except the Father draws him. Then all that the Father wills to come to Christ will be drawn. If this passage means all mankind, all will repent and be saved. It is God's goodness that leads to repentance. [Ro 2:4](#). Since it is God's goodness that leads to repentance, if this passage means all mankind, all will come to repentance. If there are more references made to that, we have more. He said: "Why should measureless love leave one out?" According to his theory measureless love leaves *millions* out. Christ loving them enough to die for them, and God loving them enough to send Christ to die for them, yet millions are left out without a shadow of a chance for salvation, according to his theory. I dare him to deny it. Millions left out according to his system without the shadow of a chance for salvation.

He speaks of the infant. He tries to draw the string of sympathy again. This I anticipated. The infant, if saved, which it will be if it dies in infancy, was [atoned](#) for by Christ on the cross and its nature will be changed by regeneration and it will go to heaven. We will see later whether his system will take it there or not.

But he spoke of some probably being commanded to believe and yet could not, or having opportunity to believe and yet could not, and if they did they could not be saved because Christ did not die for them. Christ died for everyone who believes in Christ. Christ died for everyone who ever [repents](#) of sin. Christ died for every mourner and everyone who ever did mourn, and every one of them will go to heaven.

Speaking of the "ransom for all," he did not answer my argument relative to that, neither did he answer a single argument I made in my speech this forenoon. But he gave a passage which he thought was a kind of off-set to the passage of proof. This passage was [1Ti 2:6](#), where he said he gave himself a ransom for all. Ransom is here translated from antilutron (antilutron). The preposition anti (anti) is here joined to the verb. Antilutron (antilutron) is a strong word translated *ransom* in this text. Anti (anti) means over against, corresponding to, in place of, in retribution or return for. [Lutron](#) (lutron) is from the verb luo (luo) which means to loosen, unbind, set at liberty, So the word *anti-lutron* means the payment of such a price as retribution or return for as results in loosing or setting at liberty all for whom the ransom is paid. This fact is strengthened still by the phrase 'uper pantwn (huper panton) "for all." *Huper* (for) means in the attitude of protection, so that the idea of protection over all for whom the ransom was paid is *definitely expressed*. This makes it *infallibly* certain that all for whom this ransom was paid, for whom this blessed Mediator gave himself as a ransom, will be eternally saved. So when he says he gave himself a ransom for all he did not mean the whole human

race. If he did, the whole race is going to heaven.

Speaking about taking away the sin of the world, I ask him if Christ took away the sins of the whole race, what will send any of them to hell?

Speaking of Christ tasting death for every man, in [Heb 2:9](#), he claims “every man” means the entire human race. Let’s see. The phrase “for every man,” is translated from the Greek phrase, ‘uper pantov (huper pantos). It is not ‘uper pantov anqrwpov “for every man,” but ‘uper pantov “for every.” The word “man” is not in the original. This might be translated “for every one,” if taken distributively, which means every one of the many brethren mentioned in the context, for whose salvation Jesus was made a perfect captain. Through suffering he was made the perfect captain of the salvation of all finally brought to glory by him, and not of all the human race. If he tasted death for every one of the human race, and thus became the captain of their salvation through suffering for them they will all be saved and be brought to glory. So he tasted death for those only for whom he was made a perfect captain. These were given to him by the Father, and he will ultimately bring them all to glory, and these are the “every man” that Jesus Christ tasted death for—every man understood in the context, and not the entire human race.

He refers to [Ro 5](#) to prove that Christ removed the Adamic sin, arguing that all men were lost by Adam’s sin and all justified by Christ. If that means the entire human race will not the entire human race be saved in heaven? How will he escape Universalism?

The Apostle would have said it was for the infant in the infant state if he had meant them, but he speaks of men and not of infants. I deny that all that were condemned in Adam were justified by Christ. To admit that would be to admit Universalism, from which there would be no escape. Then he said, “Goodbye.” I’ve come back. How d’y’, Brother Throgmorton.

He called attention to [Joh 11:49-52](#), to try to prove that Christ died for the Jewish nation, where it is said. “One of them—one of the Pharisees—named [Caiaphas](#), being the High Priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And thus spake he not of himself; but being High Priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.”

Then there were children of God that did not belong to the Jewish nation—but the Gospel had not been preached to others at all. Then God had a people among the Gentiles. I wish you would stick a pin there. Jesus’ atonement had been made, not only for Jews, but for the Gentiles. His people among the Jews and among the Gentiles.

He speaks about the weak brother perishing: [1Co 8:11](#), Now the Apostle is there writing to brethren in the church, and speaks of a weak brother in the church perishing. The argument of my friend is, that one who belongs to the church, is a brother in the church, might eternally perish. Do you believe in Apostasy? If not, why did you call attention to that? Did that mean a brother in Adam? [How do you know](#) it did? The Apostle is not writing to the Adamic family, but to the Church of God He means a brother in Christ. There might be many ways in which a person can perish and then not go to hell. There are different ways in which a person may perish. In [2Pe 2:1](#), he says they deny the Lord that bought them. It does not say Christ bought them. Instead of kuriov ([kurios](#)), the Greek word which is always used when Christ is meant, being used, it is despothv (despotes), referring to God as judge and ruler. He had bought them providentially by his mercy and goodness and they denied him. We will have more of that later if it is necessary.

In reference to my argument on the design, that God’s purpose in design would be accomplished, he said that his *purpose* would be accomplished, but his *pleasure* would not.

[2Ti 1:9](#): “Who hath saved us, and called us, with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.” If God’s purpose will always be accomplished, then all that God purposes to call will be called.

In reference to [1Ti 4:10](#), Christ is not referred to there. [God the Father](#) is referred to, and in saying he is the Saviour of all men and especially those that believe, he teaches that he is the *preserver* of all men by his *protection over them*, particularly and especially them that believe. The word Saviour here in the [Emphatic Diaglott](#) is translated *preserver*. In

Hind's Interlinear Greek Testament it is also translated *preserver*, so that time literal rendering would be *preserver* of all men, and especially those that believe. Now if he is the Savior of all men, he will save all, because it takes that to be a Saviour.

He quotes [Ro 3:25](#): "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God," and makes faith a condition of propitiation. Christ's death was not propitiation, then, for any except those that had faith in his blood. Now could [1Jo 2:2](#) mean all the human race, where he said he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world, seeing that the whole world doesn't have faith? If it takes faith to make Christ the propitiation, then [1Jo 2:2](#) doesn't refer to the whole world because the whole world doesn't have faith. That is Bible, Brother Throgmorton.

He then came to the answer of my third question and said Christ died to make the salvation of all possible through faith.

I have a drawing on the map which I hope you will all see. This circle represents the human race, or the world—all mankind. This triangle, or this part of the circle, represents the part where the gospel is preached. This part of the circle represents those who never hear the gospel preached. This dark part represents the portion of the world that hears the gospel preached that are saved and become the children of God. Here is God, and Christ, and the Spirit. Here are preachers. God himself reaches this part of the human family through preachers. He cannot reach this part of the human family because preachers do not get there. Here is the devil down here. He encompasses the world, the whole world. He goes where God is, where God is not, and gets a large majority that live where God is in the world, according to his theory. Yet he says God has made the salvation of all possible through faith. I ask if it is possible for those to believe? Is it possible for them to have faith? If so, how? If not, I ask him again, Has God made the salvation of all the human race possible through faith? Come to the question. More, later

His laugh is so dry it cracks.

(Mr. Throgmorton, I didn't hear it.)

He said Christ saw us when he died on the cross, as his people—but further on he saw us all saved. Didn't he see us all when he died who will finally be saved? Question for you there.

"Oh! Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that stonest the prophets, how often would I have gathered your children together---and you would not." This has reference to the people under the old Mosiac Law. The word was given to Israel. They would not obey his command. Jerusalem represented the Jewish nation under the conditional plan. He would have gathered doesn't mean he *tried* to gather, had his Spirit to go to their hearts, and could not because they would not. It does not mean that.

He says his will of purpose stands, but that his will of desire is not always met. "We know that all things work together" for good to them that love God, to them that are called, according "to his purpose." Every one he purposes to call will be called. His purpose stands like the mountain, sir, and you will never get over that mountain.

I had not yet finished the argument that I was on when I closed my speech. I referred to [Ps 89](#) to prove that the covenant is absolute and cannot fail. Beginning with the 27th verse, concluding with the 34th:

"Also I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him ever more, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgment; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fall. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips."

Then the covenant is absolute and cannot fail.

[Isa 54:9-10](#). "For this is a the waters of Noah unto me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go

over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee.”

Then the covenant cannot fail. Christ is the one Mediator of this covenant.

[Heb 8:6](#). “But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.”

Christ is the surety, for all for whom he died, according to this covenant. [Heb 7:22](#).

The offerings made by the Levitical Priests were covenant offerings, and when accepted of God never failed to accomplish the end designed. So the [blood of Christ](#) which was shed for many for the remission of their sins, was covenant blood, and, being accepted of God, it accomplished the end designed, the eternal salvation of all for whom he died. In the covenant relation he stood as the great shepherd of the sheep which were given to him by the Father and for whom he laid down his life. They shall never be plucked out of his hands, or the hands of his Father. He gives to them eternal life and they shall never perish. In the covenant relation he stood as the husband of his bride, who were the people given to him in the covenant.

[Isa 54:5](#). “For thy maker is thine husband; the Lord of Hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall he be called.”

Solomon saw this bride and asked, “Who is this that cometh up from the wilderness leaning upon her beloved?” Songs 8:5.

The angel said to John on Patmos, “Come hither and I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb’s wife.” Paul saw this relationship and declared that Christ gave himself for her.

[Eph 5:25](#). “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it.”

[Eph 5:31-32](#). “For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the church.”

I now wish to present a summary of this argument to which I invite the special attention of my opponent.

All for whom Christ died were embraced in the covenant of Grace, because his blood was covenant blood. They were given to him by his Father in that covenant as his sheep and as his bride, to whom he thus became the Shepherd and the Husband. It was the Father’s will that he should lose nothing of that gift, but that he should raise it up at the last day. He laid down his very life, spilt his covenant blood, for these sheep, for this bride, gives to them eternal life and declares they shall never perish. None shall be able to pluck them out of his hands or the hands of his Father. He will finally bring them to glory and present them before his Father, saying: “I and the children which God hath given me.” All this makes it absolutely certain that all for whom Christ died in that covenant sense will be eternally saved.

My next argument is that, as the Father made Christ to be sin for those for whom he died, in order that they might be made the righteousness of God in him, they will be eternally saved because the design of such a sacrifice cannot possibly fail.

[2Co 5:21](#). “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.”

“For us” is there ‘uper hmwn (huper hemon), signifying standing for, or in the place of, in the sense of protection, so that what would be due to the person protected is satisfied in the, protector. This is very plain and positive language. Christ received this treatment from his Father who made to be sin; or, as the original might be rendered him as though he were sin itself, in behalf of all those for whom he died. He was made to be sin for them. The Greek word *huper*, rendered “for” in this text, means over or above, and signifies protection over that for which he died, sheltering those for whom he died from every impending danger and thus warding it off.

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON'S SECOND REPLY

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen

I come before you to continue the argument on the negative side of this question and to pay some attention to the speech to which you have just listened. However, before I come to that speech I desire to finish the argument which I was making in the forenoon. You remember I marked the place. We were speaking concerning [Heb 1:1-3](#), where Christ is said to be the brightness of his Father's glory and to be upholding all things by the word of his power and where it is said that when he had by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

I had reached this point: This does not mean that all for whom he died will be eternally saved. I had given that statement. Now I proceed from that. It means that he thus redeemed *himself from* that under which he had voluntarily placed himself. As Brother Daily showed in his last argument he satisfied for himself, and was therefore placed above the angels and every name that is named.

At the same time he ransomed the *race* from the *one sin* of the first man. This my opponent desires to escape. Jesus took away the sin of the world. That doesn't mean the sins of actual transgression, but the *sin* that was on the *race* because of the *one sin* of the *one man* in the beginning. He took *this* away, so that no man will ever be lost on account of Adam's sin; so that as to Adam's transgression every child of the race is clear until he sins himself. Does my opponent deny that?

I have one question I want to give Brother Daily right here. He can answer it at his leisure. (Hands paper.)

Now I want to quote [Ro 5:18](#) again. "Therefore as by the offense of *one*, judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation." Whose was the one offense? Adam's. Who were the "all men" upon whom the condemnation came by Adam's disobedience? What does Paul say? "As by the offense of one judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation." Not by their own transgression, but because of Adam's transgression. "Even so by the righteousness of *one*," that is, the righteousness of Jesus Christ, wrought out and finished on the cross, "Even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon"—how many? "Upon all men," the same "all men" mentioned in the first part of the verse. My opponent says if that means all men, all men will be eternally saved, and told me "good bye." It does mean [universal salvation](#) from *Adam's* transgression, but not from *actual* transgression. There will never be a man in hell at last on account of Adam's transgression unless it is Adam himself. "In Adam's fall we sinned all," but Christ died for us and took that sin away. So when infants die they are saved, and God does for them whatever is necessary to make them enjoy heaven and the Father's glory. At the same time Jesus became a propitiation.—that is, a "mercy seat"—as it may be rendered in [Ro 3:25-26](#)—for actual transgressors, in the sense that God was so satisfied with what Jesus had done that he could be just and justify any sinner who would believe on him. That is what the Book says. Thus "he is the Saviour of all men and especially of those that believe." That translation doesn't suit Brother Daily? So he wants to take Benjamin Wilson's version, that he is the "*preserver*" of all men. Who is the laugh on, Brother Daily? Jesus is divine and *he* is "God over all and blessed forever;" and if you make *Jesus* the preserver of all men, it is because he died for them, and for no other reason.

But now I pass to another thought. He said Jesus shed his blood for the remission of sins, and asks shall it fail? No, sir. No, sir. Sins are remitted—Jesus doesn't fail. "He shall not fail nor be discouraged!" I have been looking for him to quote that.

Brother Daily refers to [Eph 1:7](#) and to [Col 1:14](#), “In whom we have redemption.” This redemption is not something that we obtained on the cross when Christ died. Redemption is forgiveness! When did you get forgiveness, Brother Daily? Back there? or in the hour in which you first believed? Tell us! [Col 1:14](#), “In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. “When were *you* forgiven? When Christ suffered on the cross? or when he met you in faith? I was forgiven when I met him in faith. Before that I was under the curse; I walked even as others; but when I came to him and believed on him, he met me and forgave my sins. That is what the redemption is.

Then we have this in [Joh 3:16-17](#): “For God so loved the world, that he gave his [only begotten Son](#), that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.” As I said this morning, this was not that the world *should certainly* be saved; not so; but that the world through him *might* be saved.

Notwithstanding Brother Daily’s beautiful picture, this language offsets it. Here is God—Christ, the Spirit, and the preachers and this down here (refer ring to diagram). Isn’t it possible for all these (the lost) to reach this (salvation)? You go and read the Old London Confession on Contingencies and learn that even Predestination doesn’t get away from second causes! and here in [Joh 3:17](#) it stands in letters of light that “God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be”—what does *might be* mean? Any schoolboy knows—“the world through him might be saved.” That wasn’t all of his mission. But it was his mission.

Certainly all who are saved from actual transgression have redemption or forgiveness in him; but no man is forgiven *until he believes*; while full forgiveness is in Christ for all men if they believe. How could I make that any plainer?

Reference has been made to [Tit 2:11-14](#). I have something to say on that passage. For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men; teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the [glorious appearing](#) of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a [peculiar people](#), zealous of good works.” Not a thing in this passage to show that Jesus died for those only who will be eternally saved. The first statement is that the grace which brings salvation has appeared to all men. How? in what Jesus has done for them. See [Ro 5:18](#); [Joh 1:29](#). See also [Joh 1:9](#), “That was the true Light”—Christ that died—“that was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.” Will you make that light [God the Father](#)? Jesus Christ was the true light which lighteth every man. Will you say these were only the elect? They were all—every man that cometh into the world. Therefore my opponent’s proposition cannot be true.

Also we find that the Holy Spirit was sent for the benefit of the world. [Joh 16:7-9](#), “For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; of sin, because they believe not on me.”

[Tit 2:14](#), teaches that Jesus Christ gave himself for believers, but not for believers only. He gave himself, a ransom for all. See [1Ti 2:6](#). See also [Joh 6:51](#), “His life he gave for the life of the world.” The purpose of his ransom in [Tit 2:14](#) was that he might redeem *sinner*s from all iniquity, purify them and make them a [peculiar people](#), zealous of good works. But we know this does not express all the purpose of it. See [Joh 3:16-17](#) again.

My brother also refers to Heb. 11, 14: “But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us, for if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the [blood of Christ](#), who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” Now I want to examine this passage candidly and show that it doesn’t sustain my friend’s proposition. Just as the goat

of sin offering was killed *outside the tabernacle*, Jesus was put to death on the cross, “*Outside the camp.*” And just as the High Priest in the tabernacle service took the blood of the goat which was slain, *into* the most holy place and there made an atonement, so Jesus as the high priest took his own blood *into* Heaven itself, *after* his resurrection, and there *made* and is *making* the atonement. No atonement on the cross. It is made in the most holy place by the blood shed on the cross, It must be made in the most holy place, Heaven itself.

There Jesus made “purification of sins” as to himself, and of the Adamic sin as to the race, and was “set forth to be a propitiation through faith” for every actual sinner who believes in him. See [1Jo 2:2](#), and [Ro 3:25-26](#).

The eternal, redemption means this: He has redemption in hand (which means forgiveness) for every actual sinner, but the actual sinner doesn't possess it. It is made over to the actual sinner *when he believes*, but never otherwise. Jesus has redemption for every one from the guilt of Adam and *has* made it over eternally to the race. He has redemption for the race from the grave, and *will* make it over to every one in the resurrection. But this does not mean that all actual transgressors will be eternally saved. We know that some are not saved now; so some may not be tomorrow; some may not be next year; some may not be to all eternity. This is the logic of it. And as to the Bible we know he gave himself a ransom for *all*, and we know that *some* whom he thus bought will eternally perish. See [2Pe 2:1-12](#) and so on.

My friend quoted the Greek word for Lord in [2Pe 2:1](#). It is “despotes.” He would have you think it does not mean Christ. I want first to define the word; then to give its usage. It means “a Lord, or Master.” See lexicon. It occurs in [Lu 2:29](#), where it means God. So also in [1Ti 6:1](#). In [Jude 1:4](#), it occurs and Jude says it means Christ! And Jude is considering the same situation that Peter is in [2Pe 2:1](#), where the word occurs in [Re 6:10](#), it evidently means Christ. The very meaning he says it doesn't have: So we see in [2Pe 2:1](#), “despotes” means Christ, and Peter says the Lord (despotes, Christ) *bought* these men who utterly perish in their own corruption. Brother Daily says the buying of them refers to God's ownership of them, as the Creator!

The blood of Christ purges our conscience from dead works. When? Back there when the blood was shed? Tell us. Is that what you mean—that your conscience was purged from sin when Christ died on the cross? Mine was purged in my *lifetime* by the application of that blood. And Christ's blood when shed on the cross per se, cleanses no one. That only the application of the blood can do. It is the blood *applied* that does this thing. Let me read you [Ac 15:7-9](#). It will show you *when* the purification takes place: “God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us;”—now listen!—“and put no difference between us and them, *purifying their hearts by faith.*” Not without faith— nor yet when the blood was *shed*; but by faith when the blood was applied. That is when the *purging* takes place as to the actual transgressor.

See [1 Peter](#) 1:22, 23, “Seeing ye have *purified* your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto un feigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a heart fervently.” You have pure hearts. See that you use them. The pure heart comes by obeying the truth, which means believing the gospel.

Then we come to [Ro 5:9-10](#), which seems to be a sort of favorite with my brother. “Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.” Do you mean that we were justified by his blood *when* the blood was shed? Be plain on that point. “Much more *now*— being justified”—Can his blood act *now*, 1800 years after his blood was shed? Yes; it justifies men now. The act of justification takes place *now*— we shall be saved from wrath through him ;“ for “if, when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” Do you mean that reconciliation took place on the cross? *You* wasn't reconciled then. *You* was born after that, and grew up and became a sinner and became dead in sin. *You* wasn't reconciled then, but there came a time when *you* was reconciled, and it was done by the death of Christ, not *when the death took place*, but *when you believed in that death*. That was when you was reconciled. Not before then. To speak of a man as you was and as I was before we believed, as being reconciled is ridiculous! Perfectly ridiculous! But there comes a time *when* a man *is* reconciled by Christ's death. Then the promise is that he shall be saved by Christ's life. That is what this passage means.

In [Da 9:24](#), Brother Daily thinks he finds something. Let's see. I want to show that the proofs he thinks are in the passage are not there. Now watch: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon the holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy!" How much proof is here for Brother Dailey's proposition? Let's look at it. Is there a word in this passage to show that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved? Not a syllable. "To finish the transgression." This does not mean that after Christ's death there was no more transgression even on the part of the elect. The marginal rendering is "to *restrain* the transgression!" "To make an end of sins." This does not mean that after Christ's death there were no more sins. There is no indication that this means reconciliation in the sense of eternally saving all for whom he died. "To bring in everlasting righteousness" does not necessarily mean that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. The most this *can* mean is that at the time appointed and by the means of that death, was provided a way by which transgression should be finished and sins should end. That was what it was for. It was to bring that about. It was that by which everlasting righteousness should be brought in. But all these things come to the actual transgressor only when he believes. Regeneration and redemption come then. *When* he believes, his sins are forgiven. That is when the sinner's debt is paid. Not that the payment is in the belief. The payment has been prepared for. There is a difference in the preparation of a ransom and the payment of the ransom. Christ is the ransom in hand for every sinner, and when the sinner comes and believes in him, that ransom is paid over to God, and God is satisfied with that man—reconciled to him. That is reconciliation. He is reconciled to God. [Ro 3:21-22](#), "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, *unto all and upon all them that believe.*" These are the ones; these who believe.

But now his last speech. I want to notice a few things in it. Remember what we say here is to be printed. So we are not paying so much attention to this and that except as occasion comes up, although we propose to examine every passage, as the discussion proceeds, that seems in any, way to sustain his position. He says I make a distinction between the church and others. He doesn't. If others should be saved, will they be a part of the church? They are the church then, are they not? Did the church exist when Christ gave himself for it or not? No! The church was future and was to be made up as he said of those that repent and believe. You wasn't in the church until you believed. Before that you was a stranger to the covenant of promise. Under the curse. But when you believed, you became a part of this thing you call a great universal church. If anyone else comes to believe, he, too, comes into it.

Speaking of [2Pe 3:9](#), Brother Daily says God's work is to save sinners. But that is not all of his work. God's work is to provide the ransom for sinners; to offer the gift of his Son to sinners. All this is God's work. "He will, save all he wills to save."

In the sense of determination, that is true, but Jesus determined to save everyone that believes and he determined to save every son and daughter of Adam's race from the one sin of Adam's transgression. That is already settled. Eternally fixed.

[Mt 23:37](#), refers, Brother Daily says, to Jerusalem as a nation! Where did he find that out? Jesus was talking. He said, "I would; *you* wouldn't." If God's will is always done *when* he wills, in *whatever* sense, why not in this? Isn't God just as powerful in one day as in another? That was a sort of make-shift, Brother Daily. You ought to find something better. In Brother Daily's theology "all God wills" is equivalent to this: That a sinner's will has nothing to do with his salvation. God wills and the sinner's will has nothing to do with it! The will of Jerusalem had something to do with it. Yet I don't suppose he would have a sinner saved against his will. That would be contrary to the Old London Confession. He says Christ died for all who believe. I say he died for every one.

All that Greek my brother quoted—that is all well enough—I don't think he misstated the meaning of any particular word in [Heb 2:9](#). But suppose "every man" is "every one"! What figure does it cut? Of whom is Paul talking? Who are they? Go back to the 6th verse. What is meant? Isn't it all men? He is talking about "*man*" and

the “[son of man](#).” He goes on and tells us that God put all things under the foot of man and of the son of man and then says: “We see not yet all things ‘put under’ him, but we see Jesus made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every one.” Every one of whom? The people he was talking about of course! *Man* and the *son of man*. Every man and every son of man makes it still stronger. Thank you, Brother Daily; you are doing some good as you go along.

I want Brother Daily to remember this: That a ransom must be *provided* for the thing you intend to pay it *for*, *before* you pay it! He makes no distinction. He makes the working out of the ransom the providing of the ransom—the same thing as the payment of the ransom. They are very different! Very different!

“Well” he says, “if Christ takes away the sin of the race, can any go to hell?” I said Christ to take away the sin of the world, the guilt of the world for the one sin that Adam committed. Will anybody go to hell on that account? If Brother Daily thinks he will. I want him to tell us. But he asks, “If [Ro 5:12-18](#) means the entire human race, how do we escape Universalism?” and he denies that all the guilt of Adam’s transgression as to all men was taken away by Christ. The guilt of Adam’s transgression is on the infant, he would say, and it is not taken away; consequently the infant dies. Oh, yes, it is taken away from the elect infant, he says. And God won’t let a non-elect infant die, according to Brother Daily. He would have mothers praying for their infants to be non-elect, so that they may live and grow to manhood and womanhood, because if they are elect God might take them in infancy. But he will not, if they are non-elect. That is Daily’s doctrine.
(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY’S THIRD SPEECH

BRETHREN MODERATORS, RESPECTED OPPONENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

My brother handed me a question. The question is this: “is the living infant now in its mother’s arms guilty of Adam’s sins?” My answer is: The effect rests upon the infant in its mother’s arms, otherwise why should the infant die? Remove the cause and will not the effect cease? If not, why?

In reference to Paul saying, “When he had purged our sins sat down” in [Heb 1:3](#), he took the strange position that Christ redeemed himself from that under which he had placed himself. The first time in my life I ever heard anyone say that Christ ever in any sense redeemed himself. If he had to redeem himself how could he redeem others? I wouldn’t make such a play as that if I had anything better.

In reference to [Ro 5](#), “Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” Does that justification of life mean eternal life? Does it mean they all received eternal life when it speaks of the free gift coming to all? If justification of life doesn’t mean eternal life, what kind of life does it mean? If it does mean eternal life, how can any fail to be saved forever? Answer that, and we will have more on that subject.

Speaking of God being a Saviour of all men, he denied that it meant the *preserver* of all men. He spoke of my referring to Wilson’s [Diaglott](#). I have Smith’s Greek Dictionary here,—on the original word swthr (soter) which gives preserver as the meaning; hence it has reference to God as the *preserver* of all men and especially those that believe.

In the way of redemption through his blood, in quoting that, he says we do not have redemption until we have forgiveness because redemption is forgiveness. Now Christ obtained eternal redemption for us before he entered the Holy Place, did he not? If Christ obtained eternal redemption before he entered the Holy Place, then will we not get the redemption that Christ obtained for us? If not, why? Is Christ’s work a failure? Will Christ obtain eternal redemption for a sinner when he dies on the cross, and then that sinner fail to receive that redemption that Christ had obtained for him? I proved that ransom signified a loosing, that it was to redeem that which was ransomed, and he hasn’t answered the argument, and he will not do it.

In reference to this diagram on the blackboard, he said it is possible for these to reach this—that is, for God and Christ and the Spirit and the preachers to reach this part of the world where preachers have never preached—the people to whom preachers have never preached. He says it is possible for God and the preachers to reach those people. If preachers never preach to them, and they live in this world and die without hearing the gospel, he says it is possible for God and Christ and the Spirit to reach those who die without ever hearing the gospel. How is it possible? Tell us how? You show the reasonableness of that. This part of my diagram represents those to whom the gospel is never preached. God cannot reach them; Christ cannot reach them, though according to my friend He has died for them; the Spirit cannot reach them—though according to my friend’s position Christ has died for them—because the preachers do not reach them; but he says they can reach all of them. It is possible for them to reach all of them! How can it be possible to reach one who dies without hearing the gospel, is something I cannot understand and neither can he.

He speaks of the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. I ask him if that true light lights those to whom the preached word is never preached? Does that light light those who die without hearing the gospel? He says that true light lights every man that comes into the world. Does that true light, through the preacher light those who never hear the gospel preached?

Speaking of the conscience being purged from sin, that is not the purging of the sins mentioned in [Heb 1](#). He purged our sins in a different sense when he died on the Roman cross. There was a sense in which He purged our sins when He died on the cross, was there not? So there was a sense in which He purged sins. The Apostle says He purged our sins before He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High.

Then he speaks about the souls of some being purified in obeying the truth. Their souls are not purified in that sense when Christ died on the cross. That is in another sense.

He denies that reconciliation took place when Christ died on the cross, as Daniel said in [Da 9:27](#). Daniel said that reconciliation was accomplished at that time. He says the most this passage in Daniel can mean is that provision was made that all might be reconciled. Was provision made that those might be reconciled who never hear the gospel preached? Was provision made that they might be reconciled: if not, was provision made for all, according to your position, was it possible for all to be reconciled, if millions upon millions die without ever hearing the gospel preached?

He makes a distinction between the church and others. The church is future, he says. Then it reached down to the last one and embraced all that will ever be saved in heaven, that Christ died for. The church is future, if it is future and in time, and I believe in Christ and give the evidence that I am born of God and included, that doesn’t add me to the church; it only proves I am embraced in the number. In speaking of those who are not embraced, is it possible for them to be saved? Come and answer the question, if you can.

In speaking of not being willing that any should perish, God wills to save all He wills to save. Does God save these (represented on blackboard)? If He wills to save them, how does He will to save them? Christ died for them, but God cannot save them because the preacher doesn’t get there. Does God will to save them? If He does, he cannot carry it out. He fails because the preacher fails.

In referring to [Heb 2:9](#), my friend goes back to the 6th verse: “But one in a certain place testified, saying: What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? or the [son of man](#), that Thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; Thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of Thy hands. Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that He put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man.” This is a disjunctive statement, and the Apostle doesn’t have reference to what preceded, but to something else, as the conjunction “but” signifies... If he had meant an addition, he would have said “and we see Jesus.” He does not say “and”; he says “but.” Then he goes on and

talks about what Jesus did in dying, tasting death for every man, and goes on and explains that it was for those for whom Christ was made a perfect Captain of their salvation.

He said a ransom must be provided before it is paid, and so God provided a ransom when Christ died on the cross. He paid it. And that song,

“Jesus paid it all, all to Him I owe,
Sin had left a crimson stain,
He washed it white as snow,”

expresses it. When He died on the cross was when He paid it. That was when the ransom was paid; and *all for whom the ransom was paid*, because of the payment of the ransom, *will be saved*. He *cannot* fail, and He *will* not.

He said the “sin of the world” referred to, when it is said, “He taketh away the sin of the world,” means all men. I deny it, and demand him to prove it. I deny that John meant all the sin of the world; I mean to say the [sin of Adam](#) simply. I deny it, and demand him to prove it.

He says according to my position God will not let a non-elect infant die. I am glad he said that. I agree with him. God will not let a non-elect infant die, so every one that dies in infancy is saved in heaven. Do you say God will let a non-elect infant die? If you say He will not, and agree with me, why do you ask the question? If we are agreed, why mention it? I ask you, do you mean that God will let a non-elect infant die? See if you will answer.

“What does the [death of Christ](#), apart from everything else, accomplish in the salvation of sinners?” For instance, in the case of those who die without hearing the gospel, what does the death of Christ accomplish in their eternal salvation? You deny that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. You contend that some will be eternally damned. Now what does Christ’s death accomplish in the case of those who never hear the gospel preached?

Let us illustrate the gentleman’s theory. Let this represent those that are lost, and this those who are saved (using two books). That Christ died for these he admits, but also argues that He died for these just the same. No difference in the death. What does the death of Christ do for these? They go to endless ruin. They suffer in an endless hell, though Christ died for them. What makes the difference between the two? The death of Christ? No, sir. Anything Christ did? No, sir. He did just as much for these as these. Nothing that Christ did makes the difference. My friend’s position is that what these did, and not what Christ did, is what made the difference between the classes. So that those in heaven are there for what *they* did, and *not* by reason of what Christ did for them!

I was dwelling on the argument, when I closed before, that as the Father made Christ to be sin for those for whom He died, in order that they might be made the righteousness of God in Him, they will be eternally saved because the design of such a service cannot possibly fail of being accomplished. This truth is declared in most positive language in [Ga 3:13](#), “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” When was that redemption accomplished? When He was made a curse for us. When was He made a curse for us? When He died on the Roman cross, That agrees with the other text, that He entered heaven, having obtained eternal redemption for us. So Christ has redeemed us, for it is written, “Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” The meaning is: He was made a curse over us, in the sense of protection. This represents Him as being a curse in an attitude of protection over them for whom He died. The Greek word ‘uper (huper) means over, so that the curse due to them fell upon Him. They were shielded by Him. As surety of the covenant He stood to His engagement and made full reparation for the sins of those for whom He died. Because of His being made sin and a curse, the supporting and comforting presence of His Father was withdrawn from Him, so that He cried out, “My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?” It was for no sin of His own, but because He became sin for those for whom He died, and because He died a curse for them.

Christ, in being made sin for those for whom He died, was their substitute, as the word ‘uper (huper) positively declares. Every sinner for whom He died must be absolved or the substitution of Christ is a failure. Did Christ die for sinners as an absolute substitute? He has not said yes, or no, to that question. He has not even given an *evasive* answer to that question. He has paid no attention to it. He has said that Christ died to make the salvation of all possible, when he knows that he cannot stand upon that through this debate to save his life. He is gone if I were to stop here and give him the rest of the time. His position is that God has not made provision for the salvation of all. He will never get out of that hole. It will go down in the book with him in it, covered up with no possibility of escape.

Now all secured by Christ as their substitute, as their surety, will be eternally saved, because they are secured and redeemed from the curse of the law. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. He will not answer that question; he will not answer that argument. He will treat it as he has all the rest.

My tenth argument is founded on the unity of the Trinity. The three Persons in the Trinity co-operate, the work of each being a complement to the work of the other. God, and Christ, and the Spirit form a Divine Trinity—[God the Father](#), Christ the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And these three operate in harmony, one being harmonious with the others in the accomplishment of the work. The three Persons in the Trinity co-operate, each being in perfect harmony and agreement with the others. That the eternal salvation of sinners is the work of God, my friend has admitted. God saves them, and calls them, with a holy calling, not according to their works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was given them in Christ before the world. ([2Ti 1:9](#).) This salvation is ascribed to Christ, whose work is in perfect harmony with that of the Father. [1Ti 1:5](#), “This is a [faithful saying](#), and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief.” The Holy Spirit is the author of the new and spiritual life produced in the soul in regeneration. The Holy Spirit can reach those represented by this part of the diagram, because it is not tied up in preachers. ([Joh 3:36](#).) It is the Spirit that quickens.

[1Co 6:11](#), “And such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.” Where do preachers come in? It is also the work of the Holy Spirit to change the vile body in the resurrection and fashion it like unto the glorious body of Jesus. ([Ro 8:11](#).)

The Father, as representative of the God-head, sends His only Son to die for sinners, to reconcile them to Himself, in order that they shall be saved by His life, to bear their sins in His own body and put them away by the sacrifice of Himself, to be made a curse for them, to obtain eternal redemption for them, the remission of their sins according to the riches of His grace, and finally to be their continual Advocate at His right hand.

Christ comes and acts as the representative and surety. He gives His very life for them, and purifies them to Himself, a peculiar people, and finally ascends to his Father, having purged their sins by his death. The Holy Spirit, being one with the Father and Son, cannot fail to perform the important work assigned in the great economy of their salvation. The fullness of the God-head dwells in each of the divine persons, and this renders the work of the eternal salvation of all for whom Christ died infallibly certain, the purpose of God being carried out in all its stipulations. If the co-operation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is a harmonious work, then all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. But the co-operation of these divine persons is a harmonious work, for these three are one. Therefore all whom Christ died will be eternally saved. There is an argument that will go down in the book, sustaining my proposition. Brother Throgmorton sees now he is unable to answer it.

My Eleventh Argument is that positive fact stated by Paul that just as certainly as God delivered up Christ to die for sinners, he will as surely and freely give them all things else necessary for their salvation. [Ro 8:32](#). “He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?” The argument of the Apostle is this: If God gave the best gift he could give in giving Christ for those for whom he died, he will not fail to give any other gift necessary to their eternal salvation. If he will not fail in

guying any other gift necessary for their eternal salvation then all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. Your friends are wondering what you are going to do with that.

[1Th 5:9](#), “For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him” The great purpose for which Christ died for sinners is that they should live together with him.. Cod spared him not. He will also give all things necessary to that end.

The Holy Spirit which quickens them is a gift to them. [Ro 5:5](#), “And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.” Then if God gave Christ to die for a sinner, he will give the Holy Ghost as well. [Ro 6:23](#), “The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” He gives Christ to die for the sinner. He will give everything else necessary. Eternal life is necessary; therefore he will give eternal life.

As the Holy Spirit and eternal life are gifts from God, and as he will as surely and as freely give all things to those for whom he gave Christ to die, it follows that all for whom Christ died will receive the Holy Spirit and eternal life, and all who receive the Holy Spirit and eternal life will be eternally saved. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

To offset that conclusion my friend must show that God will not give all things to those for whom he gave Christ to die. When he proves that, he will prove the Apostle told a falsehood when he declared that God would give all things necessary, when he declared that God gave Christ, the greatest gift that could be given for sinners.

My next argument is based upon the plain statement of Peter, that the object of Christ’s suffering for sinners is that he might bring them to God [1 Peter 3:18](#), “For Christ also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.” In the phrase, “the just for the unjust,” the preposition here is ‘uper (huper), and is translated “for,” signifying protection over the unjust, a substitute for the sins for those for whom Christ died. My opponent does not say whether Christ died as a substitute or not. He has not said yet. I have proved that. He knows that he has not. To deny he died as a substitute would be to deny the positive proof I have brought forward, and so he has not said, and perhaps will not.

In the clause, “suffered for sins,” “for” is from the Greek word peri (peri), which means concerning or on account of. So the meaning is, Christ also hath once suffered on account of the sins of those for whom he died, the just one in the attitude of protection over the unjust.

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON’S THIRD REPLY

Ladies and Gentlemen, and Gentlemen Moderators

It is just one-half hour more and this session will close. We are having a good I time, a warm time, and Bother Daily warmed up to the work. That is right. I want you to do your best. Brother Daily I want you to put out the best that is in you and I want to show how weak it is.

Now, he says the effects of Adam’s sin rest on the infant in its mother’s arms, else it would not die. Let me repeat that to you. The effects of Adam’s sin rest on the elect infants, else *they* wouldn’t die! So then the elect are not clear from Adam’s transgression. After all that hot speech he has ended with the *elect still under the guilt of Adam’s transgression!* Try it again, brother.

But he says [Ro 5:18](#) doesn’t mean eternal life. Who said it did? I didn’t. Why does he want to spring a new issue on that passage? What is the issue on that passage? That the *very same men, all men*, who were guilty because of one offense

of one man, are cleared by the righteousness of one man. That is the point. Not whether they have eternal life or not. Meet that, brother. But you can't meet that because the passage is as plain on its face as language can state it

But he says Christ obtained eternal redemption *before* he entered the most holy place. That is an assumption. Here is a question he asked a while ago that slipped my mind in the former speech: "What effect does the [death of Christ](#) by itself, without anything else, have on the sinner?" Now listen: *none at all*. Set that down and make all out of it you can. *None at all*. Let me prove that. In [1 Corinthians 15](#): "If the dead rise not then is Christ not risen, if Christ be not risen our preaching is vain; ye are" (how?) "yet in your sins." His death wouldn't be worth anything without his resurrection. I suppose your people are wondering what you will do with that. Well, I am, too.

But he comes to [Joh 1:9](#). He wants to know if Jesus lights those that come into the world and die without ever hearing the gospel. I am willing to take the Holy Spirit's word. What does the Holy Spirit say? "He was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Suppose you cannot tell just how the lighting is done. Suppose I can't. It is something that Jesus Christ does for every man that comes into the world. I suppose these that never hear the gospel are meant as well as others.

But he says there was a sense in which Jesus purged our sins on the cross. Not so! The purging is done afterwards. After the resurrection, after the entrance into the Most Holy Place. That is where the purging is done. Then "having purged our sins," or having done this for the purification of sins, "he sat down on the right hand of God."

He tells us Daniel said that reconciliation was accomplished on the cross. I say Daniel didn't say reconciliation was accomplished on the cross. You just look at that again. If you still think he did say it, read it out of the passage and show us that it means it.

But he says the effectual call didn't add him to the church; that when he was out of Christ he belonged to the church! This man, when he was dead in sin and the wrath of God was on him, was a member of Christ's bride! Will you people take such as that? I would call it nonsense, but that wouldn't be parliamentary. But I wouldn't say that a man dead in sin, out of Christ, under the curse, a child of wrath, is a member of the [bride of Christ](#)! That is what *he* said. I don't believe any such stuff. We become members of the [bride of Christ](#) when we become bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh: when we so believe on him that the love that is in his great heart flows into our hearts, then we are one with him, and never before! We are not in Christ before that. We are till then without God and without hope in the world. And yet Brother Daily was a member of the bride of Christ back there when he was in that lost condition!

He tells us that the conjunction in [Heb 2:9](#) is disjunctive, is explanatory, looks not back, but to the future. How far? Just enough to show the contrast in this passage to what it concerns man and the [son of man](#): "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou hast put all things under his feet."

But man lost that dominion. You know he fell and became corrupt. Since then we see not all things under him. The stars in their courses fight against him and the lower animals became his enemies. The earth brought forth thorns and thistles to vex him. "But," says Paul, "we see Jesus" (here is the contrast) made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man," and every son of Adam. The simplicity of the child ought to see this. Paul states the fact, and gives the contrast. Jesus tasted death for every one of this race called man, this race called the son of man; but they are not all going to be eternally saved. Brother Daily says not, and the Bible says not. Therefore his proposition has failed. He would prove it if he had the testimony.

But he says that Christ's death on the cross paid [the debt](#); *paid it on the cross*. And how did he prove it? By a song! He quoted a song. Well, it may be a mighty fine song, but the good Book must bear testimony here—not a song. Christ *provided* a ransom by dying on the cross, and then he took that ransom and, through the resurrection, he went into that Most Holy Place and there paid and is paying the ransom. He paid it, as I showed, by redeeming himself from that under which he had placed himself. That was new to Brother Daily. Christ took the race out from under Adam's transgression, and now he sits there, "a [mercy seat](#) through faith in his blood." That is what he is there for, and for every actual sinner that comes and believes on him, in that moment the ransom is paid, and in *that moment* Jesus Christ stands as that man's substitute, and never before.

Brother Daily denies that [Ro 5:18](#) means simply Adam's sin. I think I showed this morning that it does.

He says God will not let a non-elect infant die. I don't think that infants have anything to do with the doctrine of election. "According as he hath chosen us *in him*." ([Eph 1:4](#)) Was you one of the elect when you were out there, dead in sin? Was you one of the elect then? Under the curse and wandering from God, was you then elect? God elected you *in Christ*. "According as he hath chosen us *in him*," not out of him. It is in Christ.

But he says my Bible gets people into heaven, not because of what *Christ* did, but because of what *they* did. That is all in his eye. Here is the sum and substance of it: God comes to the actual transgressor. He offers Christ to the actual transgressors, as they are perishing, as lost and ruined. He offers him to them as a *free gift*, without money and without price. The transgressor accepts Christ as God's *gift* to him. And Brother Daily calls that paying for it! What would you think of the tramp that would come half starving o your back door for a "hand-out" and you give him a good meal, and after he partakes, he says, "I have paid for this"? And he didn't do a thing but take it as a free gift and eat it. You would want to kick him out. That is the kind of logic Brother Daily has. He has it that salvation by simple faith, for nothing, is paid for by accepting it. How do you pay for it? Who ever heard of the like?

Then he comes to [Ga 3:13](#). I have something here on that which I want to give you specially. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." A curse he was for us, for believers, for it is written, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." just as soon as I became a believer I became, *before God*, as *if* I had paid the penalty for myself. Jesus had paid it for me. Jesus had *provided* it for me on the cross, and then, *when I believed*, it was made over to me. You can understand that. Suppose you have a friend in jail with a fine of \$1,000.00 on him, and he hasn't a thing to pay with and cannot get out unless the fine is paid. You go to work to get the \$1,000.00 to pay his fine for him. You dig and plod and work and study, day and night, and do everything you can to get that \$1,000.00 to pay your friend's fine. After a while you get it all. That is *for* your friend, but he is still in jail. You have the money in hand for him and he is still in jail until you go to the proper court and settle the judgment according to the docket. The fine is not paid till then; no, sir! Just so, Jesus with the ransom that he provided on the cross has gone into the Most Holy Place of the universe and there *for me*, *when* I believed, paid the debt. There for the whole race, *as to the Adamic sin*, he paid [the debt](#). That is what the Book teaches. This passage, then, doesn't teach what my brother thinks it does.

It is true Jesus gave himself for our sins, but that doesn't mean for no one else's sin. ([1Jo 2:2](#).) This is in the Book. What is it? "He (Christ) is the propitiation for our sins"—the elect's sins. That is what that means. Mine and Brother Daily's sins, and the sins of all believers. But look: "He is the propitiation for our sins, and *not for ours only*." Here is Brother Daily's mistake. The Book says it is "not for ours only, but *also for the sins of the whole world*." My opponent asks, How can he be a propitiation for the sins of the actual transgressor? Just like you was *for* your friend who owed this \$1,000.00. It doesn't take two eyes to see that; just one will see it.

Let me quote [Joh 6:51](#), "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the"— Elect? No sir. Of course it is *for* the elect, but that point is not what Jesus is talking about. "For the life of *the world*." That is it. Remember in [Joh 12:47](#), Jesus says: "I came not to judge the world but to save the *world*." And he did save the world from the guilt of the Adamic transgression This is just what Paul makes it mean, when he says that "by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon *all men* unto justification of life."

There is another question that Brother Daily is worrying about. I had it noted and just neglected it; and now, because I am inclined to be obliging and kind and like him, I am going to answer that question. This is the substance of it: In what sense did Christ die for sinners? Did he die for them really and absolutely as their substitute, or merely for their benefit, intending his death to be a benefit to them if certain conditions should be complied with?" Here is my answer: He died for the benefit of sinners, and his death does benefit every one of them. He also intended that his death should be a further benefit to them if they should comply with certain conditions. His Father gave him, "that whosoever believeth on him should not perish." His Father sent him, "that the world through him might be saved"; and whoever believes on him shall be saved. For every believer he is counted as having died in his stead. *His* death takes the place of the *believer's* death. God accepts Christ's death for the believer and so frees the believer from eternal death. He is really the believer's

substitute. That is, God lets the believer go free and accounts that Christ's death is the believer's death. But he don't let you go free *until* you believe.

I have a string of questions here, and one by one I shall read them :

Some for whom Christ died are not saved now, but are dead in sins. If this does not dishonor God now, how will it dishonor him if some for whom Christ died should be dead in sins in the hereafter?

Here is another: the penalty of sin is death— listen closely—if the penalty of sin is death, and Christ paid the penalty for the elect on the cross, how can one of the elect, in justice, suffer the penalty for *one* day? I will give you all summer to answer that; and yet Brother Daily knows he was under the penalty for years. So was I. So are all sinners dead in sins under it now. And *death* in sin is the penalty of sin. Suppose you owe a debt, and suppose I pay it *all* for you, and the creditor to whom I paid it afterwards wants to collect a dollar on it! Is that justice? And yet Brother Daily has God collecting from the elect through long years on the penalty which has already been paid. Explain that, Brother Daily. That is pertinent to this controversy. I predict that he cannot. I will tell you, the best thing is to give up that thing right here. Take what God says in his Book, that Jesus, by the grace of God, tasted death for every one—every man, every son of man.

But he says I haven't made it possible for every man to be saved by faith. If I haven't, it is not my fault. I quoted what the Book said. If he is dissatisfied with the Book and thinks God and Christ and preachers cannot get to these people, I can't help it. With God all things are possible. Study that old document, the London Confession, on that question.

Here he preaches a fine sermon on the Unity of the God-head. There is hardly anything I could object to in that. [God the Father](#) does this, [God the Son](#) does this, God the Holy Spirit does this, *for his people*, the believers, the elect; but God the Father, and God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit does something *for others*. Now if I show that, don't I show that the Unity of the God-head is in harmony with my negative? God the Father loved *all*. He "so loved the *world*." I think that will take in about all of them, And Christ "tasted death for every one" of them. "The Father sent his Son to be the Saviour of *the world*" ([1Jo 4:14](#)). We don't have to depend alone on [1Ti 4:10](#). What will you do with that, from [1Jo 4:14](#)? I wonder if "Saviour" means to be the "preserver" here! Yes, sir, God the Father loved all men, and Jesus Christ the Son tasted death for every man, and came to be the Saviour of the *world*, and lights *every man that comes into the world*, and the Holy Spirit reproves *the world* of sin and of righteousness and of judgment. See [Joh 16:7-9](#). Now, what about the Unity of the God head? Of course the God-head is *one*. That is Bible. But when we show what the God-head does not only for the elect, but for others, all is in harmony with my negative.

My brother comes to [1Ti 1:15](#) and acted like he thought he had found something. This is a fine passage. Let's read it: "This is a [faithful saying](#), and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." How many sinners are there in the world? "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God" ([Ro 3:23](#)). That means about all. But he says whatever God desires will be accomplished. Well, God desires Brother Daily to live a "holy life every day, but he doesn't do it. He desires that I do and I don't do it. Isn't that right? Sure!

I am now going to take up Rom. 8 31-34. Here is a passage that my brother quoted, and you folks are wondering how I will answer it. I am going to show you. "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?" ("Us" means the elect, the believers.) "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." My friend after quoting this said: "All for whom Christ died will be eternally saved." That is not in the passage at all. Let's see. Does this passage say that Jesus Christ died only for the elect? No, sir. Jesus died for all, that the elect, the believers, should be saved. That is the way the Bible states it. Read [Joh 3:16](#). Believers are the elect; but the love that gave Jesus was *for the world*. Jesus was given not only that believers should be saved, but that the *world* through him *might be saved*; not *should be saved*, you understand. If, then God gave Jesus Christ *for us all*, how shall he not give to us all things that we need? This is Paul's thought. Of course he intercedes especially for his people. But this does not mean that he intercedes for none other. See [1Jo 2:2](#), "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but *also for the sins of the whole world*."

Now, as to [1Pe 3:18](#): “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.” That suffering didn’t bring us *when* he suffered. He suffered that he might bring us. You see that. Now let’s look. This passage declares that Jesus “once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust”; but it does not say for how many he suffered. It does tell the character of those he suffered for—the unjust; and the common sense interpretation would be *for all the unjust*, but I am not saying now as to that. The purpose was that we *might be* brought to God. This, however, was not all the purpose of his suffering. We as actual transgressors were not brought to Christ *when he suffered*. Put a pin there. Not when he suffered, but 1,800 years *after* he suffered. He suffered that he *might* later on, *in our lifetime*, bring us to God. Isn’t that right? Yes, sir! Years ago he suffered for John R. Daily, but the suffering at the time did not bring Brother Daily to God: and for years in his life-time Brother Daily was as far from God s anybody; but God’s [Spirit and truth](#) reached him, and by repentance and faith brought him to God. Never before. Tell us if it was. The meaning of the passage is this:

Christ suffered, the just for the unjust, to make it possible for God to bring the unjust to himself, or to make it possible for God to be just and justify the believer. In Other words, Jesus gave himself and suffered for the sins of the world, that men through him might be saved. That is as plain as the nose on a man’s face.

Here I notice Brother Daily, said that all whose sins are ‘covered by Christ’ will be saved. Yes, sir; so they will. But when does Christ put the covering on? When *we* receive the atonement. Atonement means covering—at least, that is one of its meanings—and the covering—the atonement covers us—is put over us when we believe; never before.

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY’S FOURTH SPEECH

Respected Audience, worthy Moderators and beloved Opponent:

I desire to feel grateful to God that we enjoy the privilege of meeting again this morning for the purpose of continuing the investigation of God’s Holy Word.

There were handed me yesterday two questions in the last speech by my worthy opponent, to which shall first give attention.

The first is: “If the penalty of sin is death, and Christ paid the penalty for the elect on the cross, how can one of the elect in justice suffer the penalty for one day?”

It is just as he illustrated his idea of salvation yesterday by reference to a man who had been put in jail under a fine of \$1,000.00, who was entirely unable to escape from the jail unless the \$1,000.00 should be paid. When the \$1,000.00 was paid and the court dockets were cleared on account of the payment being made, the man was still in jail, he said. His idea seems to be, however, in regard to the salvation of the sinner, that after all the provision has been made, the payment and. all preparation made, the sinner must then believe that it is made, It seems to me to be ridiculous to suppose that the man in jail must believe that his fine has been paid or he will never get any benefit out of the payment. He will never be benefited unless he believes. I desire not only to show the ridiculousness of my opponent’s position here, but to show just how this matter is, by calling your attention to [Isa 49:8-10](#), “Thus sayeth the Lord, in an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee.” The Lord is here speaking to Christ. [God the Father](#) is addressing the Saviour. “And in a day of salvation have I helped thee.” Still addressing the Saviour, “And I will pre serve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritage.” Still addressing the Saviour, “That thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth.” He makes the payment, this Saviour does, after which he is able to say to the prisoner, “Go forth because I made the payment.” If he should require them to believe in order that the payment be made, then the payment couldn’t be made until they believed, which is ridiculous, and anyone with any degree of intelligence can see the ridiculousness of it. The idea of believing a thing to be true in order to make it true, is too absurd for an intelligent mind to accept.

“That thou mayest say to the prisoner, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, shew yourselves. They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all high places.” “They shall not hunger nor thirst; either shall the heat nor sun smite them; for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them, even by the springs of water shall he guide them.” Now notice: The position of my opponent is that sinners are in prison under a fine that they cannot pay; that someone must pay for them. The large majority of the human race are in such a situation as indicated by this chart (page 58), which I wish these boys here could all see (referring to missionary preachers) in such a condition that it is *impossible* for them *ever* to *have faith! Utterly impossible!* And yet God suspends their salvation upon their having faith! Suspending their salvation upon that which they never can do! Taking the absurd position that [the debt](#) is not paid unless they believe it is paid and the payment is their belief. Belief as to the payment! Their belief is the *covering* of the debt, and makes Christ’s death a *propitiation* for their sins!

The next question given is: “Some for whom Christ died are not saved now, but are dead in sins. If this does not dishonor God now, how will it dishonor him, if some for whom Christ died should be dead in sins, in the [hereafter?](#)” I suppose he means dead in their sins forever. That is answered really in the answer that I have given to the first question, but in addition to that I want to say this: That if the ransom is paid for sinners, if the fine is liquidated and the docket cleared on that account for sinners, and those sinners remain in jail forever, it would be to the everlasting disgrace of the law of the country under which they are held as prisoners, debt being paid. Answer it if you dare. You *may try*.

I want to call your attention to another predicament into which my worthy opponent plunged yesterday and from which he will never be able to extricate himself. A corrupt tree, an alien sinner, cannot bring forth good fruit. ([Mt 7:18](#)) Faith is a good fruit, for the Apostle says it is a fruit of the Spirit. Therefore the alien sinner cannot bring forth faith. The conclusion of this syllogism will stand, because neither premise can be destroyed. It follows, therefore, that the alien sinner cannot bring forth the good fruit of faith. His theory requires him to do what he cannot do in order that the death of Christ be effectual in his salvation. The death of Christ will do him no good according to your statement, unless he complies with this condition, which this syllogism shows he cannot comply with. No alien sinner can ever be saved upon your plan. But I have something more that is interesting for my friend. It is this: He made the statement yesterday, in one speech that the death of Christ made salvation possible for all mankind. Millions die and go to hell who had no possible chance to believe. Let him reconcile these two statements. Let him deny the first one which he made yesterday, and take it back, and then we will excuse him for having said it. Let him deny the second if he dares. If he denies neither one, he will die without ever having reconciled them. Now don’t blame Brother Throgmorton for not doing that. He is not to be *blamed* for not, doing what he *cannot do*.

If the infant in its mother’s arms is not guilty of Adamic sin and has none of its own, as you say, please explain how your statement can be true, that all the race are guilty.

Now, Brother Throgmorton has been repeating a great deal, and he will continue to repeat a great deal. I will not have to repeat a great deal, because I have so much to bring forward, as you will see as this debate progresses.

But I have some more here that I want to give you on the term “the whole world,” as found in [1Jo 2:2](#). According to his position, Christ died for all the sins of all the human family just alike. Then he died for those who were in hell when he died, who had died and were lost before he died, and he now stands as the propitiation for their sins. The passage says he is now the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and so if Brother Throgmorton is right, he is the propitiation for the sins of all the lost, those who had died before his death and those who have died since. He is *now* their propitiation, being their advocate in heaven! The term “whole world” is *assumed* to mean the entire human family. It is an *assumption* without *proof*. But his position on [Ro 3:25](#), where God is said to have set Christ forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, is that faith is a condition in order for Christ’s being a propitiation for sins. That is a positive contradiction of his position on this text, for all have not faith. Since all have not faith, and since faith, according to his view, is a condition of Christ’s being the propitiation for sins, it follows as an unavoidable conclusion that the whole world, in [1Jo 2](#) ;2, does not mean the entire human family.

The key to this passage is in [Isa 49:6](#): “And he said, It is a light thing.” addressing Christ, “that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of earth.” This key shows the “world” means Gentiles. The salvation which God has prepared unto the end of the earth. Wherever this salvation which God has provided reaches, whoever

are saved by it, are included in the propitiation and advocacy of Christ. This included all the world—that is the Gentiles as well as the Jews; in fact, some of every kindred and tongue and people and nation ([Re 5:9](#)) Christ's propitiation and advocacy secures his mercy. This is the design of his glorious work, and in this he cannot fail. So all for whom he is the propitiation and advocate, the world of Gentiles as well as Jews, will be eternally saved.

He has argued at some length in [Ro 5](#). Now Adam was a figure of Christ as stated in [Ro 5:14,17-19](#), the Apostle shows that as Adam stood the head and representative of all that should ever be born of him—that is, his family—so Christ stood as the head and representative of all that should be born of him—that is, his family. That is, in Adam all that he represented were condemned, so in Christ all that he represents should receive justification; that is, eternal life, and, hence should live forever. So Christ having died for those he represented, will give to them the justification of life, which means eternal life, and they will all be eternally saved.

He says the death of Christ would have amounted to nothing had he not risen. His resurrection is not what made his death really effective, for his death was virtuous, I mean have virtue in it, as soon as he died. His resurrection showed his death to be effective. Had he not been resurrected from the dead, it would have been demonstrated that his death was not satisfactory. It was necessary to show that his death had virtue in it. If the grave had held him until today, we could not have worshipped him; he would have been a [dead Jesus](#).

He speaks of the light that lighteth every man that comes into the world, and I asked him how millions upon millions that go down to endless hell without having heard the gospel preached were enlightened. He hasn't told me and he will not dare to during this debate. Were the millions that go down to an endless hell without hearing the gospel ever enlightened by this true light, and if so, how they were they enlightened by it?

He wants to know if I was a member of Christ's bride and one of the elect when I was dead in sins? I was. The angel said, "He shall save his people from their sins." Then they were his people before they were saved. It is said he laid down his life for the sheep; then they were his sheep before he laid down his life for them. Speaking of his people who were chosen in Christ, David says ([Ps 139:16](#)) "Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them." Was I elected in sin? If I was elected, God elected me. I didn't elect myself. He chose me before the foundation of the world. And if you say they have to believe to be chosen, you have them believing before the foundation of the world. It looks like it is almost the Two Seed Doctrine.

The Trinity, he admits, does something for the saved. He didn't take up that argument and try to show that the different parts of it were not well taken, but just passed it by with the notice that the Trinity did something for all the rest, and so those that go down to hell had just as much done for them by God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, as those who go to heaven. Why do some then go down? Because those that go to heaven did something the others don't do. That is why.

When I closed my last speech I was on my twelfth argument, which is based upon the plain statement of Peter that the object of Christ's suffering for sinners is that he might bring them to God. He gave some little attention to the term "that he might bring them to God" If he had waited until I had finished the argument, I would have saved him the trouble. He wouldn't have known what to say.

[1Pe 3:18](#), "For Christ also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." The phrase, "the just for the unjust," the preposition 'uper huper in the Greek is translated "for," signified protection, over the unjust ones for whom he died, a substitute of the just one over unjust ones for whom he died. This is what that signifies.

In the clause "suffered for sins," "for" is translated from *peri*, which means *concerning* or *on account of*. So the meaning is, Christ also hath once suffered on account of the sins of those for whom he died, the just one in the attitude of protection over the unjust ones for whom he died, that he might bring those unjust ones to God. The potential verb "might bring" is subjunctive in the Greek *prosagagh* (*prosagage*), "he might bring." This verb follows the conjunction *hina*, which means "in order that." The subjunctive verb following *hina* in the Greek signifies purpose, *definite purpose*, and you said yesterday that God's purpose was *absolute* and *would be fulfilled*; it was, then, Christ's purpose in suffering for the sins of those for whom he died to *bring them all to God*. It was not to *try* to bring them or *help* to bring them, or *give them a chance* to come, or place them off where they couldn't *have* a chance to come, but to *bring*

them, all of them, to God. They were sinners, and enemies, and without strength, and therefore they could not come of themselves. Jesus said, "No man cometh unto the Father but

by me," unless by me, unless brought by me.

(Mr. Throgmorton: Did you say that the verb is subjunctive?) Answer: Yes, sir.

As his purpose is to bring those for whom he died to God, that purpose cannot fail, for he is infinite in wisdom and power. He will bring them from death to life. He will bring them from condemnation to justification, from Satan to God. If he does not bring them they will never come, for they cannot. This glorious purpose will be fulfilled when all for whom he died shall be presented before God a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, when he shall finally say, "Behold I, and the children whom God hath given me." ([Heb 2:13](#)). The Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost will then rejoice in the continuation of this wonderful work designed in the secret chambers of eternity and successfully accomplished by their harmonious operations. As it is the greatest joy of a man to see the designs he has long projected and anticipated brought to a happy home; how much more will it be to the joy of the adorable triune God when all for whom the Captain of their salvation died shall be brought to glory by him. It would be to the everlasting shame of the Three-one God if this purpose of the greatest of all his undertakings should fail. All other achievements of his would be forever overshadowed by such a failure! Disgrace would then mark his name forever! His word would be proved false when he declared, "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure!"

Christ suffered for the sins of those for whom he died for the purpose of bringing them to God, and all who are brought to God will be eternally saved. He will bring them all to God, for his power is sufficient and he is unchangeable in his purpose. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

Now I haven't time for another argument in this speech. I want to call your attention to another thing that was brought up yesterday by my opponent. In speaking of Jesus weeping over the condition of Jerusalem, because, as he supposed, Jesus was not able to save them, not able to save them, wanted to do it, gave his life to do it. and absolutely could not. Jesus weeping because he couldn't do what he wanted to do in the work of the salvation of all of these people! Now listen: If [Jesus wept](#) on that account, may we not conclude that [God the Father](#) in heaven, Jesus Christ, the Divine advocate there, and the Holy Spirit, are now weeping over countless millions that have gone down to endless hell, whom they could not save! And as they might be supposed to be weeping in heaven, and as the children of God, in love with the Father, are in sympathy, they would join in the wailing, and all heaven would ring with wailings!! God the Father, the Holy Spirit, and all who are saved in heaven, weeping because God could not save the countless millions that went to hell!! Draw down the curtains!!

He accused me yesterday of finding fault with the Word of God. I am not finding fault with the Word of God. I am finding fault with his absurd, irrational theory, unscriptural because it is absolutely absurd. The thing has fallen, and will stay fallen, for from this awful predicament my opponent is unable to escape. How different is the truth, that all that ever go down to, hell and suffer were everlasting haters of God, enemies by wicked works against him, the last one of them! God is under no obligations to them, and lets them go in the course they wanted to go. They continue on in that course until death, a justly deserved death, while those saved in heaven, saved by the grace of God, will praise God with joyful hearts forever there, though they were entirely undeserving of it and it was entirely unmerited on their part. How different! We rejoice today in the grand and glorious truth that heaven will be full of joyful company, born of Christ, redeemed by the [blood of Christ](#), praising his name forever, while those punished will be there because they deserve to be, and God was under no obligations to provide for them. That is the truth of the matter. My brother is repeating. He will continue to repeat. He will hammer upon [1Jo 2:2](#), and some other things; but, my friends, I have enough to just keep on. I promise to bring up something every time which he cannot answer, and that this day's debate will close with still plenty on hand that I could have used, that would have been to his ruin as he stands upon the opposite side of this question. I respect my brother. When we parted the last time before we met here, I remarked to him, "I think we will meet again." He said: "We will, but we will meet as friends." Thank you for your attention.

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON'S FOURTH REPLY

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I cannot help wondering, if Brother Daily had so much matter, why he didn't use it, instead of telling you what a failure I had made. We think the people here have intelligence enough to see whether I make a failure. You needn't waste so much of your time. If you have so much matter that you wish to get before the people, use your time for that. That is friendly advice, given because we are friends.

Well, he says he is glad to continue. So [Am 1](#). Two men glad. He began by noticing one of my questions, to this effect: That if Christ paid the debt of the elect on the cross, how can one for whom he paid it suffer afterwards for one day? Did you notice what a stumble he made? Did he really answer it? No, sir. Now the point is this: he agrees that the elect suffer one day, and more, too. He suffered himself for *many days* before God saved him, and yet he has been teaching you that his debt was paid absolutely on the cross 1,800 years before. And has God been collecting a *part* of this again off of him in his life-time? It is certainly unjust to collect again a part of a debt all of which has been paid. Brother Daily says it is like the man in jail, until his fine is paid! That yields the point. Money provided to pay a fine does not pay it till the money is paid over. *Just as soon* as it is paid the man must go free. To keep him in jail for years afterwards would be false imprisonment. Jesus on the cross *provided* the ransom for the sinner, but payment is not paid until that day when the sinner goes free. When does he go free?

“’Twas grace that taught my heart to fear,
And grace my fears relieved;
How precious did that grace appear,
The hour I first believed.”

Up to that hour I was paying a part of this penalty of death. As soon as I believed, the whole thing was paid by Jesus Christ, and there was no more against me. Brother Daily says I think that the debt is never paid until I believe it is paid. Now I am sorry Brother Daily doesn't understand. [Saving faith](#) is not so much believing a fact as trusting a person. When I came to the end of my own strength and trusted myself upon Jesus Christ and what he had done for me, that was saving faith; that trusting of myself into his hands, and that trusting wasn't the saving. God saved me through that *when* I trusted myself passively into his hands; I wasn't saved *before* that, but in the hour, in the moment in which I first believed, the debt was paid. Of course the *provision* to pay it was made long ago when Christ died on the cross and when he took the ransom into the Most Holy Place.

My opponent goes to [Isa 49:10](#), and finds the idea that after Jesus make payment he says to the prisoners, “Go out;” Certainly; but *when* does he say, “Go out”? You was a prisoner a few years ago, until that “hour in which you first believed.” Jesus never said to you, “Go out,” until that moment in which you believed. What was you doing up to that moment? Suffering the penalty of death in trespasses and sins! God, according to your doctrine, collecting a debt, or a part of it, off of you that had already been paid! That is unjust. I think you can see that. You didn't touch the point in question at all.

According to my position, he says that a large majority cannot have faith. Suppose this was a fact. Would that affect the truth of the doctrine that God saves through faith? Not a particle of it. Why lug in that question? If that were so, it doesn't tend to establish your proposition.

He says that, according to my position, *belief* is the covering of the debt. Suppose I owe you \$100.00 and you come and offer me a receipt in full for it, and I take the receipt. Is that my paying the debt? Why, of course not. It is a matter of grace on your part; and I go free. So when I accept God's gift of Jesus Christ *to me, for nothing*, my debt is paid; not by me, but Jesus paid it. So faith is not a covering at all. What Jesus did is the covering. “Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered” ([Ro 4:6-7](#)). “But to him that *worketh not*, but *believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly” his faith is counted for righteousness” ([Ro 4:5](#)).

But then my next question: If death in sins now does not dishonor God so far as the elect are concerned, how can it dishonor him in the [hereafter](#)? Did you notice what he said here? He said, “If the debt is paid it would be to the everlasting disgrace of the Creator not to let the debtor go free.” That is what you said; and yet back there, a few years

ago, you hadn't gone free And you say your debt was paid 1,800 years ago. How was that? According to Brother Daily himself, it was to the everlasting dishonor of the Father in heaven. That is what bad doctrine leads a man into such statements as that.

He says a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. Therefore, the alien sinner cannot believe, cannot have faith, because faith is a good fruit. Well, he cannot of himself. Brother Daily wants to get over on the next proposition. The sinner cannot of himself believe. "No man can come to Christ (or believe on Christ) except the Father draws him." Of course he can't. God does the drawing but who does the *coming*, Brother Daily? The sinner. The man that is drawn. Put that down; that is the truth. You will learn something if you put that down and study it.

But he says that, according to my doctrine, salvation is through faith, and when I say that salvation is possible to all men through faith, he wants to know how I reconcile it, when *millions* have no chance to believe! Suppose that was so. Just suppose that was so! What has that to do with this question? Suppose it was fact that some have no chance to believe what has that got to do with the argument on this question? But then, as to the question of possibility, as I said yesterday, "with God all things are possible." And it is not an impossibility that this message of salvation should have gone and should go to the utter most parts of the earth. You remember that John came "that all men through him might believe"; and so far as the gospel goes, that is the purpose of it.

He asks, "How is it true that all the race are guilty, if infants in their mothers' arms are clear?" They are not guilty now of the Adamic transgression. Christ provided for that on the cross and paid for it *when* he took away the sin of the world.

Brother Daily says that Brother Throgmorton repeats, and that *he* doesn't have to! We all see that. No, he doesn't repeat!!

On [1Jo 2:2](#), Brother Daily says: The "whole world" means "the ends of the earth." That is the first time I ever knew that the "end of a thing" is the whole thing, or that "both ends are the whole thing." He finds one of the prophets where God's peace goes to the ends of the earth. He says that means the whole earth. The ends are not the whole thing. Here is a stick (holds up stick) that stick Brother Daily makes so much racket with; there is one end, and there is the other end. Now are the two ends the whole stick? That is your logic. But suppose I should grant that the whole world doesn't mean the whole human family in [1Jo 2:2](#)! "And he is the propitiation for our sins." Whose sins? Christians'; that is, the elect's. What about the rest? "And not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" *Somebody outside of us*. It means some body *besides the elect*. It means the human family, outside of the elect. But he says Christ cannot be a propitiation unless men believe. According to my interpretation of [Ro 3:26](#), he is the propitiation just like the provision to pay the debt is the payment of the debt. But the debt isn't paid until the provision is paid over. The friend (in the illustration) had the money in hand; it was for the payment of the fine, but he didn't pay it until it was turned over.

But now we come to the *sight!* and I don't wonder Brother Daily hesitated. He said, on [Ro 5:17-19](#), which includes that 18th verse, that as Adam stood head of his family, so Christ stands head of his family. He read that between the lines. It is not in the reading, and you noticed he could hardly get along in reading. He hesitated and stumbled. Brother Daily is a man of ability and he saw he was walking in the mist there. Let me quote it and see if it is as he said. Paul's words are plain enough: "As by the offense of one man judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one (Jesus Christ) the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." It doesn't say two families. Paul is talking about one family. Yet my friend, blinded by his proposition, reads into this scripture *two* families, two sets of "all men," when evidently they are the same "all." He says Christ's resurrection didn't make his death effectual. I think the last verse of [Ro 4](#) settled that: "Who was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification." Put that down. I want you to learn a great deal in this debate.

On [Joh 1:9](#), Brother Daily wants to know how the millions in heathendom are enlightened when they have no chance to believe. Suppose I can't tell you how the enlightening was done. You can't tell how God drew you. You don't know the motions of the Spirit. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth." This is incomprehensible; it is unexplainable. And now my opponent wants me to explain how it is that God has given light to all men. I take the fact as God states it. What is the fact? "He (Christ) was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." If I wanted to designate every member of the human race, could I do it in stronger language? I don't have to explain *how* it is done, but it is done. God says it is done, and that is enough for me. It ought to be for you, Brother Daily.

He says he was a member of Christ's bride when he was dead in sins. When you was bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh" when you was under the curse, when you was on the road to hell, when you was paying part of the penalty that was due you as a sinner. You was a member of Christ's bride!! That is ridiculous enough in itself to be its own refutation. He says God knew us before we were born. Of course God knew everything from all eternity, but that doesn't make you a member of the bride when you was dead in sins and a child of wrath, even as others.

But Brother Daily says he was elected when he was in sin. What does Paul say? "According as he has chosen us *in him!*" Not in *sin*, but in *him*. Get that down; "According as he hath chosen us *in him.*" Not *in sin*. My friend doesn't seem to think that God could look forward and see a man in Christ and choose him. You people can see that; you all do see it. Chosen *in Christ*. Brother Daily says "chosen *in sin.*" And yet that doesn't affect the proposition before us particularly.

He says my doctrine looks like "Two Seed" doctrine. And some slapped his hands. That is a great point, of course. You had to cheer him. Do it again! No, don't for the moderator says don't.

Then he tells you I tried to show that the God-head did the same for all. Mistaken again, Brother Daily. Not the same. God does more for his people than he does for other men. He is doing more for his people now than for other men. But my point is that he tasted death for every man.

I am a little in the chart business myself

CHART

JOHN R. DAILY

All for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

THE BIBLE

Jesus tasted death for every man. See [Heb 2:9](#)

He is the Saviour of all men, but specially of them that believe. See [1Ti 2:10](#)

He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. See [1Jo 2:2](#)

Some shall go away into everlasting punishment. See [Mt 25:46](#).

I want to show you the contrast here between my friend and the Bible. You see over there is what John R. Daily says. What does the Bible say? "Jesus tasted death for every man." If that is right, Brother Daily says every man will be eternally saved. But he tells us every man will not be eternally saved! The Bible says that Christ "is the Savior of all men, but specially of those that believe." The Bible says he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. And the same I saw some "shall go away into everlasting punishment." Therefore Brother Daily's proposition cannot be true. Hear! "He tasted death for every one," hut some of them shall go away into everlasting punishment. That chart is enough to refute my friend's proposition in the mind that will take the straight meaning of the straight words. Of course if you won't that; the case is different.

I have some negative matter that I want to introduce in form here, and the first statement I make is this:

Christ's mission and death were for the world in general. You see I am repeating. It is line upon line. [John 3:16](#), "God so loved the world." God's love was for the world in general. When the term world refers to mankind, unless there is some modification it means all Adam's posterity, not just two or three "ends of the earth." Sometimes when modified it means all living at the time, except these that have been chosen of God and separated into another family. Sometimes it means all the race then living. Sometimes it means all the race for all time, except God's people. *It never means God's people only*. Put that down. Christ was sent to save the world. [1Jo 4:14](#). "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the son to be the Savior of the world." Hear that same John in that same [1Jo 5:19](#), "and we know that we the elect are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness." But John says we have seen it and we testify to it "that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world" And Jesus says, "If any man hear my words and believeth not, I judge him not, for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." ([Joh 12:47](#)). Who are the world? Those that believe not. Jesus says he doesn't judge them: he didn't come to judge but to save them. It is to save them all. My friend

says not. Jesus says he came to save them. Why doesn't he save them? They don't believe on him. Don't forget Jesus said that, concerning those that believe not, "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not;" for "I came not to judge the world but to save the world." That is in [Joh 12:47](#). Before men believe they are of the world; when they believe they are counted no more of the world. Jesus said of his apostles, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" ([Joh 17:16](#)). He said, "I have chosen you out of the world" ([Joh 15:19](#)). Before they were separated from the world, they were part of it even as others. See [Eph 2:1-3](#), "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein, in, time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others" God loved the world before his people were separated from it, and he loved it afterwards. Between those separated from the world and those left John distinguishes thus ([1Jo 5:19](#)): "And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness." Speaking of those now separated from the world, Paul described them thus ([Eph 3:11-12](#)), "Wherefore remember that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." And yet my opponent says that they were then members of the [bride of Christ!](#)

Let us see what Peter says of them after they were separated from the world ([1 Peter 2:9-10](#)): "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light; which in time past were not a people, but now, the [people of God](#); which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." What are you going to do with that? And yet he has it that back there, before they had obtained mercy, they were members of Christ's bride! Debt all paid! Salvation sealed! They locked up in the eternal life and the key to the lock thrown in the well! Saved forever. That kind of people! My! My!

Yes, I was about to forget that subjunctive mode business. What does the subjunctive mode mean? When I went to school and taught school it meant doubt. You see I called on him to know whether he meant subjunctive or potential. He said "subjunctive." "That he might bring us to God," in [1Pe 3:18](#), he says is "subjunctive." That proves it uncertain whether some for whom Christ suffered come to God! The peculiarity of the subjunctive means power and possibility. You know that.

He says it will be to the shame of the Triune God if one is lost for whom Christ died. Well, I will tell there are some things that God cannot do. God cannot lie; and God has pledge himself in the person of his Son. "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" "He that believeth not shall be damned." Can God, justify an unbeliever? Say whether he can or not. I say he cannot, for he cannot lie. So he cannot save Jerusalem in unbelief. No.

If I have time, I have another thing I want to show. Here is a chart of the tabernacle

[Page 127](#)

Look at this picture of the tabernacle. See the outside, which is the outer court. See the entrance out there. See the altar of burnt offering. See the entrance into the Holy Place. See the Most Holy Place, the Sanctum Sanctorum, the Holiest of All. Into this Holiest of All the high priest went once each year, and there made atonement. I will leave it so you can see it. (Mr. Daily, stepping forward and looking at the chart: "I am not afraid; I want to see it." Mr. Throgmorton "Well, don't get between me and the audience.")

Thus did the high priest, according to the 16th of Leviticus, "He went into the Most Holy Place and took the blood of the goat of sin offering. That goat of sin offering was a type of Christ crucified. The high priest carried the blood into the Most Holy Place, and never went into that place without blood. He took the blood of the goat that was slain and went into the Most Holy Place and *there* made an atonement—in *the Most Holy Place*. Now my point is that Jesus Christ took his own blood which was shed outside the camp, and through the veil, in his death and resurrection, he took that blood into heaven itself, the Most Holy Place of the universe, and there made and is making the atonement; there makes the covering for sins.

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY'S FIFTH SPEECH

Gentleman Moderators, worthy Opponent, respected Audience:

He said if I had so much matter, why not use it instead of giving the exhortation? He will see that I have plenty of argument.

He contends that the payment was not made until the day the sinner, goes free by believing. Then the illustration he used yesterday would indicate that the prisoner in jail under fine of \$1,000.00 did not have his fine paid until he got out of the jail by believing. That only needs to be mentioned that any intelligent mind may reject it. Saving faith, he says, is not so much believing a fact as trusting the Saviour.

(Points to chart, page 58.) -

[Page 58](#)

The Saviour must be trusted. Sinners—all Adam's race—must trust the Saviour. They cannot trust the Saviour until the Spirit through the preachers gets to them, and the Spirit cannot get to them any other way, according to his theory, and I dare him to deny that. But the preachers do not get to those who die without ever hearing the gospel preached. Then they never have an *opportunity* of exercising saving faith, and yet they sink down to an endless hell because God has suspended their eternal salvation upon a condition they cannot perform—it be trusting

He says belief is not covering [the debt](#). He says, "If I owe \$100.00, and you pay it and give me a receipt, then I am free." Not unless you believe, according to your theory. Then when I give you the receipt and you believe it, the debt is paid, and not until then! I wonder how he got the receipt if I didn't pay the debt first!

Alien sinners, he says, cannot of themselves believe. He says God does the drawing, the sinner does the coming, and if God doesn't draw he doesn't come. If God draws the sinner, the sinner *comes*. If God *tries* to draw him, he *may* come. If God *draws* him, he *comes*, and he will not come until he does draw him, for no one can come unless the Father draws him. He says, suppose it is so that millions have no chance. He *has to suppose* it is so, according to his theory. He is *compelled to suppose* it is so.

He says the ends of the earth are not the whole thing. Then I suppose that if the gospel that carries the Spirit to dead sinners to save them, without which they could not be saved, in reaching the ends of the earth, doesn't reach the whole thing. So all between the ends have not been reached by the Holy Spirit, and they are gone without chance of salvation.

Our sins, in [1Jo 2:2](#) are the sins of the elect. They are the sins of the elect among the Jews. And the "world" has reference to the Gentiles in distinction from the Jews, God's elect among the Gentiles, so that it is every nation, kindred, tongue and people, these nations, represented by this part of my chart, as well as the people represented by *this* part. (See page 58.)

I want to turn to [Ro 5:17-19](#), and read: "For if by one man's offense death reigned by one (that is, Adam), much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." There is restriction; those that shall reign in life by one (Jesus Christ) are not the same number as those upon whom death comes by the offense of one. They are restricted to those who receive abundance of grace and righteousness. "Therefore by the offense of one (that is, Adam), judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." That is, the free gift of righteousness and abundance of grace through Jesus Christ came upon all men, just as the 17th verse says, represented by Christ unto justification of life.

Resurrection did not make Christ's death effectual. He says it did. Resurrection, he said, did make his death effectual. He quoted this in supposed, proof: "He was delivered for our offenses, he was raised again for our

justification.” Now, though he was delivered for our offenses, we never could have been justified unless he had been raised, because he would have been a dead Savior, and that would have proved his death could not effect reconciliation for our offenses. His resurrection was a demonstration of the virtue of his death. There was virtue in the death itself, as I told you, aside from the resurrection. When Christ lay in the tomb, his death was virtuous. When he was raised from the dead, it was *proof* that his death was virtuous.

How does God give light to all men? He said he didn't have to take time to tell how. God gives light to all men. He doesn't dare to say that God gave light to the millions that go down without ever hearing the gospel preached.

He spoke of my being a member of Christ's church or bride. He spoke of Christ's church being in the future, when Christ died on the cross, and said Christ died on the cross for the church, and spoke of others that Christ died for, too, that didn't belong to that church. It is in that sense I spoke of belonging to the [bride of Christ](#). “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church.” It was his church before he gave himself for it in that sense; there is a sense in which I was brought in. That is a result of what Christ did on the cross, and not the cause.

He made sport of the idea of election, being elected in sin, and said we were chosen in Christ. But the Apostle says that we were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. I ask you, were we in Christ before the foundation of the world? The choice was before the foundation of the world. The choice is before they came to Christ, for David says, “Blessed is the man whom thou chooseth and causeth to approach unto thee.” They were chosen ones before they approached him. The God-head did not do the same or all. I did a good deal for children. I ask him if he didn't do the same for all in their lost state, according to his theory? If he didn't do the same for those finally lost in order to their salvation, that he did for those saved? Did he not? Answer the question according to your theory.

Then he arrays me against the Bible about Christ tasting death for every man. Yesterday he said I said that the conjunction “but,” being disjunctive, means to look forward. That was not the point I made. The point I made was, that the disjunctive “but” indicates a change in the subject-matter; that the Apostle, after using that conjunction, referred to some other matter; that if he had intended to make an addition, he would have used the co-ordinate conjunction “and”; that “every man” doesn't have reference to the men mentioned in the fore-part of the lesson, but to those that follow, Christ being described as being the perfect captain of their salvation, and they being brought to glory by him.

He arrayed the scripture which says, “He is the preserver of all men” and “Propitiation for sins of the whole world.” I have answered that.

In the negative argument he calls attention to [John 3:16](#), “God so loved the world.” The Jewish idea was that the Messiah was to come exclusively to the Jews, that he was to come to save them; but Christ tells them that he came in love to the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews*. Love, in its very nature, is particular, definite and special. It must center upon some *particular* and *special* object of its exercise and cannot, go to everybody in general. When God says, “I have loved thee with an everlasting, love,” he addresses not persons in *general*, but persons in *particular*. That the nations of the world meant the Gentiles is seen by a comparison of [Lu 12:30](#) with [Mt 6:32](#), “For all these things do the nations of the world seek after; and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things.” “For after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your heavenly knoweth that ye have need of all these things.” The Gentiles are here called the nations of the world, in conformity with the Jewish manner of speaking. Again, the Gentiles are denominated “the world” by Paul in [Ro 11:15](#), “For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of him be, but life from the dead?” So Paul calls the Gentiles “the world.”

That Christ did not mean the entire human family when he said, “God so loved the world,” is proved conclusively beyond successful dispute by Paul's quotation, when he says, “Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated” ([Ro 9:11-13](#)). God could not love all alike and hate any. If he loved some and hated some at the same time, he did not love all alike; in fact, he did not love all *at all*.

The learned Moses Stuart, though he believed in a [general atonement](#) as a theologian, was too candid as a scholar to build an argument or found his faith on such passages as [John 3:16](#). He says, “The sacred writers mean to declare by such expressions that Christ died really and truly as well and as much for the Gentiles as for the Jews.”

Subjunctive mode means doubt, he says. Not always. Brother Throgmorton, you assume the role of teacher. I am going to accord you that place. However, I want to correct you. Subjunctive mode doesn't always mean doubt. It only just occasionally means doubt in English, and as used in the Greek, you know, after the conjunction *hena* it means a certain purpose, being properly translated, “in order that.” So he gave himself in order that he might bring us to God, the purpose being to *bring* us, not to *try* to bring us, or give us a *chance* to come, or enable somebody *else* to bring us, or place us where we *have no chance* to come, but to *bring* us.

He says something has to be done. God cannot lie, so he cannot save sinners unless they believe. That is about what that amounts to. They have to do something, or God cannot do it. But he says the sinner doesn't do that of himself. How does he do it, then? How does he do it? Eph., 1:19-20, “And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to upward who believe according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought it Christ, when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.” How did we believe? We came to believe according to the working of his mighty power. Does not that teach that God can make the unbeliever believe, just the same as he brought forth Christ from the dead? I will ask that question. Come to it like a man. More anon.

He says God cannot save a sinner until that sinner himself believes in God, any more than God can lie. God is just as helpless. A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit—as much tied up as he is tied up with inability to lie.

I come now to the next argument in support of my proposition. It is that God lay on Christ the sins of those for whom he died; that Christ actually bore those sins on the cross; that he put those sins away and made an end of them and sealed them up.

[Isa 53:6](#), “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” All we, like sheep will do have gone astray. The Lord laid upon him the iniquity of all his sheep. In the end of time the human family will go before God, the sheep upon the right, the goats upon the left, and the sheep will be those whose iniquities he has laid upon Christ. To those on the left he will say, “Depart from me, for I never knew you.” If God loved them just as much as these, he would have known them just the same. If he had died for them, he would have known them just as he knows these. But he says, “I never knew you.”

[1 Peter 2:24](#), “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed.” The fact that he actually bore the sins of all for whom he died in his body on the tree is emphasized by the appositive phrase “his own self,” and by the additional use of the word “own” to the pronoun “his” in its limitation or modification of the word “body.” “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.” These adjectives are used to make the declaration emphatic. This cannot be successfully denied. Then it is proved that God laid on his Son the sins of those for whom he died, and that the Son, his own self, bore these very sins in his own body on the cross. I inquire as to the result. What became of those sins which the Father laid on his Son which he bore in his body on the tree? Let the word of God answer, and let us all bow to the answer and forever keep silent rather than deny the answer so plainly given.

[Heb 9:26](#), “For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world bath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” The end of the world here spoken of is the end of the Jewish economy. This is the fulfillment of what God promised by [Da 9:23](#). [Seventy weeks](#) are promised to make an end of sins, to make reconciliation and to seal up the vision and prophecy. I will now give the English translation of the Greek Septuagint: “Seventy weeks have been determined upon by thy people and upon thy holy city, for sin to be ended, and to seal up the transgression and to blot out iniquities, and to bring in

everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and the prophecy and to anoint the most holy.” A week in prophecy is 7 years; 70 times 7 is 490. This seventy, then, is 490 years. To make an end of sins, or for sins to be ended, is from the Greek phrase *tou suntelesqhnai* ‘amartian (Tou suntelesthenai hamartian). The Greek infinitive in this phrase *suntelesqhnai* is derived from the verb *suntelew* (*sunteleo*), the meaning of which is to *bring to an end altogether to finish wholly*, to consummate. To finish the transgression or to seal up the transgression, is from *tou sfragisai* ‘amartiav (Ton sphragisthai hamartias). The infinitive *sfragisai* (*sphragisai*) is from *sfragezw* (*sphragizo*), to close, to seal up, to make fast, as the seal with a seal or signet as of letters and books, so that they may not be opened and read. An instance of this is found in [Isa 29:11](#), where a book that is sealed is mentioned, and one that is learned says, “I cannot read it, because it is sealed.” So the sins of those for whom Christ died are so completely put away that no one can ever read them against them to condemn them.

The phrase “to make reconciliation (or atonement) for iniquities,” is from *tou ecilasasqai adikiav* (Tou exillasasthai adikias); the infinitive *ecilasasqai* (*exillasasthai*), is from *‘ilaskomai* (*hilaskomai*), *to appease, expiate, or to make atonement for*. The Septuagint gives a phrase in the passage we are now considering that is not in the King James translation: *apaleiyai tav adikiav* (*apaleipsai tas adikias*), *to blot out, wipe off, or obliterate, to finish or seal, to make an end of sins, to make atonement or propitiation for them*, and means to *satisfy* for the sins of those for whom he died, and to put them away so as to be seen or read no more against them, for which reason no one can lay anything to the charge of God’s elect because Christ died for them. ([Ro 3:4-8:33](#).) This is the propitiatory or expiatory sacrifice by which the punishment due to sin was removed from those for whom Christ died. In this way he bore their sins in his own body and put them away. Though those for whom Christ died remain in ignorance of the fact till it is revealed to them and they are brought to experience the joy that it brings, yet it became a fact, as shown by Daniel, at the time Jesus died on the cross.

As God laid on Christ the sins of all for whom he died, and as he bore them on the cross, and made an end of them, and sealed them up and blotted them out, so that no charge can be laid against those for whom he died, it follows as an unavoidable conclusion that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My next argument is that the justification of sinners is necessarily connected with the [death of Christ](#) for them as the procuring cause of their justification. As the cause of the justification is the bearing of the sins of those for whom Christ died, all for whom Christ died will be justified.

“By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities” ([Isa 3:11](#)).

If the mere results had been borne and not the iniquities themselves, then justification would have been impossible. Pardon there might have been, but justification there never could have been. The word of God, by one sweeping declaration, settles this matter forever. Listen: “By his knowledge” (mark you, it is Jehovah speaking of his Son), “By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities.” If we ask why any sinner is justified what is the cause of his justification, we find the answer in our text: Because Christ bore his iniquities. It is impossible that one sinner only should be justified, because he bore the iniquities of many. It is equally impossible that *all the race of Adam* should be justified unless he bore the sins of all the race. As the iniquities of sinners being borne by Christ in his death the cross is the cause of their being justified, as the text declares, then if he bore the sins of all the race then they will all be justified. Christ bearing the iniquities of sinners cannot result in the justification of only a part of them for whom he died, for the text declares he shall justify those whose iniquities he bore, because he bore them. Besides, if Christ’s bearing the iniquities of those for whom he died might result in the justification of only a *part of them*, then it might result in the justification of only *one*, or even *none* of them, for whatever is uncertain in *part* is uncertain in all.

This is far from the truth for God declares that he will divide Christ a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong. Why is this glorious exaltation? Because he bore the sins of many, justifies that many

and makes intercession for that many. These are the many sons he will bring to glory, saying: “Behold I and the children which God has given me.” *All shall be justified* whose iniquities Christ bore on the cross. Therefore *all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.*

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY'S FIFTH SPEECH

Gentleman Moderators, worthy Opponent, respected Audience:

He said if I had so much matter, why not use it instead of giving the exhortation? He will see that I have plenty of argument.

He contends that the payment was not made until the day the sinner, goes free by believing. Then the illustration he used yesterday would indicate that the prisoner in jail under fine of \$1,000.00 did not have his fine paid until he got out of the jail by believing. That only needs to be mentioned that any intelligent mind may reject it. Saving faith, he says, is not so much believing a fact as trusting the Saviour.

(Points to chart, page 58.) -

[Page 58](#)

The Saviour must be trusted. Sinners—all Adam's race—must trust the Saviour. They cannot trust the Saviour until the Spirit through the preachers gets to them, and the Spirit cannot get to them any other way, according to his theory, and I dare him to deny that. But the preachers do not get to those who die without ever hearing the gospel preached. Then they never have an *opportunity* of exercising saving faith, and yet they sink down to an endless hell because God has suspended their eternal salvation upon a condition they cannot perform—it be trusting

He says belief is not covering [the debt](#). He says, “If I owe \$100.00, and you pay it and give me a receipt, then I am free.” Not unless you believe, according to your theory. Then when I give you the receipt and you believe it, the debt is paid, and not until then! I wonder how he got the receipt if I didn't pay the debt first!

Alien sinners, he says, cannot of themselves believe. He says God does the drawing, the sinner does the coming, and if God doesn't draw he doesn't come. If God draws the sinner, the sinner *comes*. If God *tries* to draw him, he *may* come. If God *draws* him, he *comes*, and he will not come until he does draw him, for no one can come unless the Father draws him. He says, suppose it is so that millions have no chance. He *has to suppose* it is so, according to his theory. He is *compelled to suppose* it is so.

He says the ends of the earth are not the whole thing. Then I suppose that if the gospel that carries the Spirit to dead sinners to save them, without which they could not be saved, in reaching the ends of the earth, doesn't reach the whole thing. So all between the ends have not been reached by the Holy Spirit, and they are gone without chance of salvation.

Our sins, in [1Jo 2:2](#) are the sins of the elect. They are the sins of the elect among the Jews. And the “world” has reference to the Gentiles in distinction from the Jews, God's elect among the Gentiles, so that it is every nation, kindred, tongue and people, these nations, represented by this part of my chart, as well as the people represented by *this* part. (See page 58.)

I want to turn to [Ro 5:17-19](#), and read: “For if by one man's offense death reigned by one (that is, Adam), much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.” There is restriction; those that shall reign in life by one (Jesus Christ) are not the same number as those upon whom death comes by the offense of one. They are restricted to those who receive abundance of grace and righteousness. “Therefore by the offense of one (that is, Adam), judgment came upon all men to condemnation;

even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” That is, the free gift of righteousness and abundance of grace through Jesus Christ came upon all men, just as the 17th verse says, represented by Christ unto justification of life.

Resurrection did not make Christ’s death effectual. He says it did. Resurrection, he said, did make his death effectual. He quoted this in supposed, proof: “He was delivered for our offenses, he was raised again for our justification.” Now, though he was delivered for our offenses, we never could have been justified unless he had been raised, because he would have been a dead Savior, and that would have proved his death could not effect reconciliation for our offenses. His resurrection was a demonstration of the virtue of his death. There was virtue in the death itself, as I told you, aside from the resurrection. When Christ lay in the tomb, his death was virtuous. When he was raised from the dead, it was *proof* that his death was virtuous.

How does God give light to all men? He said he didn’t have to take time to tell how. God gives light to all men. He doesn’t dare to say that God gave light to the millions that go down without ever hearing the gospel preached.

He spoke of my being a member of Christ’s church or bride. He spoke of Christ’s church being in the future, when Christ died on the cross, and said Christ died on the cross for the church, and spoke of others that Christ died for, too, that didn’t belong to that church. It is in that sense I spoke of belonging to the [bride of Christ](#). “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church.” It was his church before he gave himself for it in that sense; there is a sense in which I was brought in. That is a result of what Christ did on the cross, and not the cause.

He made sport of the idea of election, being elected in sin, and said we were chosen in Christ. But the Apostle says that we were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. I ask you, were we in Christ before the foundation of the world? The choice was before the foundation of the world. The choice is before they came to Christ, for David says, “Blessed is the man whom thou chooseth and causeth to approach unto thee.” They were chosen ones before they approached him. The God-head did not do the same for all. I did a good deal for children. I ask him if he didn’t do the same for all in their lost state, according to his theory? If he didn’t do the same for those finally lost in order to their salvation, that he did for those saved? Did he not? Answer the question according to your theory.

Then he arrays me against the Bible about Christ tasting death for every man. Yesterday he said I said that the conjunction “but,” being disjunctive, means to look forward. That was not the point I made. The point I made was, that the disjunctive “but” indicates a change in the subject-matter; that the Apostle, after using that conjunction, referred to some other matter; that if he had intended to make an addition, he would have used the co-ordinate conjunction “and”; that “every man” doesn’t have reference to the men mentioned in the fore-part of the lesson, but to those that follow, Christ being described as being the perfect captain of their salvation, and they being brought to glory by him.

He arrayed the scripture which says, “He is the preserver of all men” and “Propitiation for sins of the whole world.” I have answered that.

In the negative argument he calls attention to [John 3:16](#), “God so loved the world.” The Jewish idea was that the Messiah was to come exclusively to the Jews, that he was to come to save them; but Christ tells them that he came in love to the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews*. Love, in its very nature, is particular, definite and special. It must center upon some *particular* and *special* object of its exercise and cannot, go to everybody in general. When God says, “I have loved thee with an everlasting, love,” he addresses not persons in *general*, but persons in *particular*. That the nations of the world meant the Gentiles is seen by a comparison of [Lu 12:30](#) with [Mt 6:32](#), “For all these things do the nations of the world seek after; and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things.” “For after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your heavenly knoweth that ye have need of all these things.” The Gentiles are here called the nations of the world, in conformity with the Jewish manner of speaking. Again, the Gentiles are denominated “the world” by Paul in [Ro 11:15](#), “For if the casting away of

them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of him be, but life from the dead?" So Paul calls the Gentiles "the world."

That Christ did not mean the entire human family when he said, "God so loved the world," is proved conclusively beyond successful dispute by Paul's quotation, when he says, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated" ([Ro 9:11-13](#)). God could not love all alike and hate any. If he loved some and hated some at the same time, he did not love all alike; in fact, he did not love all *at all*.

The learned Moses Stuart, though he believed in a [general atonement](#) as a theologian, was too candid as a scholar to build an argument or found his faith on such passages as [John 3:16](#). He says, "The sacred writers mean to declare by such expressions that Christ died really and truly as well and as much for the Gentiles as for the Jews."

Subjunctive mode means doubt, he says. Not always. Brother Throgmorton, you assume the role of teacher. I am going to accord you that place. However, I want to correct you. Subjunctive mode doesn't always mean doubt. It only just occasionally means doubt in English, and as used in the Greek, you know, after the conjunction *hena* it means a certain purpose, being properly translated, "in order that." So he gave himself in order that he might bring us to God, the purpose being to *bring* us, not to *try* to bring us, or give us a *chance* to come, or enable somebody *else* to bring us, or place us where we *have no chance* to come, but to *bring* us.

He says something has to be done. God cannot lie, so he cannot save sinners unless they believe. That is about what that amounts to. They have to do something, or God cannot do it. But he says the sinner doesn't do that of himself. How does he do it, then? How does he do it? Eph., 1:19-20, "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to upward who believe according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought it Christ, when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places." How did we believe? We came to believe according to the working of his mighty power. Does not that teach that God can make the unbeliever believe, just the same as he brought forth Christ from the dead? I will ask that question. Come to it like a man. More anon.

He says God cannot save a sinner until that sinner himself believes in God, any more than God can lie. God is just as helpless. A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit—as much tied up as he is tied up with inability to lie.

I come now to the next argument in support of my proposition. It is that God lay on Christ the sins of those for whom he died; that Christ actually bore those sins on the cross; that he put those sins away and made an end of them and sealed them up.

[Isa 53:6](#), "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." All we, like sheep will do have gone astray. The Lord laid upon him the iniquity of all his sheep. In the end of time the human family will go before God, the sheep upon the right, the goats upon the left, and the sheep will be those whose iniquities he has laid upon Christ. To those on the left he will say, "Depart from me, for I never knew you." If God loved them just as much as these, he would have known them just the same. If he had died for them, he would have known them just as he knows these. But he says, "I never knew you."

[1 Peter](#) 2:24, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed." The fact that he actually bore the sins of all for whom he died in his body on the tree is emphasized by the appositive phrase "his own self," and by the additional use of the word "own" to the pronoun "his" in its limitation or modification of the word "body." "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." These adjectives are used to make the declaration emphatic. This cannot be successfully denied. Then it is proved that God laid on his Son the sins of those for whom he died, and that the Son, his own self, bore these very sins in his own body on the cross. I inquire as to the result. What became of those sins which the Father laid on his Son which he bore in his body on the tree?

Let the word of God answer, and let us all bow to the answer and forever keep silent rather than deny the answer so plainly given.

[Heb 9:26](#), “For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world bath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” The end of the world here spoken of is the end of the Jewish economy. This is the fulfillment of what God promised by [Da 9:23](#). [Seventy weeks](#) are promised to make an end of sins, to make reconciliation and to seal up the vision and prophecy. I will now give the English translation of the Greek Septuagint: “Seventy weeks have been determined upon by thy people and upon thy holy city, for sin to be ended, and to seal up the transgression and to blot out iniquities, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and the prophecy and to anoint the most holy.” A week in prophecy is 7 years; 70 times 7 is 490. This seventy, then, is 490 years. To make an end of sins, or for sins to be ended, is from the Greek phrase tou suntelesqhnai ‘amartian (Tou suntelesthenai hamartian). The Greek infinitive in this phrase suntelesqhnai is derived from the verb suntelew (sunteleo), the meaning of which is to *bring to an end altogether to finish wholly*, to consummate. To finish the transgression or to seal up the transgression, is from tou sfragisai ‘amartiav (Ton sphragisthai hamartias). The infinitive sfragisai (sphragisai) is from sfragezw (sphragizo), to close, to seal up, to make fast, as the seal with a seal or signet as of letters and books, so that they may not be opened and read. An instance of this is found in [Isa 29:11](#), where a book that is sealed is mentioned, and one that is learned says, “I cannot read it, because it is sealed.” So the sins of those for whom Christ died are so completely put away that no one can ever read them against them to condemn them.

The phrase “to make reconciliation (or atonement) for iniquities,” is from tou ecilasasqai adikiav (Tou exilasasthai adikias); the infinitive ecilasasqai (exillasasthai), is from ‘ilaskomai (hilaskomai), *to appease, expiate, or to make atonement for*. The Septuagint gives a phrase in the passage we are now considering that is not in the King James translation: apaleiyai tav adikiav (apaleipsai tas adikias), *to blot out, wipe off, or obliterate, to finish or seal, to make an end of sins, to make atonement or propitiation for them*, and means to *satisfy* for the sins of those for whom he died, and to put them away so as to be seen or read no more against them, for which reason no one can lay anything to the charge of God’s elect because Christ died for them. ([Ro 3:4-8:33](#).) This is the propitiatory or expiatory sacrifice by which the punishment due to sin was removed from those for whom Christ died. In this way he bore their sins in his own body and put them away. Though those for whom Christ died remain in ignorance of the fact till it is revealed to them and they are brought to experience the joy that it brings, yet it became a fact, as shown by Daniel, at the time Jesus died on the cross.

As God laid on Christ the sins of all for whom he died, and as he bore them on the cross, and made an end of them, and sealed them up and blotted them out, so that no charge can be laid against those for whom he died, it follows as an unavoidable conclusion that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My next argument is that the justification of sinners is necessarily connected with the [death of Christ](#) for them as the procuring cause of their justification. As the cause of the justification is the bearing of the sins of those for whom Christ died, all for whom Christ died will be justified.

“By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities” ([Isa 3:11](#)).

If the mere results had been borne and not the iniquities themselves, then justification would have been impossible. Pardon there might have been, but justification there never could have been. The word of God, by one sweeping declaration, settles this matter forever. Listen: “By his knowledge” (mark you, it is Jehovah speaking of his Son), “By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities.” If we ask why any sinner is justified what is the cause of his justification, we find the answer in our text: Because Christ bore his iniquities. It is impossible that one sinner only should be justified, because he bore the iniquities of many. It is equally impossible that *all the race of Adam* should be justified unless he bore the

sins of all the race. As the iniquities of sinners being borne by Christ in his death the cross is the cause of their being justified, as the text declares, then if he bore the sins of all the race then they will all be justified. Christ bearing the iniquities of sinners cannot result in the justification of only a part of them for whom he died, for the text declares he shall justify those whose iniquities he bore, because he bore them. Besides, if Christ's bearing the iniquities of those for whom he died might result in the justification of only a *part* of *them*, then it might result in the justification of only *one*, or even *none* of them, for whatever is uncertain in *part* is uncertain in all.

This is far from the truth for God declares that he will divide Christ a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong. Why is this glorious exaltation? Because he bore the sins of many, justifies that many and makes intercession for that many. These are the many sons he will bring to glory, saying: "Behold I and the children which God has given me." *All shall be justified* whose iniquities Christ bore on the cross. Therefore *all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved*.

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY'S SIXTH SPEECH

Gentlemen Moderators, Worthy Opponent, Respected Audience:

We are getting along so nicely with the discussion. We feel well toward each other. We differ but it is in friendship. If any attending this discussion should be too full of prejudice to allow room for anything else, the discussion would do such no good. So let us try to lay aside all prejudice and study the word of God to ascertain its teaching.

I attend first to the questions which my Brother handed to me.

The first is: "Does God require all men, elect a non-elect to seek him? None are commanded to seek God except his children.

The second is: "Can a man be blamed for not accepting a gift which is not offered to him?" A man is not blamed for not accepting Christ. He is blamed for violating God's law.

I have a question now for him. Can a man be blamed for not accepting Christ who never hears of him? Are heathens, who never hear of Christ, sent to hell for not accepting him?

"Is Christ offered to men, elect and non-elect, in the Gospel?" Not *offered* to anybody.

"Does God command every sinner, elect and non-elect to repent?" A man cannot repent without life, whatever kind of repentance it be, natural or spiritual.

"Does God censure sinners, elect and non-elect, for not believing on his Son?" Not believing is not the *cause* of condemnation. It is the *evidence* of it.

"What is the penalty due to sin?" Death.

"Where do you learn that only elect persons die in infancy?" All that die in infancy are saved in Heaven. I believe that. Those that are saved in Heaven are elect. Therefore only elect persons die in infancy.

"Can a man believe in Christ without believing that Christ died for him?" The devils did.

(Mr. Throgmorton: "Did they believe that Christ died for them?")

Devils believe.

(Mr. Throgmorton: "On Christ, is what my question said.")

Don't interrupt, please.

"Is there any way for a sinner to repent or seek God except through the crucified Christ?" None repent or seek after God in a state of unregeneracy.

"Why does God favor a non-elect person with long life, and deny the same, blessing to the elect?" Because it seems good in his sight.

"Would Christ have suffered any more in dying for all of Adam's race than in dying for just one sinner?" No way of knowing.

"When Paul says, Christ loved me and gave himself for me, does he mean that Christ loved no one else and gave himself for nobody else?" No, he gave himself for *all* the elect.

"Can you name a passage in the New Testament where the word "world" means only, the elect?" Yes, sir; [1Jo 2:2](#). The "whole world" means *only* the elect among the Jews and among the Gentiles. He tries to make an impression relative to experience, that because Christ [atoned](#) for our sins and satisfied God by reconciling us to God by his death, that therefore the Holy Spirit in revealing to us that we are sinners reveals to us what is false. It is one thing to be reconciled to God and another thing to be reconciled in the court of our own conscience and in our actual experience, as revealed by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit reveals to us that we have sinned and reveals to us the great guilt of that sin, then, in the second revelation, that Christ on the cross atoned for our sins; that we may be made to rejoice. Having been shown that we had sinned, we are then enabled to rejoice that Jesus atoned for our sins, and that experience, if we have it, is but the *necessary* result of what Christ did on the cross. The ransom being paid the transgressor is released. But he illustrates again by speaking of the prisoner who is [in debt](#) for \$1,000.00, and is in prison for that indebtedness. He says he goes to work and works very hard, suffers a great deal to get the money with which to pay the debt. Now I ask him, is the payment of the money necessary to the release of the prisoner, and must [the debt](#) be paid before the prisoner is released, and does the release of the prisoner necessarily follow the payment of the debt, which is made before the transgressor is released? If you want to be fair about that illustration you will come up and answer those questions.

He says his duty is to examine the proof text. His duty is to examine the *arguments* and *proof texts* that I submit. He examines the proof texts, but the *arguments* he passes by. He quotes [Joh 3:26](#). "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." His position is that he believes to *get* the everlasting life. My position is that he believes because he *has* the everlasting life. If his position were true, it would not be true that he that believeth hath everlasting life. It ought to be stated that he that believeth will get it.

In reference to [1Co 8:10-11](#), where the Apostle speaks of a weak brother perishing for whom Christ died, I desire to read the 11th, 12th and 13th verses. "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died? But when ye sin so against the brethren (the brethren, not the world), but when you sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak consciences, ye sin against Christ." Whose weak consciences? The weak consciences of the brethren. The brethren out in the world? No. The brethren in the church, God's children. "Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend— What brother, Brother Throgmorton? The brother out in the world,—that is not the meaning— It is the brother in the church,—I will eat no flesh while the world standeth." I argued it was a brother in the church. He argued it was a brother out in the world, a brother in Adam. Why are the brethren in the church concerned about perishing who is just a brother in the world, a brother in Adam? There is no question but that wrong about the interpretation of the text. I believe you would stand well before this audience to confess that you made a mistake there. Indeed, I believe it would help you.

Then he refers to [1Ti 2:1-6](#), where it is stated Christ gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. "Ransom for all" is here translated from antilutron 'uper pantwn (antilutron huper panton). The preposition anti (anti) is here joined to the verb lutron ([lutron](#)). Antilutron is a strong word translated "ransom" in this text. Anti (anti) means over against, corresponding to, in place of, in retribution or return for. Lutron (lutron) is from the verb luw (luo), which means to *loosen, unbind, unfasten, set at liberty*. So the word, *antilutron* (antilutron) means the payment of such a price as retribution or return for as results in *loosing or setting at liberty all for whom the ransom was paid*. This makes it *infallibly certain* that all for whom the ransom was paid, for whom this blessed Mediator gave himself as a ransom, *will be eternally saved*. It doesn't say he gave himself a ransom for the entire world. "All" there simply signifies those for

whom he gave himself a ransom, and signifies that they shall be released on account of the ransom made for them. He says, "God says 'I would, but you wouldn't.'" It wouldn't do for God to say "I could, but you couldn't." Because he said God cannot save the sinner in unbelief. Some influence aside from God must bring the sinner into the circle of belief or God cannot reach him. That gives another being greater power than God, some other being able to go out in the circle of unbelief and bring, sinners from that state into belief, before God can reach the sinner! Now who is it that brings the sinner into the state of belief so that God can save him? If you can tell, you can tell who has greater power than God has in the salvation of sinners!

In [Mt 13:44](#), reference is made to the treasure hid in a field and a man selling all he had and buying the field. His argument is that Christ sold all he had to buy the world for the treasure that is in the world. Now, then, if that be the true interpretation of that parable, then Christ didn't care anything about any of the field except the treasure that was in it. His position is that Christ, in dying for the world, has tried to make the world a treasure. The world and treasure of the world are, alike according to his position, when it comes to the idea of trying to make the whole world a treasure. But the parable lands him on the position that there is a treasure in the field, and for the sake of the treasure the field is bought for the treasure that is in it. What proves too much, proves nothing. Now this has reference to the kingdom of heaven, the church of Jesus Christ on earth. There came a time in my life when I was willing to give up everything for the precious treasure I found in obedience to my master-

"Perish every fond ambition,
All I've hoped, or sought, or known,
Yet how rich is my condition,
God and heaven are still my own."

I am willing to give up the whole world, that I may enjoy this treasure.

He says again that Paul meant in [1Ti 4:10](#), when he speaks of God being saviour of all, men, that Jesus is referred to, and that he is the Saviour, of all men. I ask him this question: Is Christ the Saviour of the damned in hell? What is a Saviour?

I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued by [Harry Todd](#) when Harry was a member of the Old Baptist Church and professed to believe its true doctrine, having left the Missionary Baptists when he was a young man and made us believe he was converted to the truth. He lived with us and preached for us awhile. He held a discussion with Elder J. S. Edmunds, after which discussion he issued this pamphlet as a proof, a defense of the Bible doctrine of atonement. I read this as argument because it is good. I want to get it before this intelligent audience. "Can God damn a sinner justly without Christ dying for him? If so would it be unjust in God to send his Son to die for one, or a dozen, or a half, or any number of the guilty lost race of man? If it would not be an act of injustice for him thus to do, could he not die for a part by mercy and save them for his glory, and by his justice damn the ungodly, whose sins were unatoned? Or finally, if God could not damn a rebel sinner without Christ dying for him, I ask will all be saved for whom he died? If they will not, and God could not have damned them without his Son suffering for them, and since he died for them some will be lost; would not this make the atonement the angel of death, and the ground cause of man's damnation? Now, Mr. Preacher, you will never with all your twisting and misrepresentation, get from under these unalterable and eternal truths. They will goad the neck of all the Missionaries. I accuse your theory of debauchery and crime. It incriminates God and makes him meaner than the Devil and his soul black in hypocrisy for offering to save by giving his Son to die, knowing they would not accept it; and knowing he could not damn them without it, he gave his Son in order to damn them. Oh angels! blush that men would thus defame the holy name of God."

I now proceed with my Fifteenth Argument: My Fifteenth Argument is that the sins of those for whom Christ died are reckoned as debts and the [death of Christ](#) is the full payment by which those sins or debts are said to be covered. In the prayer the Lord taught his disciples, as given by Matthew, he said: "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. ([Mt 6:12](#).) As worded by Luke, the same petition reads: "Forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us." ([Lu 11:4](#).) This interchange of the words *debts* and *sins* proves them to be scripturally synonymous in a sense. In the covenant of Grace, Christ became the surety for his people, an engagement which rendered it an obligation upon him to settle for all their sins. [Heb 7:22](#). "By so much was Jesus made a surety for a better testament." Bondsman here translated surety, means bondsman, sponsor, and surety. He was not surety for God, as he needed none, but for

the sinners for whom he died. As surety for them, he covered their sins by his death as the payment of [the debt](#) covers it.

[Ps 32:1-2](#), "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile." Who is it whose transgression is forgiven? It is the one whose sin is covered. What covers sin as a debt? The payment of that debt.

Rom. 4:6-7-8, "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." He covered the sins of those for whom he died by bearing those sins in his own body on the cross, thus rendering satisfactory payment to Divine justice.

[1 Peter 2 :24](#), "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed." Those for whom Christ died have their sins covered by his death, which is the only real covering for sins. As surety for them he had the right to make full payment for all their debts. The payment he thus made must result in righteousness being imputed to them without works. Nothing stands against those whose sins are covered and to whom this righteousness is imputed without works. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My next argument is that as it is the work of the Holy Spirit to call effectually all who are ever called, and as in this work, he acts in a sovereign and irresistible manner, all for whom Christ died will be called, and therefore eternally saved. The outward influence of the Holy Spirit as exercised in the preaching of the Gospel and the influence of the [people of God](#), is resisted by man while his heart is in a state of enmity. Stephen pressed this fact upon the Jews whom he denominated stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart, saying: "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do, ye." [Ac 7:51](#). Immediately he explained this by saying: "Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted?" The Spirit's influence as thus manifested is merely an external influence, while the Divine call I am now considering is an internal work. The external influence may be resisted, but when the Spirit himself comes in the omnipotence of his grace, resistance vanishes. The same power which created the world, and said, "Let there be light," is exerted in the call of the sinner from the darkness of death to the marvelous light of life. This is signified in the following passages: "Who hath saved us and called us, not according to our works, but according to his own purposes and grace which was given us in Christ before the world began." [2Ti 1:9](#), "Whom he did predestinate them he also called." [Ro 8:30](#), "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to his purpose." [Ro 8:28](#), "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts." [2Co 4:6](#). This is as I argued in one of my speeches this forenoon. Jesus is by the Spirit raised from the dead. We believe according to his mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. He is able to make the believer believe in the same way he raised Christ from the dead and by the same power. His power in creating the heavens and the earth and the calling forth of the light was unresisted and irresistible, and the power by which he new-creates the soul and puts his Divine light therein is equally unresisted. All the Father giveth me shall come to me. All for whom Christ died *shall be effectually called*, the work in calling being irresistible. All who are effectually called shall be eternally saved. Therefore all whom Christ died shall be eternally saved.

I desire my brother's attention to some more questions I have here on the board. The first question I have here is: If faith is necessary to make Christ's death an atonement for sinners, is his death an atonement for those who die without hearing the gospel? That question is plain. If faith is necessary to make Christ's death an atonement for sinners, is his death an atonement for those who die without hearing the gospel?

Would it be injustice in God to send any one to hell without a chance of salvation?

Is faith the work of the sinner or the work of God? I hope that my brother will attend to these three questions in his next speech.

I advance to my next argument, which is that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved because the eternal perfection of all for whom Christ died is necessarily connected with his death for them. Did you get that? The eternal perfection of all for whom Christ died is necessarily connected with his death for them, in consequence of which all for whom he died will be eternally saved.

[Heb 10:14](#), “For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” The sanctified mentioned in this passage are the ones that are sanctified by God the Father as mentioned in [Jude 1:1](#): “Sanctified by [God the Father](#), preserved in Christ Jesus, and called.” This sanctification precedes the calling, which proves it to be the setting apart in the eternal purpose of God, to his own use and service and glory. The sanctified ones are the ones for whom he made the one offering, who are therefore sanctified before he made offering. It is by the will or eternal purpose of God that they are sanctified or set apart to be represented by the one offering of Christ.

[Heb 10:5-10](#), “Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me; In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering, and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou would’st not, neither had’st pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.” By the eternal and unchangeable will of Jehovah those for whom Christ died were sanctified, and through the offering of the [body of Christ](#) for them this sanctification was made manifest. This offering was once for all, “*for all*” being in Italics. It means once for all time, never to be repeated, perfected forever those for whom he died, by fulfilling the law once perfectly for them.

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON’S SIXTH REPLY

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I join with Brother Daily in his expressions concerning our friendship. I approve them. I also approve of his statement that we ought to listen as far as possible without prejudice, because if we don’t [listen without prejudice](#), we will not be benefited. I want to answer his questions and then hastily to notice some things besides. I want to thank him for giving me these questions in writing. First:

He answers my questions; that is, after a fashion.

“What is the penalty of sin?” “Death,” he says. He is right about that. “Death in sins.”

This was a sight: “Where do you learn that only elect persons die in infancy?” He says he believes that all that die in infancy are saved. That is about like I thought you’d answer. Because you *think* it. I don’t want to find out what you *think*, but where you get the *authority* for your thought. His answer is he believes that all who die in infancy shall be saved!

“Why does God favor a non-elect person with long life and deny the same blessing to the elect?” “Because it seems good in God’s sight,” he answers.

“When Paul says ‘Christ loved me and gave himself for me,’ does he mean that Christ loved no one else and gave himself for nobody else?” He answers that “No.” Then here is what I want to ask: When Paul says that Christ loved *the church*, and gave himself for it, it, does that mean that he loved nobody else and gave himself for nobody else but the church? I answer on the same principle that he answers here. It does not prove that he gave himself for no one else; unless this proves that he gave himself for nobody else but Paul.

“Would Christ have suffered any more, in dying for all of Adam’s race than in dying for just one sinner?” He says he has no way of knowing! This man doesn’t believe that Christ’s suffering is immeasurable! It took infinite, immeasurable, the equivalent of eternal, suffering, to save one sinner. Could there be any more than that? No, sir. Then Christ would suffer just as much to save me as he would to save billions, as far as the quantity is concerned.

“Does God command every sinner, elect and non-elect, to repent?” He replies, “Can’t repent without life.” Why didn’t you answer squarely; Yes or No? Paul says “*God commandeth all men everywhere to repent.*”

Does God require every man, elect and non-elect, to seek him?” What did Paul mean when he said “God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation, that they should seek him,” etc.? [Ac 17:26](#), This says God made all nations of men

that dwell on the face of the earth, “*that they should seek him.*” Now Brother Daily says none but the elect are to seek him.

“Does God censure sinners, elect and non-elect for not believing on his Son?” He replies that the sinner is not blamed for not accepting Christ. Not blamed!

Put that down. This man that I am debating with says “there is no blame on a man for not accepting Christ!”

“Can a man believe on Christ without believing that Christ died for him?” “The devils did.” he says. The devils did no such thing. The devils didn’t believe *on Christ*. They believed *about him*. There is a great deal of difference between believing *on* Christ and believing *about* him. Every Christian has learned that. That was a slip of the tongue, Brother Daily. Devils don’t believe on Christ. He didn’t answer my question. Can a man believe on Christ without believing that Christ died for him?”

“Is Christ offered to men, elect and non-elect, in the Bible?” Brother Daily’s reply. “Not offered to any body.” He is out of harmony with the Old London Confession.

Can you name a passage in the New Testament wherein the word “world” means only the elect he refers to [1Jo 2:2](#), “He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for us only but also for the sins of the whole world.” And he says that means the elect. Why does he say it? Not a bit of proof. He found it in that Book of Supposition. So much for the questions.

By the way, Brother Daily says I am not answering his arguments; that I am simply answering his proofs. I am going by the rules. “Rule 7. Whatever *proofs* may be advanced on either side should be examined with fairness and candor; and any attempt to answer an adversary by arts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit caviling or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy.” This rule says that the rule is to do the very thing he says I am doing, examining his proofs. Now, where are you? Good bye. Your own rule.

But I have some more questions from him.

“Can a man be blamed for not accepting Christ who has never heard of him?” No, sir; he is not blamed for that, unless he *could* have heard of him. That is the truth. He is not to blame unless he could have heard. I don’t see why anybody should laugh at that.

“Are heathens who never hear of Christ sent to hell for not accepting Christ?” No, sir; they are not. If they are sent to hell they are sent for their sins. Paul says they are without excuse, and if they sin against the light they have, that is why they are condemned. Not for rejecting Christ, but for sinning. Why my opponent seems to think that I hold that God was under obligations to send Christ into the world. I have never said anything like it. Christ came not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.

He wants to know “if Christ is the Saviour of the damned in hell?” Yes, sir; he saved every one of them from the guilt of Adam’s transgression. I have proved that by [Ro 5:18](#). Christ took Adam’s sin away. They are not in hell for that. What is a Saviour? One who saves. Those are saved from the guilt of Adam’s transgression.

Another question: “If faith is necessary to make Christ’s death an atonement for sinners, is it necessary in order to an atonement for those who die without hearing the gospel?” In the case of all who have sinned *actually* the atonement cannot be received without faith. And “faith comes by hearing.”

He asks. “Would it be unjust to send any to hell without giving him a chance of heaven?” Without a chance? What do you say, Brother? I think God can do as he wills with his own! He is under *no obligation* to give chances.

Another question: “Is faith the work of the sinner?” No, sir. “This is the word of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.”—[Joh 6:29](#). But the sinner *believes*, Brother Daily, if God by his [Spirit and truth](#)—and this question will come up in the next proposition—if God by his Spirit and truth, leads the sinner to believe, who does the believing? He said this morning *God* does the drawing and the *sinner* does the coming. (And here he got off something a little like what is forbidden in the rules, but let it pass. He says the holy Spirit reveals to us that we have sinned, he makes you feel that you are guilty of sin when, according to your doctrine, Brother Daily, in this proposition, you are *not* guilty. The guilt was

taken away before you were born. But he says the Holy Spirit *reveals* to the sinner that Christ [atoned](#) for him on the cross—that is to say, the Holy Spirit comes to a man and makes him believe that he is a sinner, and that he is guilty, and that he is dead in sins and on the way to hell, and then after a bit, he turns round and tells him, “No, that is a mistake! before you was born Christ paid your debt on the cross!” Don’t you know such doctrine as that won’t do? It is not only unscriptural, but unreasonable and contradictory.

He asks concerning the man in jail, “Must the debt be paid to get him out? *May* he continue on in jail after the debt is paid?” Yes, the debt must be paid to get him out; but I think it would be unjust to keep him *after* the debt is paid! His penalty, the debt, is paid, and just as soon as the forms that must be gone through with are met, he must be taken out, or he may *prosecute the State for unlawful imprisonment*. After the sin debt is paid in the Court of Heaven, if he remains under the curse *two minutes*, he is being punished for a debt that has already been paid, and is suffering unjustly, and that is the difficulty my opponent is under in this discussion. He endeavors to make the [death of Christ](#) do on the cross what the *application* of the death does.

Brother Daily says a man believes because he has life. That is his assertion. My friend is getting tired of this proposition. I will give him plenty on the question of life before faith on the next proposition. I want you to just tear my arguments all to flinders if you can. I will not object.

He thinks I ought to get up and acknowledge that the weak brother in [1Co 8:11](#), was one of God’s saints who had sinned and perished. I guess that would look well to him! But how does it look for you, Brother Daily, to get up here and say that a brother for whom Christ died may perish? How does it look for you to say that a true saint may perish? I will turn you over to the Methodists. I didn’t know you believed in the possibility of a saint’s final apostasy! This brother in [1Co 10:11](#), you say was one of the elect, a brother *in Christ*. So, if you are right, a child of God may perish—does perish. To escape this, he must show that to perish does not mean to be finally lost.

Speaking of I. Tim., ii, 1-6, Brother Daily says that the ransom is the *payment* of the price and that “all men” there doesn’t mean all men. I think I showed the facts sufficiently as to this passage. Paul says Christ gave himself a ransom for all men;—he exhorts that prayer be made for all; he declares that God desires that all men be saved;—the same all in each case; that is my point! That same “all” that he wants prayer for, including such men as Nero, perhaps the wickedest ruler that ever lived or ever will live until the end of time, he would have to be saved! Christ says: “I would; *you wouldn’t*.” He says that, Brother. “I would; you wouldn’t.” That is what he said. What are you going to do about it? My opponent says, “According to that, that man’s power is greater than God’s power.” That is not it at all; it is not God’s *will of determination* in every case to accomplish his *will of desire*. He wills (desires) the salvation of all men, but he does not will (determine) the salvation of all men.

But this parable about the field that Jesus bought. My friend said Jesus didn’t care for the field, but for the treasure. But he *bought* the field. He bought it by his death. If he did this to get the treasure, that proves the proposition on the chart is not true.

According to his argument he is saved by works. He says, “When I was willing to give up all that I might enjoy the, treasure!” That is to say, he *bought* it! “The kingdom of heaven, is like unto a man that sold all he had, etc., and bought a field.” He gave up all he had in order to buy this blessing. What is that? Salvation by works? Brother Daily tells me that simply accepting a gift is working for it. Much more than, is selling all you have and then buying, a work.

Well, [Harry Todd](#)’s book! And Harry joined the “Old School” Baptists after he was of age! I don’t believe he was of age. Maybe he was, but I think the brother is mistaken, he quotes from this work of Brother Todd that God could condemn sinners without having Christ to die for them. Brother Daily you needn’t argue that. God would have been just in condemning the race and in never having sent Christ, so far as justice is concerned.

Now he says in his fifteenth argument, that Christ’s death was a full payment of the sinner’s debt at the time. It was a full provision, but *provision* is not *payment*. That is it. I have shown you that Christ died and on the cross made provision; that Christ went through the veil through the resurrection, *into* the Most Holy Place, *into the* Heaven of Heavens and *there* made and makes the atonement. He didn’t make it on the cross at all. My Brother steers as clear of the 16th of Leviticus as if it were not in the book.

Christ is surety for believers and Christ covers the sins of believers, he does not cover the sins of all, because, though he tasted death for every man, yet there will be some lost. *When* does he cover their sins? *When* they believe. Just then, *never before*, as to actual transgressors.

Brother Daily says the Holy Spirit operates in an irresistible way on the man for whom Christ died. Let us try this. He died for you. What does the Holy Spirit want you to do? He wants you to do right in this thing, and in that thing and everything. Do you always do it? When you fail, you resist God's Spirit. If one of the elect can, why cannot another? *Why not another?* "The Holy Spirit came into the world to reprove the world of sin, because they believe not on Christ. But his reproof is not irresistible.

Let me get to something else that I want to give you. I am very anxious to notice every proof—not necessarily every *argument*, but every proof. I think it is [2Co 5:21](#), that I have failed to examine. I want to examine that proof. Yes, here it is: "for he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might he made the righteousness of God in him." This passage does not indicate that Jesus died only for the elect. It says he was made sin for us. In this way, he became the propitiation for our sins.

This means that God is so satisfied with Jesus that he can offer pardon for the sins of transgressors. See [1Jo 4:14](#), And Jesus said in [Joh 3:17](#), that he came not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." On this basis Paul speaks in [2Co 5:18-20](#), thus: "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did be you by us, we pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." And so in that same connection, here are these verses, [2Co 5:14-15](#), "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." *All* were dead, and he died for all the dead that they who obtain life "should not henceforth live unto themselves." Some for whom he died did not obtain life. They remain dead and are lost.

I want to notice [2Ti 1:9](#) a little. "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Yes, sir; believers are saved. They are called. Neither their salvation nor their calling is of works, but is according to God's purpose and grace which were in Christ before the world began. But how is this salvation? It did not take place when Jesus died; much less when the purpose was made. It took place when they believed. *Before* they believed they were like other people. [Eph 1:1-3](#). But for all these other people Jesus died. He tasted death for every one.

Let us now turn to [Heb 10:10](#). "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Yes; by the will of God we are sanctified through the one sacrifice once offered. But *when* were we, actual sinners, sanctified? *Not* when the offering was made, but later on in our own life time. See [1Co 6:10-11](#). "Nor thieves, nor covetous nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the [kingdom of God](#), and such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are *sanctified*, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." When did that take place? See Paul's commission, [Ac 26:16-18](#). Paul was told to rise and stand upon his feet, and hear the purpose for which God was going to send him: "But rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, *that they may receive forgiveness of sins*, and inheritance among them *which are sanctified by faith* that is in me." Here is the point. It is in this, that they received the forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me. That is when it is. So are we sanctified by the will of God, through the death of Jesus once for all *when* we believe. [Heb 10:14](#), "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." By one offering those sanctified are perfected forever. But not before they believe. They are perfected forever the hour in which they first believe. I heard you all singing today:

"Amazing Grace, how sweet the sound,
That saved a wretch like me;
I once was lost—"

But you was never lost. Before you was born, Christ actually paid the debt *you* owe on the cross and you never was a sinner, never was lost! This is your doctrine, Brother Daily. Your peoples' hearts are better than your creed. So they *sing* the truth!

"I once was lost but now I'm found;
Was blind but now I see.
'Twas grace that taught my heart to fear—"

What had you to be afraid of? Anything? That is in the song!

"Twas grace that taught my heart to fear,
And grace my fears relieved;
How precious did that grace appear,
The hour I first believed."

That was when your debt was paid. *That* was when the sanctifying took place. *Before that* you was in sin, tinder sin and under wrath.

That subjunctive mode again. Brother Daily said this morning that it is not always that it means doubt. But he said the subjunctive was in [1 Peter](#) 3:18 to prove that there was *no* doubt there. I want the brother to be consistent, but he cannot be even in grammar.

Now I want you to look again at the Tabernacle—

See [Le 14](#). The High Priest was to kill a bullock and a goat of sin offering, and he was to take the blood of these animals, *after* they were killed, *into* this Most Holy Place, where only the High Priest could, go, and there he made the atonement. *Once every year* the High Priest went into that place *alone* and *with the blood made the atonement*. And yet my brother is arguing that Christ our High Priest made the atonement on the cross and not in Heaven Itself where he went for us.

I wanted to read a few verses from this [Le 16](#). I am rushing with these things, because there are some special points I want to get to. I desire to read especially the 30th verse: "For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord." The difference between Brother Daily and Leviticus: Leviticus has the atonement made in the Most Holy Place and Brother Daily has it on the cross, without the camp where the victim was slain. "And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel, two kids of the goats for a sin offering, and one ram for a burnt offering. And Aaron shall offer his bullock of the sin offering, which is for himself, and make an atonement for himself, and for his house. And he shall take the two goats and present them before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat," verses 5-8. In the 11th verse: "And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin offering, which is for himself, and shall make an atonement for himself, and for his house, and shall kill the bullock of the sin offering which is for himself," verse 11. The chapter then goes on and tells the ceremonies that he shall go through with; that "he shall put the incense within the vail"; and that "he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord; that the cloud of the incense may cover the seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not." That mercy seat is in the Most Holy Place. The High Priest was to take the blood and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat; and "before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times," verse 14. Then the record proceeds and tells that the blood of the goat of sin offering shall be taken within the vail and the same things be done with it for the people, and that there shall be no man in the Tabernacle until he comes out and have made atonement for himself and for his household and for all the congregation of Israel. Read verses 15-17. This whole argument is to show that the atonement took place and takes place not on the cross but in Heaven itself. Christ is the victim; Christ's blood is the blood shed; Christ is the High Priest that takes the blood into the Most Holy Place, Heaven itself, and there makes the atonement, as I have shown you, first for himself, then for the Adamic race, which means all men as to Adam's sin, and is making it as the years pass for every one who believes. That is the sum and substance of it.

I think it would be well here if I again turn to and read Paul's description of the Tabernacle and its service as found in [Heb 9:18](#). Here it is: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For

there was a tabernacle made, the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the show-bread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; which had the golden censor, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant. And over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the [mercy seat](#); of which we cannot now speak particularly. Now when these things were thus ordained, the *priests* went always into the *first tabernacle*, accomplishing the service of God. But *into the second* went the *high priest alone* once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people; the Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing.”

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY'S SEVENTH SPEECH

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I do appreciate so much your patience, and I know that my friend on the opposite side unites with me in this appreciation. I am sure it is because you are interested that you are patient, and that makes us think, of course, that we are giving you something that is interesting. So just be patient, now, until two more speeches are made this afternoon. It will not take us long to speak an hour, half-hour each, if we will hurry.

He wants to know where I get my authority for saying that all infants that die in infancy are saved. That sounds like he disputes it. When a man calls for my authority, the inference, of course, would be that he rather doubts it. If not, why should he call for my authority? Now if I were to take the time I think I could prove that infants that die in infancy are saved. I will just make this general statement, however, without entering further into proof that everything that is said of that class in God's word is favorable to it. David wept and fasted while his child was sick. He was glad in his heart, and so quit weeping when he learned that his child was dead, because he had the assurance that he could go to the child. All infants that die in infancy are saved with an everlasting salvation, and, therefore, they belong to the elect, since the elect are saved. That is plain.

But Christ, he says, loved the church and gave himself for it, and says he loved all the others just as well and gave himself for them too. Loved the whole world, loved everybody in the world, everybody that ever lived in the world, gave himself for the whole world, and yet arranged a system of salvation that confines him to a very narrow territory of the world, and gives the devil liberty, without restraining him, to operate all over the world and with all of the human race without being tied up in Bibles, or preachers, or anything else! But those he loved of the world, if he loved those that never hear the gospel preached enough to die for them, why did he not arrange that they should hear the gospel, that a chance might be made for *them*? Why did he give the devil the whole territory, and confine himself to a limited part of the territory so he could not operate outside of that, if he loved all the rest as well as he loved the church? Why did the Apostle say he hated Esau? I want my brother to answer that in his next speech.

As to [Ac 17:29](#), I want to read the 28th verse: “For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said. For we are also his offspring.” Offspring or children, those born of the parent, of whom they are the offspring. “For as much, then, as we are the off spring of God, we ought not to think that the God-head is like unto gold, or silver, or stone; graven by art and man's device. And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent.” God commanded all men everywhere to repent, to turn away from their idolatrous worship, such as the Athenians were engaged in, all men, Gentiles as well as Jews, to repent of their idols and turn away from them to the worship of the one true and living God.

He asks a question: “Can a man believe on Christ without believing he died for him?” Again I ask, Does a man have to believe that Christ died for him to make it a fact? If a man believes that Christ died for him and that is a fact, did not Christ die for that man long before he believed it, and does the man, when he believes, believe according to God's mighty power which he exerted when he raised him from the dead? Cannot God reach those in unbelief by the same power? You say God cannot. I say again he does, and the regeneration of every sinner is a demonstration of the fact.

He says that Christ is the Saviour of the damned in hell by saving all of them from the guilt of Adam's transgression. He has not proved, neither can he prove, that Christ by his death atoned for the entire human race by satisfying for Adam's transgression. There is not a text in the Bible from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelations that says or intimates that Christ by his death on the cross atoned for the Adamic transgression for all the human race. If Christ could pay [the debt](#) on the cross for the Adamic transgression, I ask why could he not pay the debt of actual sins for sinners on the cross? You say he did pay the debt of the Adamic transgression on the cross. Do you have any proof that he atoned for, the entire race? In [Ro 5](#)th chapter, the reference to which you called attention do not prove that, but to the contrary, for it has reference to those "who receive abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness," and not the entire Adamic family. He says that is the work of God that the sinner believes on Christ. Well if that is God's work, and the sinner believes because God works in him to believe, why then cannot God reach them in unbelief and cause them to believe? You said he had to believe before God could reach him. There you are in the hole. If God works the belief in the sinner causing the sinner to believe, then cannot God reach him in unbelief and cause him to believe? Yet you take the position that God could not save a sinner until that sinner believed! Draw down the curtains!!

If God draws the sinner he says the sinner may not come. If you should try to draw me out of this room, and I didn't go, you wouldn't draw me. You couldn't do it if you should try, if you had your feet both well. If you should try to draw me out at that door you couldn't do it. If you should try to draw me out of this room, and I didn't go, you wouldn't draw me. If God draws the sinner to Christ the sinner *comes* to Christ. Your brethren see that, and so do you. If the sinner is drawn to Christ by God, then the sinner *comes* to Christ. If God *tries* to draw him and *doesn't*, he only *tries*! You have a God that tries, and you say he cannot do it until the sinner comes by faith! If that is so, he cannot do it, for the sinner must first come to Christ.

In reference to praying for all men, for all who are in authority, Christ refused to pray for all men universally. [Joh 17:9](#), "I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine." But those for whom Christ dies he goes to Heaven and intercedes for, and as to the offering being made and then the atonement, I have this to say: The moment Christ was received in Heaven by the Father, there was a recognition of what he had done manifested by his reception, and just as certain as Christ was received in Heaven, the bride will be received. For if a parent should refuse to receive the bride, if the bride comes and isn't received by those parents, the bridegroom would object to being received. And in receiving Christ the Father engages to receive the bride, for they stand as one in him. Christ intercedes in Heaven for all he made the offering for, just as the Jewish high Priest always went in and interceded for the very ones for whom those offerings were made. The making of the offerings and the intercession of the priest was the duty of the priest, and the sins were forgiven in every case where the offerings were made by the high priest for the sins of the individual or for the sins of the people collectively. There wasn't a single failure in that, and so in the anti-type Christ.

What does perish mean? It doesn't always mean to perish in hell. I proved to you by the context that the brother for whom Christ died was the brother in the church, and he cannot answer it if he lived until dooms-day and tried all the time. The perishing in that case is in a different sense from perishing eternally. We perish in the sense of losing our religious enjoyment in the service of the Lord, by disobeying his commands. There is a perishing, by losing our enjoyment. It is not perishing in hell, and he cannot prove that it is. He takes an affirmative, and if he could prove it, he would prove apostasy.

But he says we can resist Spirit by sinning, therefore all can resist it in the call. How about that? When God calls us from death to life, can we, being dead, resist the call? We might, after he had called us to life, resist in the sense of disobeying the commands, but could we resist the call from death to life? The idea of a dead person resisting the call! The Apostle says, [Eph 2](#). "You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins:" The idea of the sinner resisting that call because we may disobey Gods commands, is too light to weigh anything. He is making out God trying and failing, and Christ trying and failing, and the Holy Spirit trying and failing. I do not believe in a Triune God that fails.

[2Co 5:15](#), "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead ; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." This cannot mean that he died for all who are dead in sins, for that would make his dying for them the *cause* of their being dead in sins. Were they not dead in trespasses and in sins independent of his death for them? His dying for them didn't cause them to be dead in trespasses and sins! It did cause them to be dead in some sense. In what

sense? If one died for all then were all dead, means that he died for all that were dead in sins,—then his dying for them is the cause. No, it doesn't mean that at all. All were dead in sins, and the death of Christ has nothing to do with that. All would have been dead in sins and would have forever continued in that state if Christ had not died. So his dying for sinners did not *cause* them to be dead in sins. The Greek shows that all died for whom Christ died. "If one for all died, then they all died is the literal rendering. I want to repeat that. "If one for all died, then they all died," They died because he died. How? His dying for them was the cause of their dying, but in what sense are they dead because he died for them? He died as their substitute, as the preposition 'uper (huper) shows, and they died because of his death. As he, their substitute, died for them, he died just as the substitute going to the war. If one takes the place of one in the army, then his death is the death of the one for whom he goes as a substitute. Christ died as their substitute, and for that reason we are dead because Christ died for us. All for whom Christ died are dead in that sense, and therefore all are going to be finally saved. That is an argument in my favor.

I shall not take the time to recapitulate. The book will show the arguments, and recapitulation would not be of as much profit as to introduce what new arguments I can in support of this question.

I was treating my 17th argument when I took my seat at the close, which was: All for whom Christ died shall be eternally saved, because the eternal perfection of all for whom Christ died is necessarily connected with his death for them.

Christ by the offering of his body once for all did perfect forever those for whom he died, by accepting their sins or by bearing their sins in his own body on the cross. Not one shall ever be lost whom Christ has forever perfected by this offering made for them. In him they have a perfect sacrifice for their sins, a perfect righteousness for their covering, a perfect advocate with the Father continually perfection of all they need to bring them home to glory and present them faultless and spotless before the [throne of God](#). Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My 18th argument is that all for whom Christ died are declared to be dead because he died for them. They are dead in him as their substitute. It is said that they that are dead are freed from sin. [Ro 6:7](#). Those who are free from sin shall be eternally saved, therefore, all for whom Christ died shall be eternally saved.

[2Co 5:14-15](#), "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." This text declares that the reason for all being dead is that Christ died for them. Their death in sin cannot be meant, for that is not caused by Christ's dying for them. No other death can be meant than their death in him as their substitute, for no other death could be caused by his dying for them. Those for whom he died are dead, all of them, because he died for them. If he had not died for them they would have died the eternal death. His death being accepted as their death, they are dead because he died for them. So Paul says, "I am crucified with Christ." [Ro 6:8](#), "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him;" All for whom Christ died are dead because he died for them. All who are dead in this sense are freed from sin, shall live with him and shall he eternally saved. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My next argument is founded on the covenant relation between Christ and the people he came to save and for whom he died, represented as Shepherd and sheep. They are declared in the Scriptures to have been his sheep before receiving eternal life, and before being brought to God by him. Jesus said, "I give unto them eternal life." [Joh 10:28](#), and "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring." This shows they were his sheep before receiving eternal life, or before being brought to the Father by him. This relation, therefore, is not a *vital*, but a *covenant* relation.

The sword of divine justice, that would otherwise have found its satisfaction in the everlasting destruction of the sheep, was called forth by Jehovah and required to strike his own Son with the death blow. Zach. 13:7. "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts; smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones." Jesus says "I am the [good shepherd](#); the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." [Joh 10:11](#), and "I lay down my life for the sheep." [Joh 10:15](#). There shall be a final separation as taught in [Mt 25:31-34](#), "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand; but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Those who shall be eternally saved are the sheep, the

others are the goats. It is not said Christ gave his life for the goats. Christ gave his life for the sheep. He did not lay down his life for the goats. Christ died for the sheep. His sheep shall be eternally saved. Therefore, all for whom Christ died shall be eternally saved. Those on the left hand are those who have always hated God, have never believed in Jesus Christ in the true sense of faith, have always stood in opposition to his blessed Gospel in their hearts, have always been enemies to God and not subject to his law, and not disposed to be, and going to death in that condition they are justly punished. It does them no injustice. His death for them would have been in vain. God would not require his Son to die for sinner, knowing his death could be of no advantage to them whatever. So you see those for whom Christ died believe in Christ as the Gospel is preached to them, but there were those who did not believe, and Jesus told the reason, and said, "Ye believe not because you are not of my sheep." Had they been of his sheep, he would have given them the faith and they would have believed. He would have caused them to believe according to the power of God I say he has the power to reach those in unbelief, does reach them by his own blessed, conquering Spirit, and causes them to walk after him as the blessed Redeemer, the Shepherd of the sheep, who obey in their experience as they follow after the blessed Saviour. They love him. The others do not, who are damned justly, not because they refuse to accept Christ as the reason, but because they are sinners, as my brother and I are agreed. They are sent to an endless hell because they deserve to be.

I haven't time for another argument. I have a number more here that I haven't time to introduce, and so I want your attention, in conclusion, to the great contrast between the salvation that saves a poor sinner dead in trespasses and in sins, and that plan which is a failure, which my friend advocates, unless the Spirit can get to the people through the preacher. And, although Christ has died for all the human family, God has tied himself up in such a way that the devil operates where God cannot go, and sinners are dragged down by millions to an endless hell whom Christ died for and whom God loved, while God cannot reach those in enlightened countries where the gospel is being preached until they first come to Christ by faith, and they cannot come, for coming would be bearing good fruit. So it suspends the [plan of salvation](#) upon conditions that sinners cannot comply with, even where the gospel is preached.

I argue, my friends, that heathen (and heathen are in countries enlightened under the public proclamation of the gospel as well as in "heathen" land) are not out of God's reach. He saves sinners through Christ Jesus, our adorable Saviour. I love this grand doctrine, because I have experienced that, as I humbly trust, God's blessed Spirit found me when I was wandering from God.

"Jesus sought me when a stranger,
Wandering from the fold of God;
He, to rescue me from danger,
Interposed his precious blood."

Although I was a poor, helpless, hell-deserving sinner, the riches of his grace was such that his Spirit reached my heart. My course was changed from the love of sin unto the love of righteousness, and a desire to live to the glory of my Saviour's most precious and adorable name.

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON'S SEVENTH REPLY

In just one-half hour, the work on this proposition is closed. I have nothing now to do but refute my brother's last speech, if there is time for it.

I must confess I was a little surprised at his closing statement. I thought he was going to recapitulate, but he turned 'round and talked awhile on the next proposition, and then he said: "I was wandering from God!" *He* was wandering from God! Wasn't you resisting the Spirit when you did that, Brother Daily? He has been teaching us that the Spirit's work in bringing the sinner to Christ is irresistible, but *he*, himself, one of the sheep, one of the elect, was wandering from God and was "a helpless, hell-deserving sinner." That is what he says he was, just a few years ago—in his lifetime. Yet he has been telling you that he didn't owe God a thing; never did since he was born. Christ paid all his debt on the cross when he died there 1800 years ago. Brother Daily, you just overlooked that. But you couldn't help it. It is the fault of your doctrine, the fault of your position.

“I didn’t know I was debating with a “Two-Seeder” before, but I have found it out. Who was it that laughed about the “Two-Seed” doctrine this morning? Of course you are not going to laugh now.

Brother Daily makes a distinction between men and women as they are, by nature, between the elect and the non-elect *before* God calls the elect. They—the elect—are all his sheep before they are quickened. When did they get to be sheep? I understand from your teaching in this last speech that you were *always sheep*. Then there is an eternal distinction between God’s children and the devil’s children; and that is the “Two-Seed” doctrine. Paul says, however, that there is *no* difference. The elect are “by nature the children of wrath, even as others.” [Eph 2:3](#).

He tells you it seems that I doubt that infants are saved. Oh, no. What I wanted was for you to tell me where *you* found authority for their salvation, and in answer you said you found it in the fact that you believe it. I told you I wanted better authority. Now he says the Scriptures point that way. If he had said that in answer to my question it would have been well. But he said his authority was in the fact that he believed they would be saved—or words to that effect. Well, John R. Daily is not the authority in this discussion, but in answering the question this last time, he goes to the Scriptures.

He goes again to his chart and finds God and Christ and the Holy Spirit and a great many people that don’t get to hear the gospel and wants to know why God didn’t arrange that all should hear, and says that therefore his proposition is sustained! All that belongs to the next question, and I want to say again that I am fully prepared on the next question. You have said so much about it while we have been discussing this one, that some of your remarks will be a little stale. You will have to repeat yourself a good deal.

But he says he wants me to answer about Esau in this speech. I am glad of this, for I had overlooked it. I was intending to speak of it anyway, and by some means it slipped my mind. I have a great deal of material that I haven’t been able to use. I wish we had more time, but then, perhaps, that would make the book too lengthy. Here is the passage: [Ro 9:10-13](#), “And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; (for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;) it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger.” *That* was before the children were born. But this other: “As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated!” This wasn’t before the children were born. Listen to this: The fact that Esau was to serve Jacob does not prove that God hated Esau; God did not hate Esau until Esau sinned. We read in [Mal 1:3](#), “And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste, for the dragons of the wilderness.” That was after Esau’s descendents owned the land. Why should God hate an infant unborn or an infant in its mother’s arms? He does not!

Yet there are *men* whom Jesus bought that perish. Read the account of them in [2Pe 2:1](#), which I have quoted: “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying *the Lord that bought them*, and bring upon themselves *swift destruction*.” Then going on to describe them further, the apostle said: “But these, as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall *utterly perish in their own corruption*.” Men that Jesus bought! That one passage settled the proposition before us.

And did you notice that my brother, with all the time he had to spare, couldn’t give any attention to the Tabernacle? He has never referred to the Tabernacle. Yet all the time he has kept saying that Christ made the atonement on the cross. I showed it to you on the chart that the atonement was made in the Most Holy Place—in Heaven. I don’t blame you. You had no answer; so of course, you couldn’t make it. Thank you for the liberty as to Esau.

He asks, “Must a man believe that Christ died for him to make it a fact?” No, sir. I have never said that at all. Christ “tasted death for every man,” and to believe that Christ died for a man doesn’t make it so. But when I believed on him as having died for me, *then* was my debt paid.

“How precious did that grace appear
The hour I first believed.”

Sing it again. Keep singing it. It is the truth.

Then he tells you I haven't proved that Christ satisfied for the race, by his death on the cross, as to Adam's guilt. I never said he satisfied on the cross. I am saying all the time that the atonement—the satisfaction—wasn't made on the cross, but in Heaven. On the cross the victim was provided, and then the High Priest took the blood of the victim into the Most Holy Place and *there* made and makes the atonement; there makes satisfaction. No, I never said that Christ satisfied for the race when he died, as to Adam's guilt. He satisfied as to Adam's guilt *when* he took the blood and went into the Most Holy Place. “And as by one offense judgment came upon all men to con' even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men”—upon the same all men—“unto justification of life.” My brother has not been able to get away from this plain word of God. The same all that were condemned for Adam's transgression attained to justification by Christ's righteousness; and thus he took away the sin of the world.

Now, on that question of working belief in the sinner's heart. Let me say this: If God works belief in the sinner's heart, even as Brother Daily says, that does not change the fact that God cannot save a man in unbelief. *If* it be a fact that God in the most absolute sense, works faith in the sinner's heart, isn't that working of faith in order that he doesn't save him in unbelief? That is my argument exactly. Let us notice just a little as to how my opponent has the Holy Spirit to work irresistibly. He has God working on the sinner like a woodsman has a yoke of oxen to work when hitched to a log. I don't think that is it at all. We believe according to God's mighty power which he wrought in Christ. We believe *according* to that, but that doesn't say that God works faith in us in that way, Brother Daily says if God draws a sinner, the sinner comes. He says *every one* God draws comes. He didn't try to prove it. He says that I say the sinner must come to Christ before God can save him. That is what you say, too, brother!

Of course, we differ a little about the coming. You have him coming like a log drawn by oxen. I have God to draw him by the gentle wooing of his Spirit. Whether he comes, as I teach it or you teach it, it is in order to salvation. But that is all on the next question. Brethren Moderators.

But he says Christ refuses to pray for all men and quotes from the 17th chapter of John. I think that deserves an answer, and I am going to turn to it. I have more on that very point. Now in [Joh 17:9](#), Jesus says: “I pray *not* for the world but for those whom thou hast given me.” “Those whom thou hast given me” means just the apostles in that verse, because Jesus goes on further in the same chapter and says: “Neither pray I for these alone but also for all them that shall be on me through their word.” Then verse twenty. These who are to believe are no part of “the given.” You can see that. It was a mistake to say that Jesus never prayed for the world. At the *particular moment* when he uttered the language in John 17:0, he did not pray for the world. Neither did he pray for those that were afterward to believe; but later on he did. At that particular moment when he uttered the language quoted ([Joh 17:9](#)) he didn't pray for the world. He was praying for the Apostles alone there. He was not even praying for all believers. He prayed for all believers and for the world further on. “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word: that they all may be one.” Why does he want them to be one? “That *the world* may believe that thou hast sent me.” See verse 21. Prayed for them and for the world. The benefit of *these* as for the world, that the world might be led to believe. So much for that.

He says when offerings were made by the priests sins were forgiven. But where was atonement made? When was the covering provided and put on? Where was it? Echo answers “Where? O where?” so far as Brother Daily is concerned. After looking with open eyes and open mouth at that Tabernacle Chart and argument, he has been dumb as an oyster as far as answering it is concerned. Won't the book look fine without an attempted answer to that? That is going to appear in the book. Won't it look fine with all this argument, and you, Brother, as silent as if you were dead concerning it, when I have rubbed it in on you, as much as I have? That wasn't just the right way to say that for it to go in the book. It is not a very classical expression, but, however, let it go.

He says that the brother in [1Co 8:11](#) didn't perish eternally. We just have his word for that. He didn't try to prove it. He says he might lose the enjoyment of a saint and perish that way. He said it didn't mean to perish everlastingly; yet I showed you that the Greek word *apollumi* is the same word that is used for perish as in [John 3:16](#), [Mt 10:28](#), and [Ro 2:12](#); the very same word. You can answer any argument you want to with mere assertion. But what is it worth?

I want you to look at that chart: I am going to have that chart in the book.

CHART

John R. Daily.

All for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

The Bible.

Jesus tasted death for *every man*. See [Heb 2:9](#).

He is the Saviour of *All men*, but *especially of them that believe*. See [1Ti 4:10](#).

He is the propitiation for the sins of *the whole world*. See [1Jo 2:2](#).

Some shall go away into everlasting punishment. See [Mt 25:46](#).

He answers this question: "Can a sinner in the call resist like a Christian?" And says: "No." He says the sinner is dead and that is the reason. And he says I make out the God-head trying and failing. Was the God-head *trying* when you were wandering in sin, Brother Daily, and when you didn't come? Of course, finally you came, but for a good while you were resisting. The fact is, while the sinner is dead, he is not dead like a block of wood or block of marble. I have an argument on that which John R. Daily, with all his ability, will never answer, consistently with his position here. But this belongs to our next question.

He says as to the passage in [2Co 5:14-15](#), "If Christ died for all, then all were dead." That it means they all died in Christ. Now I don't think that is the idea in that scripture. He wouldn't have suffered for all if all hadn't *been* dead, is the way I take it. Of course you can choose between his interpretation and mine. It is purely a matter of interpretation. He makes an argument on his interpretation, but can not establish his interpretation.

Then in reference to the sheep. He says they were sheep in covenant relation. Why did you not say that before? That would have sounded a little better than your Two-Seed theology of sheep from all eternity! Answer me, Did they get to be sheep before the effectual call?

Mr. Daily: That is it. Prospectively.

How are you going to have a man that does not exist in a covenant relation? The idea of having men making a contract before they are born! Of course, if you have God looking forward and seeing them as his people that is more like it.

Mr. Daily: That is it. Prospectively.

But they were sheep as you have it, before they had eternal life! That looks, like a very peculiar statement to me, and I must quote this language from Paul at this point: "You have he quickened who were dead in trespasses and in sins, wherein in time past you walked"—they were not so dead but what they could walk—"according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; *and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.*" Not sheep. Not eternally God's children, but by nature the children of wrath, even as others—just like others. No difference between them. Brother Daily has a difference before they were quickened. But he explains that. It was just in covenant sense he says. They were not actually sheep, but God, looking ahead, saw they were going to be.

Now, I guess I have a little time to recapitulate. But, I have something here. Some of the things I wanted to say, as a part of the recapitulation. See this chart. (Points to chart as already given.) That is John R. Daily over there. Here is the Bible over here. You see what he says. He sticks to it to the last. He is like the woman who said “Scissors.”

Jesus is the Saviour of all men: he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. He died for some that will not be eternally saved. They will go into everlasting punishment. I think Brother Daily’s statement on that chart and those Bible statements are a sufficient presentation of this whole question. If these words mean what on their face they signify, that proposition is false; and so, as I said in the beginning, he has failed, failed, failed, just because he didn’t have the proof.

He has been complaining because I have been examining the *proofs*; said I ought to examine the arguments! If I take up a man’s proof and show that it doesn’t contain the term to be proven nor its equivalent, he fails. And Brother Daily has failed to prove this proposition. Christ did die for some who will not be eternally saved.

I have shown you that Christ’s death is for all and that some will be lost You can see that here the chart. I have shown you the statement in [Joh 6:51](#), where Jesus, speaking concerning his flesh, says: “My flesh which I will give for the life of the world.” But my brother says he gave it just for the life of the elect: just for the life of some of the world.

Jesus says, in [Joh 12](#), I cannot just call the verse to mind now, but you have it. It will be found back in the book somewhere, “If any man believe not I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world.” This shows that the world takes in the man who believes not, for there are the words: “If a man believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.” He came that the world, the believers, might be saved: might come to be believers and he saved. But according to my friend some of them are beyond the possible reach of salvation because Christ never died for them. Brother Daily says Christ didn’t die for all; and in his debate with Mr. Hughes, says: “The scriptures teach that there will be a resurrection in a spiritual state of the natural bodies of all the dead, of the Adamic race, a part of whom will suffer endless punishment.” Of course Christ didn’t die for these last, according to his theory.

I am quoting you passages concerning the world. [1Jo 2:2](#) is one which he quoted as a proof that the world means the elect. I will tell you, if I were asked for proof and couldn’t give a better one, after I had thought over it, I would be ashamed. How does that passage read “He (Christ) the propitiation for our sins”—for the elect’s sins is what my brother claims— not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” That whole world is somebody outside of the elect, I showed you how that was.

I showed you that Jesus actually made atonement for the Adamic sin when he entered in the Most Holy Place which Brother Daily was afraid to look into.

I showed you how that Christ is a propitiation— God set him forth to be a propitiation, a [mercy seat](#), through faith. What for? “That he might be just and the justified of him that believeth in Jesus.” No matter how he is brought to believe. It doesn’t matter about election, so far as this question is concerned. We have *the fact* that he is set forth to be a propitiation through faith.

In [1Jo 4:14](#), we see he was to be the Saviour of his people, but he is also the Saviour of the world.

I showed you about the Jewish Nation—how Jesus died for it—and my friend has touched that question mighty gingerly. I desire to bring it in right here—close to the last, and emphasize it: Christ died for the Jewish Nation. This was foretold by the High Priest when he said in [Joh 11:49-50](#), “And that the whole Nation perish not.” You see it is not a few, but “the whole Nation.” “And this spake the High Priest” not for himself, but being High Priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that Nation; and not for that Nation only, but that he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad. My opponent says God had some children scattered abroad; but what has that got to do with the point? The point is, Jesus died for the Jewish Nation. Suppose, then, I show you some lost Jew. Judas was a Jew. “Good were it for that man if he had

never been born.” The rich man in hell was a Jew. He called Abraham father, and wanted him to send someone back from the spirit land to warn his brothers. Abraham said: “They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them.” And this rich man was in hell and in torment, and there was such a gulf between him and the place of the righteous that it could not be crossed by bridge nor by boat nor by angel’s wing. His doom was fixed, fixed! And yet he was one of a Nation for whom Jesus Christ died, and he died for the *whole* Nation. Can my friend’s proposition then be true? *Never!*

(Time expired.)

SECOND PROPOSITION—THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT GOD EMPLOYS THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL AS A MEANS IN THE REGENERATION OF SINNERS

ELD. THROGMORTON’S FIRST SPEECH

Gentlemen, Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen

I want to set this chart here for a little bit so you can all see the proposition.

(Sets chart containing proposition in place.)

I want you to see it as well as hear it: “The Scriptures teach that *God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners.*”

It is my province to affirm that proposition. Brother Daily’s to deny it.

I wish incidentally to call attention to a mistake in the reading of our rules. In the quotation from “Hedges’ Rules of Controversy,” the word “Argument” is used where the word “Proof” should be used. I hope this will be remembered if the rules are printed in the book.

It gives me great pleasure to affirm this proposition in discussion with my worthy friend once more. A year ago we had a delightful discussion of it. So far, we have had a pleasant discussion here. As has been said before, we met here at the beginning as friends, and I am sure we are now better friends still. The fact is, I esteem my opponent as a man very highly. I have been entertained in his home. I ate salt with him, besides other good things, and had a fine social time. He has a good wife and a nice family—a family that he ought to be proud of, and I have no doubt is; but in questions of this sort matters of friendship, of course, should cut no figure; neither should differences of this sort decrease the friendship that should exist between good men.

I will begin this morning by defining, briefly, the terms of the proposition. “The Scriptures teach.” By the Scriptures, I mean the Old and New Testaments, what we actually accept as the Bible, we Baptists, and Protestants generally. The term “teach” occurs. The proposition says “The Scriptures teach.” That means they make known, and so what I mean is this: The Scriptures fairly interpreted teach, make known, what my proposition affirms.

The first word in the proposition proper is “God” (not the first word in the writing but in the affirmation) God, the Supreme one, the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit; that is what I mean by the term God; and we will have no difference on that. We have heard Brother Daily on the God-head and he is orthodox. The Scriptures teach that “God employs.” That word “employs” means that God makes use of, or uses the *Gospel* in the regeneration of sinners, and in doing that work he uses the *preaching* of the Gospel. That is my affirmative. The Gospel means the story of Christ crucified, buried and risen, and the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in him.

If you will excuse me I will be a little more deliberate in my speech this morning. I shall also, on account of my ill health, have to be a little quiet in my delivery.

In [1Co 15:1-4](#) we find Paul saying: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand, by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory that which I have preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." That is Paul's definition of the Gospel, the term in my proposition.

He also gives it a further definition in [Ro 1:16](#): "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."

The next item in the proposition is the *preaching* of this Gospel. The preaching of this Gospel is employed by the Godhead in the regeneration of sinners. Preaching means proclamation in a way to make known; it means to proclaim so as to teach.

That other term "Means." Means as defined in the Standard Dictionary, is the medium through which anything is done; the process in order to obtain an end; the subservient or secondary agency, instrumentality." This from the Standard is as good a definition I think as I could make.

God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. That word, "regeneration," means the work of God in imparting to the human soul the divine nature and the divine life and making the children of Adam the children 'of Jehovah. That is what I mean by regeneration.

The last term to define: "Sinners." This means persons who have transgressed God's law. "Sin is the transgression of the law."

I have now a little preliminary statement which I wish to make before I begin my arguments:

In producing any being—vegetable or animal—the germ or seed is necessary. The *implantation* of the germ or seed is the *means employed* in order to the production of the new being.

The most beautiful flower-pot filled with the most fertile soil will not produce a flower without seed. The *means* in order to the production of the flower is the *implantation* of the seed.

The Gospel or word of God, is the seed of the [Kingdom of God](#). In planting or sowing this seed *God employs preaching*. See [Lu 8:4-8](#), the parable of the sower, and [Lu 8:11-15](#), the explanation. I want to read you: "And when much people were gathered together, and were come to him out of every city, he spake in parable; A sower went out to sow his seed, and as he sowed, some fell by the wayside, and it was trodden down, and the fowls of the air devoured it. And some fell upon a rock, and as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it lacked moisture. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprang up with it, and choked it. And others fell on good ground, and sprang up, and bare fruit an hundredfold. And when he had said these things, he cried, He that hath ears to hear let him hear." There is the parable.

Now here is the explanation: "Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God. Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved. They on the rock are they, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away. And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and

pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection. But that on the good ground are they, which, in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience.”

We see from this that the heart of a man is the soil; the seed is the word of God, the gospel; the sowing is preaching the word or explaining the word.

In our correspondence, more than a year ago, before we had the former discussion, Brother Daily refused to deny that God employs, the *truth* of the gospel—put the emphasis on the *truth*—in the regeneration of sinners. He does, however, deny that God uses or employs that truth *when preached!* That is his denial. God, he says, doesn't use that truth this way when it is preached. So, according to Brother Daily, *preaching* the truth is a bad thing for the truth. It puts it where God will not *employ* it. Surely this robs God of his sovereignty. It *limits him* to what is entirely *outside the word*. It cuts him off from employing his truth *if it be in preaching*.

For instance, to illustrate: We employ water to quench thirst. When the water is in a drinking cup or glass we *employ* the glass or cup as a medium to get that water to our thirst. If Brother Daily's logic be worth anything, the employment of a cup or glass would hinder the water from quenching thirst. Brother Daily has it that God *employs* the *truth* in the regeneration of sinners, but holds that if that *truth be in* words spoken, God will not employ it. I think I am stating that fairly. More as to this later perhaps. You know it is of great importance that the question be understood. So I am giving a good deal of time to the defining of the question.

The question before us is not a question as to what God's *power* is. It is a question as to what God's *method* is. God *could* make the giant oak of the first *without an acorn*. But that is not the *method* he employs. He employs the acorn. And he as truly *makes* the oak *when* he employs the acorn as he *made* the first oak that was *without an acorn*. So our question is not whether God regenerates sinners! That is in my affirmation; I say in it that God regenerates sinners; we both agree that he does. But my affirmative is that, *in doing it*, he *uses* the *preaching of the gospel*. That is not ruling God out. God is *in*, and God does the work! And we are both agreed to this. The one question is: Does God, in regenerating sinners, employ the *preaching of the Gospel as a means*? Is that God's *method*? As to the mere question of power God *could* regenerate sinners *with* means or *without* means; he *could* employ the preaching of the gospel in regenerating sinners or he *could* regenerate them without employing the preaching. I affirm that his *method* is—that the Scriptures teach that his *method* is to employ the preaching of the gospel. That is what I have to prove and that is what I am going to prove.

Another preliminary remark I desire to give you. This remark is that in denying my proposition Brother Daily is out of harmony with the "Old Baptist Faith." Do you get that? *In denying my proposition Brother Daily is out of harmony with the Old Baptist Faith!* He sets himself squarely against the Old Baptist [Confession of Faith](#). If he shows that I am wrong in this discussion, he will show that the Old Confession of the Seven Churches in London, of 1644, was wrong. He will show that the "Somerset Confession" (of churches in West England), 1656, was wrong. He will show that the "Old London Confession" of 1689, of which his people have boasted so much, is wrong. He will show that the [Philadelphia Confession](#) is wrong. If he shows that my proposition is wrong, good bye to the doctrine of the old Baptists. I am here to defend the 'Old Baptist Faith, as to what is involved in this proposition. Brother Daily is here to oppose it, and to over throw it, if he can! Will you "Old School" Baptists follow him in this?

Now for the facts: I will quo first, from the Confession of 1644, issued by Seven Churches in London. Speaking concerning faith it says: "That faith is ordinarily begot by the preaching of the Gospel, or Word of Christ," etc. Art. 24. See McClothlin's "Baptist Confessions of Faith," page 181. Proof text given, [Ro 10:17](#). "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" also [1Co 1:21](#).

The Somerset Confession in West England, 1656: "We believe that the Spirit is administered (that means 'given,' in that old way of expressing it) by or through the [word of faith](#) preached." ([Ga 3:2](#).) "Received ye

the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith; that the Spirit is administered by or through the word of faith preached, which word was first declared by the Lord himself and was confirmed by them that heard him." Baptist Confessions of Faith, page 201.

"That this [Spirit of Christ](#), being administered by the word of faith, worketh in us faith in Christ," etc. Same work, page 207. These works show us plainly what those Baptists believed. What is in my proposition? The same idea: that faith comes by hearing. Inasmuch as regeneration comes by faith, then regeneration comes by the preaching of the Gospel.

I come to the "Old London Confession," 1677. "Those whom God has [predestinated](#) unto life, he is pleased in his appointed and accepted time effectually to call (How?) *By his word and Spirit* out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ." How? By the Spirit alone? No, sir. By his Word *and* Spirit. That is the Old Baptists Faith. Chapter 10 of the Old London Confession.

Mr. Daily: What section is that?

Section 1 I believe it is.

There is another point I wanted to give in the way of a preliminary. This question before us is not as to *election* or *predestination* or *effectual calling* or [limited atonement](#). And all the time that my opponent may waste in discussing any one or more of those questions, is waste indeed. Our question is not whether *salvation* is *conditional* or *unconditional*; our question is just one thing: whether *God employs preaching* in the regeneration of sinners! I hope this will be remembered by my worthy opponent and by the audience as well. Let me now go on with this testimony.

"The grace of faith (this is from the old London Confession) whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the [Spirit of Christ](#) in their hearts, and is ordinarily *wrought by the ministry of the word*." That is by the *preaching* of the Gospel, don't you see? This is the Old London Confession, chapter 14, paragraph 1. This same point is found in the Old [Philadelphia Confession](#).

In denying my proposition, I want to say further, that Brother Daily not only sets himself against the "Old Baptist Confessions," but also against noted worthies whom he and his people have honored as leaders.

All who were in the assembly of 1689, who approved and sent out the London Confession; those in the old Philadelphia Association when it adopted its confession, the one known by its name; Dr. John Gill, Dr. R. W. Fain, Dr. John M. Watson, Morgan Edwards, [John Gano](#). I just want to call your attention to this list of names. These all endorsed these words which I have read from the Confessions and which Brother Daily denies in denying this proposition.

But by the way, before I give you these quotations from these men, I have a few questions to present which he can answer at his leisure, or he can answer them in his next speech if he desires.

Do you accept the statement in the Confession of 1644 that faith is ordinarily *begot* by the *preaching* of the Word?" (This is going on record.)

Do you accept the statement in the Somerset Confession of 1656 that "*the Spirit is administered by or through the [word of faith preached](#)?*"

Do you accept the statement on page 10 of the London Confession of 1689 that it pleases God effectually to *call* the elect *by his Word* and Spirit out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ?"

"Do you agree with page 14 of the London Confession that *faith* is ordinarily *wrought* in the elect *by* the *preaching of the Word*?" That is on record. I don't ask Brother Daily to answer these in his next speech unless he wants to.

Mr. Daily: I will.

All right; we shall be glad to hear you.

Will you old people who have so long boasted of your leaders and the London Confession—will you follow him in his issue with that Confession? (Someone in the audience nodded yes.) One brother says he will. All right. Some people follow their leader no matter where they go.

I want to show you about Dr. [John Gill](#). I want to show what Dr. Gill affirms in his comment on [Jas 1:18](#): "But he begets us of his, own free grace, and favor, and of his rich and abundant mercy, and of his sovereign will and pleasure, according to his counsels and purposes of old" Well, what next? "And the means—that word "means over there in the proposition on the chart—"he makes use of—"that signifies employs, or with which he does it—is the [word of truth](#); not Christ, who is the Word and truth itself, but the Gospel which is the word of truth, and truth itself, and contains nothing but truth; and by this souls are begotten and born again." That is Dr. Gill, Brother Daily. He refers to [Eph 1:13](#). Yes, sir; Brother Daily knows it, but is setting himself against him. [1Pe 1:23](#). Dr. Gill also refers to, and this is what he says: "And hence ministers of it"—that is, ministers of the Gospel—"are accounted spiritual fathers."

Now I will quote from R. W. Fain, page 15 of the Old Baptist Test. This is in the preface to Dr. Watson's great book: "Upon this principle the Gospel is *preached to all*, repentance and an interest in a Saviour's blood is *offered to all*." What was that we heard about offering salvation yesterday? That is neither here nor there of course! Brother Fain continues: "The charitable invitation, whosoever will, goes out to *all*, inviting them to take the water of life freely."

Dr. John M. Watson: "To show that the will of God is in his word; '*of his own free will*,' says James, "begat he us with the [word of truth](#)." "Old Baptist Test," page 421.

David Jones' Circular Letter in the Old Philadelphia Association minutes, 1788, endorsed by that association: "The precious gift of faith is a free and sovereign gift of God, conveyed *through* the power of the Holy Ghost, and the *instrumentality of the Word*." This is what I want you to hear: "is *co-existent* with regeneration if not an essential part of it." Isn't that my proposition? Brother Jones says "faith is coexistent with regeneration"—History of the Philadelphia Association, page 240.

[Morgan Edwards](#) (supposedly—it is not sure, but it is understood that he wrote it) approved by the Philadelphia Association, 1766: "Oh! Pray for your ministers, that the Lord will *make them* successful *instruments* in his hands for the comfort of saints (that is true isn't it? But it doesn't stop there) *and* the conversion of sinners."

Now from Elder [John Gano](#), endorsed by the Old Philadelphia Association. Those "Old Baptists" you know. Philadelphia Association minutes, 1784. He is talking about effectual calling, as per tenth chapter of the Confession, first paragraph: "This is an act of [sovereign grace](#), which flows from the everlasting love of God, and is such an irresistible impression made by the Holy Spirit upon the human soul, as to effect a blessed change." I haven't got to the issue yet. "This impression or call is *sometimes* immediate"—there are exceptional cases—"as in the instance of Paul and others—though more ordinarily *through* the instrumentality of the Word and providence of God."

So, Brother Daily, in denying my proposition, is off the old Baptist track and *you* are going to follow him, are you? He is out of line with the Old Baptist Confession! and will you follow him? He is out of line with

the American Baptist Fathers before the great division of 1832, and is at cross purposes with some of the best of the "Old School" Baptists since the division. For instance, Watson and Fain.

I am coming now to argue the proposition. I think we understand the issue clearly and where we are.

Argument Number One: My first argument I base on the fact that John in his gospel teaches that God *employs* the *preaching* of the Gospel as a *means* in bringing men to faith in Jesus Christ and to life; or in other words, uses the preaching of the Gospel in producing faith and in communicating life which is regeneration.

[Joh 1:6-8](#): "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." (That was John the Baptist.) "The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light (that is to preach. What for? Why did John come?) "that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light."

The purpose was that all through him might believe. God employed this preaching of John to make believers. *God sent him that men through him might believe*". He preached as in [Joh 3:36](#): "that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." To make this point more clear let us read [Joh 20:30-31](#): "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not, written in this book. But these are written" (What for?) "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the [Son of God](#), and" (what else?) "and that believing ye might have life through his name."

Having life through his name is regeneration, Brother Daily.

Now the purpose of the written words (which are the same as the spoken words when you preach,) is, first: That men "may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the [Son of God](#)," and, in addition to that, that by believing they might have life through his name. You see both the faith and the life come *through* these written words and these spoken words as in the case of preaching the Gospel. God *employs* the written or spoken word in producing faith and in giving life. And, Brother Daily, the communication of life is regeneration.

Argument Number Two: Jesus while here in the flesh taught that God *employs* the preaching of the Gospel in producing faith and in giving life. [Joh 17:20](#): "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me *through their word*." How do men believe? "*Through their word!*" *Through the preaching* of the Apostles. Jesus knew that men would believe, and he prays for them that believe through their word. Here faith was to be produced *through* the word; the word as a means.

Jesus declares elsewhere that whoever thus believes has eternal life. [Joh 5:24](#): "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." And the believing is in order to the life. "That believing ye *might have life*," John says.

Believing and coming to Christ are the same. [Joh 6:35](#): "And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." And the coming is in order to life. Note that the coming is not because you already have life. It is in *order to life*. Listen to the word, [Joh 5:40](#): "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not *come* to me *that ye might have life*." What is it to come to Christ? To believe on him. How do we believe on him? Through the Apostle's word. What are we to get by coming to Christ? Life. What is the communication of life? *Regeneration*.

So then, the proposition is true that “God employs the preaching of the Gospel in the regeneration of sinners”—in giving life to sinners. The Word is preached that men may hear; they hear that they may believe or come: they believe or come that they may have life. The hearing, the believing and the life are *all* of God, and in giving them, he *uses the Word as a means*. Don’t let us misunderstand. God uses the Word as a means. The communication of life is regeneration. It is not given to unbelievers, but to believers *through* hearing the Word.

Argument Number Three: I come next to argument three. Salvation, which involves regeneration, is wrought of God through the preaching of the Gospel.

[1Co 1:18](#): “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.”

[1Co 1:21](#): “For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God; it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.”

Now the preaching of the Gospel is the power of God to the saved. So reads that eighteenth verse there. It is that by which, as a means, they are saved. God does the saving. *He* saves those that believe, and it pleases him, *in* saving them, to *employ the preaching of the Gospel*, isn’t that plain? Just as plain as my hand.

In this I am supported by Dr. [John Gill](#) on [1Co 1:21](#), that passage I have just quoted. Listen to him: “So the wise men of the world, with all their wisdom are left ignorant of God, and perish in their sins, whilst the Gospel which they despise is the power of God unto salvation, to all that believe in Christ; this, through [efficacious grace](#), becomes the *means of regenerating and quickening* men, showing them their need of salvation, and where it is, and of working faith in them to look to Christ for it.” But perhaps I had better show you how the Old Baptists far back regarded Dr. Gill. You have all heard of the Old Philadelphia Association. In 1807 that body adopted this: “This Association resolves to support the Publishing of the work to the utmost.” That was Dr. Gill’s Commentary which I have been quoting. To support the work to the utmost; they also recommended “to each church to subscribe for a COPY of this incomparable work for the use of their minister.” And yet Dr. Gill’s incomparable work conforms to my proposition.

Hassell’s Church History, a work, I am informed, which is held in high esteem by “Old School” Baptists, says on page 655: “John Gill of London was the soundest, the most learned and most able Baptist theologian since the death of the Apostle John—the author of a complete critical commentary of the old and new Testaments, and of a complete body of divinity—the only man that ever hunted and drove out Arminianism from the explanation of every verse in the Bible, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelations.”

These “Old School” preachers here were glad that Arminianism was put out and John Gill, in running Arminianism out completely from the Bible, is complimented by them.

Argument Number Four: Now I have argument four to give you. Peter informs us that when God regenerated the first Gentile converts mentioned in the New Testament, he did it *through* the preaching of the Gospel as a means. You remember how Peter was sent to Cornelius’ house and about his sermon when he got there. Read [Ac 10:11](#) for the whole story. Also read [Ac 15:7](#). Here is what he says. It was at the Council at Jerusalem when they were discussing whether the Gentiles would submit to the law and be circumcised after the manner of Moses to be saved. [Ac 15:7](#)— “And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe!” But I am not through yet. “And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the holy Ghost, even as he did unto us”—I am not through—“and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts”—How?—“By faith.”

Were their hearts pure before Peter went down there? Was it before Peter went down there, and before they believed? No, sir! "Purifying their hearts *by* faith."

Who purified their hearts? *God*. How did he do it? *By* faith. How did he work faith in them? Read the seventh verse again: "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe," and *by* that believing which was through the word preached to them, *God* purified the hearts. God did it. *God purified their hearts by faith. Not without faith. Not before faith. But by it.* And faith was worked in them by Peter's preaching. That is God's word. Using preaching as the instrumentality, as the old Baptist authorities say, the Holy Spirit worked faith in them. Here we have all the terms of my proposition. It is a rule of controversy that the proofs must contain the terms to be proven or their equivalent. I have found the equivalent where I have not found the term itself. Here we have God; we have God employing the preaching of the Gospel, we have regeneration; we have purification of the heart—God "purifying their hearts." I think that means regeneration. God purifies their hearts and in doing so he employed the preaching of the Gospel. Now I appeal to you! Doesn't all this prove my proposition? As Brother Daily said yesterday, let us lay aside prejudice. Let us take the word of our God, no matter where it leads us.

By the preaching of the Gospel they believed. This believing was faith and by this faith *God* purified their hearts. Their hearts were not purified, as I said a moment ago before faith, but by faith, and God did it. Don't forget that. *He* purified their hearts and in purifying their hearts he used Peter's preaching, to work the faith in them and he purified them *by* the faith.

Argument Five: I will give you Argument Five. I am pretty well stocked up, but I want to ask you again to pardon me for being slow this morning. Paul states it as the Gospel rule that God employs the preaching of the Gospel in producing faith.

[Ro 10:8-17](#), "But what saith it? 'What says the word of faith? That is the meaning. The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith, which we preach; That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation. For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Creek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

"How then shall they call in whom they have not believed and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher (the preacher of the Gospel)? And how shall they preach except they be sent as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace and bring glad tidings of good things.

"But they have not all obeyed the Gospel For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? (17th verse) So then faith—I have read all this to reach this conclusion—"So then faith cometh by hearing." How? By hearing. "And hearing by the word." Isn't that plain enough for you? Looks plain to me. Nothing could be plainer. The word of faith is preached. Men hear, men believe and are saved.

God employs the word of God in producing faith. By this faith men are saved, have life, are purified, are regenerated.

[Eph 2:8](#), "By grace are you saved *through* faith." Not *before* faith. Not *without* faith, but *by* faith. And how does faith come? "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God." That this salvation involves regeneration, see verses 4 and 5: [Eph 2:4-5](#), "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved). "The quickening and the salvation are the same. The quickening is by faith. Yes, sir; it is *by* faith. It is not *before* faith, it is *by* it. And it is the salvation—the regeneration.

I desire to give you what Dr. John Gill says commenting on [Ro 10:17](#). Possibly some of you may have made eyes at my interpretation of this passage. "So then, faith cometh by hearing—that is, by preaching; for the word *hearing* is used in the same sense as in the preceding verse; and designs the report of the Gospel, or the preaching of the word, which is the *means* God makes use of to convey faith into the hearts of his people; for preachers are ministers, or instruments, by whom others believe." Dr. Gill's commentary on [Ro 10:17](#).

Argument Six: I want to give Brother Daily a chance to see these arguments. I don't want to save them up to the last.

Paul clearly teaches that faith comes *by* hearing and *after* hearing. [Eph 1:13](#), "in whom ye also trusted after that ye heard, that is you trusted in Christ." (When?) "whom also ye trusted, *after* that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise."

With the faith and through the faith, as a means, comes life, the communication of which means regeneration. God employs the preaching of the word of truth, which is the Gospel, in regenerating sinners. I will not elaborate here very extensively just now, but will pass, if you please, to

Argument Seven: We are specifically taught that uses the word as a means in what is called quickening. [Ps 119:50](#). David says: "Thy *word* hath *quickened* me." Doubtless he quickened the Ephesians just as he did David. See [Eph 2:1](#), "And you hath *he quickened* who were dead in trespasses and in sins." Notice who did the quickening. *God*. That is what my proposition says: "*God* employs the preaching of the Gospel." He does the quickening, and in doing it, he employs the preaching of the Gospel. [Joh 20:30-31](#), "But these are written that ye might I that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." Not life *before* believing. Not life *without* believing, but life *by* believing.

Argument Eight: Now I will give you Argument Eight, if I have time, Brother Daily. [1Co 3:5-7](#) shows that God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a mean in the regeneration of sinners: "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos, watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase."

Here again we have all the terms of my proposition or their equivalent. Paul preached the Gospel and thus planted the good seed in their hearts. The result was, believers—children of God—*God* is in the proposition; *he* caused the seed to grow. Planting the seed was a *means* which God *employed* in the *regeneration* of the Corinthian *sinners*. In fact, when there is no seed there can be no growth. But the planter and the planting of the seed count. It is God's ordinary way of producing new beings. He used Paul and Apollos simply as a means. They were ministers by whom the Corinthians were made believers. God gave the increase, but he gave it through the preaching of Paul; through the preaching of the Gospel. The increase was the regenerated sinners. That was the way God gave it.

Argument Nine: In another place the Corinthians are declared to be the epistles of Christ. That is Christ had written in their hearts. They were thus made what they were not before. They were regenerated; before they were not regenerated. Here are the words: [2Co 3:3](#), "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the *epistle of Christ ministered by us*, written not with ink; but *with the Spirit of the living God*, not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." The Corinthians' hearts were the paper; the Holy Spirit was the ink; Paul was the pen; Christ was the writer. God had employed Paul's preaching as a means; through that means the Holy Spirit reached their hearts and there imprinted and emplanted his own nature, which means *regeneration*.

Now I appeal to you, my friends, if in these two passages from the letters to the Corinthians, are not all the terms of the proposition which I have affirmed. God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners.

Could anything be plainer? And so we have it that Paul teaches, and Peter teaches, and John teaches, and Jesus teaches—God himself teaches—that in the regeneration of sinners God employs the preaching of the Gospel.

My friends, I want you to take these arguments and think about them and construe them; I trust my opponent will take up the proofs—what care I for the argument, if he shows there is nothing in the proofs? I want him to examine the proofs and show, if he can, that what I have said is in them is not in them. If he does that, he meets my arguments.

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY'S FIRST REPLY

Gentlemen, Moderators, Worthy Opponent. Ladies and Gentlemen:

It gives me great pleasure this morning to appear before you, and thus approach what I feel to be my privilege as well as my duty to respond to the speech to which you have just patiently listened. I appreciate more than I can express the compliments of my Brother opponent of myself and my family. I was glad to have him at my home. We would have treated him better than we did if we could, and if I ever have the pleasure again of having his company there I will try to do as well or even better than I did then.

Mr. Throgmorton: "Don't think you can do it."

I esteem him as a high-toned. Christian gentleman and we entertain no ill feelings toward each other. We differ, but differ honestly. We differ in friendship. I want to say to those who may infer from me in this discussion, that I hold no malice in my heart toward any.

Both the propositions we agreed to discuss at this time were worded by my opponent, he would not consent to have it word "atone" in the first proposition, or the word "necessarily" in this. In our correspondence he insisted that no [Missionary Baptist](#), no representative Missionary Baptist, had ever taken the position that the preaching of the Gospel is really necessary in the regeneration of sinners, and so would not have the word necessary in the proposition. He spoke of my objection to affirm that God makes use of the *truth* of the Gospel. I objected to that term because it was somewhat ambiguous and would allow the affirmant to make a play upon it.

Now it is important that the people understand this to begin with: that either he regards the Gospel really necessary to the regeneration of sinners, or that he does not. If he does not regard the preaching of the Gospel as really necessary there is not so much between us as there would be if he did regard the preaching as really necessary: so that to show these people and get before you clearly just how much there is between us and what is the exact issue. I desire to get this matter settled in the beginning of this question.

I hold in my hand a printed pamphlet containing the report of an oral debate held about fifty years ago between Elder G. M. Thompson of the Primitive Baptist Church and Elder Selvidge, of the Missionary Church at Calhoun, Ga. In this, on page 8, Mr. Selvidge says: "The Gospel is the means God has

appointed for the conversion of the world. It must therefore be preached or the world must remain in unbelief. The Bible must be printed in the different languages and sent to the different nations before they can be redeemed from heathenism and idolatry. The mind and judgment have to be informed and convinced of the truth of the Gospel before we can believe or have faith, and preaching is the means God has appointed for this, purpose." On pages 42 and 43, he says: "The Gospel is the means of grace, and without it none can be saved; for none can believe on him of whom they have not heard, and none can hear without a preacher. The Gospel must be preached before sinners can be converted. The day of miracles is past, and we now live in the day of means, and it is only in the use of those means that the world is to be converted to God. We must plant our seed and cultivate our ground if we expect to gather a crop. Mr. Thompson's corn will not grow if he does not cultivate it; and we cannot expect sinners to be converted unless we use the means. Faith comes by hearing, and is the fruit of testimony; without testimony we cannot believe anything. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. Faith is the condition of salvation, and if we believe not we shall be damned; and this faith we can never have without a preached Gospel." One more quotation from this book. On page 26, Mr. Selvidge says: "God speaks to man through human language, and human language alone. I would like to know what words the Holy Ghost ever said to Mr. Thompson. There is a great deal of talk about the Holy Ghost that is vain and foolish, the people are taught to look for some miraculous light, some supernatural invitation, but this is all superstition. The Gospel is to be preached, and the world is to be evangelized through human efforts, and by language, and language alone, does God speak to men. We know nothing but what we learn; and it is by use of human language that we learn all we know, either as men or as Christians. This is the age of means, and it is by the use of means and human language that men are taught religion."

Now Mr. Selvidge was a representative [Missionary Baptist](#) preacher, chosen by his people to represent them in this discussion with Mr. Thompson. But it may be that Brother Throgmorton has never seen this work, and when he wrote that no representative Missionary Baptist ever did take the position that the preaching of the Gospel is a necessary means in the regeneration of sinners, he had not read this work and did not know that Mr. Selvidge said this. I will, therefore, give him something a little more modern than that. I have a debate between Eller Cayce and Elder Penick. It will not be disputed I am sure that he is a representative Missionary Baptist. I heard him two days. He has had fifty-three discussions he informed me, and I regard him as an able man. In this work, page 237. Mr. Penick says: "Never have I admitted that any man was saved before hearing the Gospel." On page 333 he says, speaking of his opponent, "So you see the point that he makes is that there are regenerate people who are not believers, and these regenerate people who are not believers in heathen lands must be made believers by the preachers. He thinks these will be saved. Is there somebody who is not a believer that will be saved, Brother Cayce? That never heard the Gospel, don't have to hear it?" Again, on page 259, he says, "I have you any evidence that any one is saved who has never heard or believed the Gospel? I don't find the case. I should be glad to find it." From these plain, statements, and many others made by Elder Penick it is certain that he as a representative Missionary Baptist preacher taught that the preaching of the Gospel is absolutely necessary to the work of regeneration. It may be possible that my worthy opponent is so busy with his editorial and preaching work and other duties that he has not been able to read this work very carefully and has not noticed that Elder Penick said that in that debate. And not having just noticed that, he made the assertion that no representative Missionary Baptist had ever said the preaching was a *necessary* means in the regeneration of sinners. To refresh my opponent's memory a little, I shall now give a few quotations from the Potter-Throgmorton debate. I give these statements from Brother Throgmorton himself, to refresh his mind, for surely he had forgotten he said these things when he wrote me that no representative Missionary Baptist had ever taken the position that the preaching of the gospel is really necessary in the work of regeneration. On page 211, Throgmorton-Potter debate: "We plant the incorruptible seed. The church through her ministers is to go forth unto the uttermost parts of the earth and plant this seed. We do not make it grow, Brother Potter. God giveth the increase. But he does not give it without the seed. We sow the seed, don't you forget that. If you think you can show that he does give increase without seed, try it. Show a single instance where he ever brought anybody to Christ without the word. Do not misunderstand me. I do not say the word atone, not that. The word alone will not bring

a man to Christ. 'We are workers together with him.' He prepareth the soil, and maketh the seed to grow; but not where the seed is not. He does not sow the seed by means of his angels or do anything of that sort. Well, how is it? Thus: 'For after that in the wisdom of the world the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God,' 'Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight,' 'It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe,'"

Hear Brother Throgmorton again in the same debate. Page 213: "I do not say that salvation is in the preaching; not that. I do not say that the seed alone produces the children of the kingdom; not that. But I do say that it has pleased God to make these things inseparable in the conversion of sinners in all lands, countries and nationalities since the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Now, Brother Throgmorton wrote to me in type capitals that no representative Missionary Baptist had ever taken the position that the preaching was absolutely necessary in the regeneration of sinners. Either he did not regard himself as a *representative*, or he had forgotten he said it himself. I could give much more of the same kind from this book, but this is sufficient.

I have a little work here that was published by Harry Todd when Harry was with the [Primitive Baptists](#), and in this little work on "Church Identity," just to prove without a question of a doubt that the Missionary Baptists had departed from the original faith, Harry gives their Seventh Article, as follows: "That the influence of the Spirit is co-extensive with the proclamation of the Gospel." This must be correct, for Harry knew. That is according to my representation on this black board. (see page 58). The Spirit of God cannot operate beyond the territory in the world's history where preachers preach. Looks like some limitation there. Now this [Article of Faith](#) must be correct because Harry knew. He had been a Missionary before he came to us. Then it is a plank of the creed of the Missionary Baptist Church that the preaching of the Gospel *is necessary to the regeneration of sinners*. In fact, Brother Throgmorton has taken that position in this speech he has just made. But I have agreed to debate with Brother Throgmorton, in a friendly way, with all good feeling, the proposition as worded by him and accepted by me, which has been read in your hearing. My brother handed me some questions to which I believe I will now attend:

"Do you agree with Chapter 14 of the London [Confession of Faith](#), that faith is ordinarily wrought in the hearts of the elect by the ministry of the word?" The 14th Chapter, Article One, of the Chapter in the Confession of Faith, says that the *grace* of faith is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word. There is a *distinction*, which I desire you to hold in mind throughout the discussion of this proposition, between the life that produces the faith, or out of which the faith comes, and the graces. The faith is a fruit of the Spirit and the Spirit's work in giving life, in producing that fruit, and so I accept this article of the London Confession with the understanding that there is a distinction and difference between the trace and the fruits, and the thing itself which produces them. Very well.

"Do you accept the statement in Chapter 10 of the London Confession of 1689, That it pleased God effectually to call (the elect) by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation?" Yes, sir; I accept that with the explanation given in the next paragraph, Section 2, of Chapter Ten—"This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen of man (faith or anything else), nor from any power or agency in the creature co-working with his special grace; the creature being wholly passive therein, is dead in sins and trespasses, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace there and conveyed in it, and that by no less power than that which raised up Christ from the dead." Yes, sir; I accept the London Confession of Faith. Brethren, just follow me as long as I keep to the faith. I dare him to show he accepts the wording just as it is in that Second Chapter. Let him say he will.

"Do you accept the statement in the Somerset Confession of 1656. That the Spirit is administered by or through the word of faith preached?" I do not accept that statement. I will object to any error that has ever crept into the church from the days of the Apostles down to the present. In the church of Jesus Christ there have crept many errors, even in Confessions and circular letters. When I find any of them erroneous

I am going to object. When I find anything taught in these that is not taught, in the word of God, I am going to stand up against them. The next question:

"Do you accept the statement in the Confession of 1644, "That faith is ordinarily begot by the preaching of the Word?" I have no objection to that statement. Faith may be, in the sense of belief or accepting a fact as published or taught. In that sense faith is wrought that way. Of course I have no objection to that whatever.

In his definitions Brother Throgmorton spoke of God as the Supreme One. Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and said we agreed in reference to that. It may develop, in fact I am not sure but it has already developed, that we are not agreed in regard to the actual *supremacy* of God; that we are not fully agreed.

Passing over his definitions and accepting them except where he places some misconstruction upon the Scriptures—he says in producing any being the germ or seed is necessary, implanting is the means, and the Gospel or word of God is the seed. My contention will be during the discussion of this proposition that the Gospel or word of God is simply the truth, spiritual truth, and the preaching is the proclamation of what is true, the truth. I shall make a distinction between *truth* and *life*. I shall show that *truth* is not *life*, that life is distinct from truth in the sense of facts existing and published. He calls attention to the parable of the sower, not in any regular argument, but in the line of his definitions and proceeds to make an argument upon that parable to which I shall now give attention. I want you to mark that the Word of God is called the "Word," [Mr 4:14](#); "the Word of God," in [Lu 18:1](#), and that the heart that is said to be represented by the good ground in the parable in [Lu 8:15](#), is called the honest and the good heart, Now that seed, he says, is the truth that the preacher preaches. Well, we accept that. But is that the life? That is the question. Is that the life? I know that seed sown by sowers is living seed, but in this parable what does that seed represent? If it represents eternal life, then my friend is right, but it devolves up to him to *prove* that it means eternal life—not what the seed is in itself, but what the seed *represents*. I deny that the seed represents the life. I deny that by my preaching or through my preaching I can speak to dead sinners, dead in trespasses and sins, and give life to them by my speaking this word or preaching it.

His position is that the preacher or preaching the truth gives life to dead sinners by his preaching, just as the sower puts life in the ground by sowing. That God depends upon the preacher for the transmission of life to the sinner dead in trespasses and sins. There was no change produced in the ground, the good ground even, by sowing the seed. It is the same ground it was before. There was no change wrought in the stony ground by sowing the seed. There was no change produced in the wayside ground by sowing seed upon it. There was no change in the ground that brought forth thorns, briars, etc., by sowing seeds among those thorns. The sowing produced no change. The ground represents the hearts. The preaching then produces no change in the hearts of people. None whatever. The seed sown cannot be eternal life; because where it fell on the wayside it was taken up the fowls and carried away. If it represents eternal life fowls get eternal life by swallowing the seed they will get salvation, and if it represents eternal life then eternal life perishes. If it represents eternal life, then eternal life is choked. I deny that it represents eternal life, and call upon him to prove it, which he will never do. He accuses me of having God limited, and speaks of our quenching thirst by the use of a cup. Of course we could employ a *gourd* to drink our water, but in *his* system the *preached Gospel* is the only *means*. Will you deny it? Your illustrations are rather unfortunate for your cause, to say the least of it. But he says it is not a question of God's power, but a question as to method. But he said yesterday that God could not save a sinner until the sinner came to Christ. So it was a question of power yesterday. It is not a question of power today. Do you say he can save them now? Do you say he has the power to do it? I dare you to get up and say.

He says I am out of harmony with the Old Baptist faith, London, Somerset, etc., and I have already answered that by calling your attention to the London Confession. But he calls up John Gill. Now I have John Gill's works. I couldn't bring my library, it is too big. I have a great many Commentaries. Indeed I do not know how many. I will not take the time to count, and I prize all those Commentaries for what they are worth, but they are only worth what is true in them, and I accept what is true. How about John Gill in

his Commentary? It did seem that John Gill favored the heresy that I am now opposing and that I expect to successfully oppose in this debate. But John Gill has contradicted himself very much, and if a witness comes into court and testifies concerning a case, and then in addition testifies contradictory to that testimony, his testimony as a witness is set aside. So I shall set John Gill aside. Page 180, Cause of God and Truth—"There is want of spiritual consideration and attention in every man, until God opens his heart, by his powerful grace, as he did Lydia's, to attend to the things which are spoken, or which regard his spiritual welfare. The parable of the seed sown, instanced it, shows that the hearts of unregenerated men are unfit and unprepared to receive the word, and therefore it becomes unfruitful to them." Bless my life, he is against my brother on the parable of the sower! I am discovering something! "And that it is only fruitful where it is received in an honest and good heart, made so by the Spirit and grace of God in regeneration." You see? Well, I just declare! "whence it follows, that regeneration is rather a preparation for the right hearing of the word than the hearing of the word is a preparation for regeneration." Dr. John Gill, page 180.

Cause of Regeneration, pages 114 and 115, Body of Divinity, Volume 2: "The instrumental cause of regeneration, if it may be so called, are the word of God and the ministers of it; hence regenerate persons are said to be born again by the word of God. [1 Peter](#) 1:23, and again: Of his own will begat he us by the word of truth, [Jas 1:18](#), unless by the word in these passages should be meant the eternal logos, or essential word of God, Jesus Christ, since logos is used in both places. Though ministers of the Gospel are not only represented as ministers and instruments by whom others believe, but as spiritual fathers."

Seems like John Gill put his studying cap on here. Seems like he wanted to get it right. Though you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, says the Apostle to the Corinthians, yet have ye not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the Gospel. So he speaks of his Son Onesimus, whom he had begotten in his bonds. [Phm 1:10](#). Yet this instrumentality of the word in regeneration seems not so agreeable to the principle of grace implanted in the soul in regeneration and to be understood in respect to that, since it is done by immediate infusion and is represented as a creation; and now as God made no use of any instrument in the first and old creation, so neither does it seem so agreeable that he should use any in the new creation; wherefore, this is rather to be understood of the exterior of the principle of grace as the drawing it forth into act and exercise, which is excited and encouraged by the ministry of the word by which it appears that a man is born again. So the three thousand first converts and the jailor were first regenerated, or had the principle of grace wrought in their souls by the Spirit of God, and then were directed and encouraged by the ministry of the Apostles to repent and believe in Christ; where by it becomes manifest that they were born again."

Mr. Throgmorton: What work is that you quote from?

Body of Divinity, page 535.

"The new man is created in righteousness and true holiness; the principle of holiness is then formed, from whence [holy actions](#) spring. The grace of repentance then appears. The stony, hard, impenitent heart being taken away, and a heart of flesh susceptible of Divine impressions being given; on which to follow a sense of sin, sorrow for it of a godly sort, and repentance unto life and salvation, which is not to be repented of; faith in Christ, which is not of a man's self, but the gift of God, and the operation of the Spirit of God, is now brought into exercise, which being an effect, is an evidence of regeneration." Page 537: "Regeneration is a passive work, or rather, men are passive in it; as they must needs be, in the first infusion and implantation of grace, and the quickening of them; even as passive as the first matter created was, out of which all things were made; and as a dead man when raised from the dead is."

So much for John Gill. How about this work from which I am quoting? Was it written when he was a boy and didn't know? By no means. In the Memoirs of John Gill, found in his "Body of Divinity," it is said: "This was his last work, and contains the substance of what he delivered to his people in the space of five or six years." So much for Dr. John Gill. Yes, I stand where Dr. John Gill did in his mature age, when he had

thought the matter over studiously. So, as I follow Brother John Gill, my brethren can follow me along. Rather, you follow me as I follow Christ. That is the *proper* rule.

He then calls our attention in his first Argument, to [Joh 1](#) :6-8 and [Joh 3:36](#) and [Joh 20:30-31](#), arguing from this that it was John's teaching that God employs; the preaching of the Gospel in producing faith and consequent life. I believe I will confine my notice of this argument to the notice of [Joh 20:30-31](#), as that seems to be the strongest claim by him made in support of his proposition. Now this verse reads as follows: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." Dead, unregenerate sinners are not meant or addressed in this passage, sinners whose hearts are enmity toward God, who are not subject to his will and cannot be. They are merely natural, having been born of the flesh only. They receive not the things published in the Gospel, because they are foolishness to them, and they cannot know those things because they are spiritually discerned. To say an inducement is offered to them to believe what they do not believe and what they cannot believe while their hearts are unchanged, is absurd. An offer to change their hearts by the gift of eternal life if they will only believe, made to them while they were in a state of enmity, while their hearts are unchanged and unprepared to bring forth the good fruit of faith, is too absurd to be entertained for a moment by any intelligent mind. As they will not receive the spiritual things published in the Gospel and cannot know them, they must be made spiritual by being born of God before they can know them, just as *John Gill* says.

Elder Throgmorton's theory requires them to do what they will not do and cannot do in order to receive the change produced by the gift of eternal life to them. Again, if these things had to be written and believed in order that eternal life might be given and received, then no one had eternal life till they were written and believed. The rebuke of the Jews by the Saviour is in place here, and could be given to all who advocate Elder Throgmorton's false theory: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me." [Joh 5:39](#). How blind they were to think that life was in the mere testimony! They might be excused, but people now ought to *know* better. In this *day of enlightenment*, people should not *display such blindness as that*. In *Christ* is the life. It is *not* in the *Bible* or the *preaching*. These are mere *testimonies* of the life. John was sent to *bear witness* of that light, and he made *no higher claim*. No one has a *right* to claim more.

In his second argument he says God employs Gospel preaching in the regeneration of sinners and quotes from [Joh 17:20](#), where it is said that there were those who believed on him through the word of the Apostles. Now we are not discussing as to whether people can believe the truth by hearing it preached. That is not the question. We are discussing whether or not God employs the preaching as a *means*, a *necessary means*, at that, in the *regeneration of sinners*.

Of course he has everlasting life, or he cannot believe. Why, to be sure nobody believes but those that have everlasting life. People don't believe without the Spirit. Faith is a fruit of the Spirit. Why, to be sure they have everlasting life, and by their faith they know that. It is the evidence, and so faith is a *fruit*, the *evidence* of eternal life there, by that Spirit. So, my friends, it is an *evidence* of eternal life, and every one that believes *has* it.

In his third argument, he said salvation which involves regeneration is said to be through preaching. There is another little issue between my brother and myself. I hope we will be nearer together when this closes: that is, I hope he will be nearer to me, and that if he should be right, I will be nearer to him. That is fair.

Salvation does not always involve regeneration. But notice in [1Co 1:18](#) it is said that preaching is the power of God to save the *believers*. Brother Throgmorton said it was the power of God to the saved. We are agreed. If it is the power of God to the saved, it is not the power of God that *saves* them and *regenerates* them. It is the power of God to salvation unto every one that *believes*. It devolves upon him to show that it is the power of God to the *unbeliever*, to the one who is dead in sins. If he finds a text that

says it is the power of God to regenerate the *unbeliever*, who in his heart *despises the truth*, then he will succeed in sustaining his position. But on account of his inability to do it, the proposition will never stand. It is said that it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. It is to save the believer from what? From erroneous teaching, false points in doctrine and practice. Salvation in order to bring to him the sweet evidence that God has already regenerated his heart, in which he is made to rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

In his fourth argument, he calls attention to the first Gentile converts and asks if Cornelius was regenerated, quoting [Ac 1:7-9](#). It is said in that passage that their hearts were purified by faith. We want to know what the nature of that purification is; whether it is a purification from a state of death in sins or a purification from error. God had cleansed Cornelius and his household, before Peter preached to them, by the work of regeneration, is my position. To convince Peter that he had a people among the Gentiles that he should preach to, the Lord let down a vessel unto him as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, wherein were all manner of four footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts and creeping things and fowls of the air. "And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call thou not common." God had already cleansed the Gentiles before sending Peter down there. This is proof that Cornelius was cleansed by regeneration before Peter ever saw him. He was said to be a "devout man." A devout man is one devoted to religion and piety. He "feared God." The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. [Pr 1:7](#). "It shall be well with them that fear God." [Ec 8:12](#). He prayed to God and was heard and answered. He was a worker of righteousness. "He that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." [Ac 10:35](#). He was born of God, therefore, for [1Jo 2:29](#), says: "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him." Now Cornelius was doing righteousness and therefore born of God. He loved God and was born of God before Peter ever appeared and preached a sermon to him, and he that loveth is born, of God. Therefore, Cornelius was born of God before Peter preached to him, so the purifying of hearts by faith did not mean the purification in regeneration, but meant the purification from error by instructing them, and that is all the Gospel is ever intended to do, instruct the people. That is the truth, and I will stand on it these two days.

In regard to Paul's Gospel rule, as given in [Ro 10:17](#). I desire our attention a little to some things that I have which I regard as very pertinent here. It is said in that lesson: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Now the terms belief and unbelief, believer and unbeliever, apply only to a special class of the human family. Those terms do not apply to people who have not heard the Gospel preached. If I have a fact in my mind, and you do not know what it is, you do not know whether you are a believer or not. I do not know whether you are a believer of that fact or not. But when I tell that to you, I may be able to discover whether you are a believer or unbeliever. So those that never hear the Gospel preached have not rejected it, because they have never heard it. They cannot be said to be believers in the sense of believing the Gospel. One cannot be said to believe a proposition until the proposition is presented to his mind. So believing and calling on the name of the Lord, and not believing, in the sense of this passage, are applicable to those only who hear the Gospel and give evidence of their condition by either believing or not believing. The terms belief and unbelief, believer and unbeliever, are not at all applicable to infants, the insane or the idiotic. Neither are they applicable to those who have not heard the Gospel preached. An unbeliever is one that, having heard, does not believe, and a believer is one who, having heard the Gospel receives it with a good and honest heart, believes in the Christ it publishes, loving him and the truth as it is in him. Here is the distinction.

In his sixth argument he referred to [Eph 1:16](#). Why to be sure, Cornelius, after he heard the word, trusting in the Lord, rejoiced. Whenever you hear a Gospel sermon, you children of God, some of you that are growing aged, that Gospel sermon calls forth anew and fresh, and bright, the faith wrought in your hearts, and your love is revived and you trust anew in the Gospel of the Lord thus preached and heard. That is your experience. We believe all that, but that does not prove that through this means, the hearts are prepared to receive the truth.

His seventh argument was based on [Ps 119:50](#). The word of God quickens God's children. There is a difference between quickening people who are dead, and quickening people who are living. One may quicken a dead horse if he is able to give him life; he, may quicken a living horse with a spur or a switch or a slap of the bridle reins, but no person can quicken a dead horse without he has ability to give him life. So no preacher can quicken a dead sinner with preaching unless he has ability to give life.

Argument Eight: "Who is Paul and who is Appolos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?" My brother has been contending that "every man" meant the whole human family. Did God give to every man this faith in the territory where the Gospel is never preached? Does God give faith to every man, does he give faith to every man that hears the gospel? If he *does*, man will never believe until God gives him the faith. He may listen but he will never believe until God gives him the faith. It doesn't mean the whole human family. It doesn't mean all men in that text. It is restricted.

But he quotes from [2Co 3:3](#) to prove this argument. We will notice that briefly now and perhaps more fully later on. He says that in that passage, Christ is the writer, the pen is the preacher, the ink is the Holy Spirit, and the paper is the heart of the ungodly unregenerated sinner, the act of writing being the work of regeneration. If I take my pen to write on paper, the pen must move as I move it, it cannot resist or refuse, and the paper just has to receive whatever is written on it. It cannot help it. The ink just has to flow through the pen. It cannot help it. The pen has to move as the writer moves. But in writing on the paper the pen isn't changed a particle. It is the same paper and this writing was not on tables of stone, it was not on stony hearts, but on the fleshy tables of the heart. Allusion is made in this passage of Ezekiel, whet God declares by him: "I will take away the stony heart and give you a heart of flesh." Then when God, in regeneration, gives the heart of flesh, there will be writing on fleshy hearts. It will be on a stony heart until God gives a heart of flesh. The writing won't change the heart, just as the sowing of the seed didn't change the ground.

I now have some questions for Brother Throgmorton

1. Does God want everybody to be saved?
2. Doe the devil want everybody to be lost?
3. If God is more powerful than the devil wants to save everybody, will he not save them?
4. Are not those born of God who love him? [Joh 4:5](#).
5. If those who love God are born of God, does the alien sinner love God?
6. If the alien sinner does not love God or does not love Christ, then must he accept Christ in order to be born of God?
7. If the alien does accept Christ when he does not love him, does he not accept what he does not want?
8. Does an alien sinner have to become willing in order to be regenerated?
9. Is the alien sinner regenerated according to his own will or according to God's will?
10. If the alien sinner is regenerated according to his own will, is it not of the will of the flesh or of the will of man?
11. If you say it is of the will of man reconcile this idea with [Joh 1:12-13](#).

12. Do the heathen without the Gospel have an equal chance with those who have the Gospel?

I will give you an hour, *two* hours at noon, to answer.

I come to my first negative argument now:

My first negative argument is that there is of necessity in regeneration, a direct contact or, impact of the Holy Spirit. It matters not, so far as this argument is concerned how the Spirit reaches the sinner's heart. My opponent in our correspondence said the spoken and written words were vehicles. Suppose for the sake of argument that this is true. It is not the vehicle that does the work nor does the vehicle stand between the power that does it and the work done. "It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing." [Joh 6:63](#). "That which is born of the flesh is flesh: and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." [Joh 3:6](#). That spirit is God for "God is a spirit." [Joh 4:24](#). "Now the Lord is that spirit, for where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." It is comparable to the blowing wind. The wind blows directly upon whatever it touches and move and not through a medium. It is like leaven which a woman took and his three measures of meal. [Mt 13:31](#) and [Lu 13:21](#). The leaven comes in direct contact with the meal, so the spirit comes in contact with the heart. Elder Penick said in his debate with Elder Cayce, page 227: "I take it that every Missionary Baptist believes that in the process of salvation there is an immediate touch or contact with the Holy Spirit." Again, on page 285, he said: "Let me say again, to get it clearly before you to-wit, that every passage of Scripture that intimates or implies, or says in almost direct words, that God's Spirit does come in immediate direct contact with the heart, I believe it, my brethren believe it. Every single, solitary one of them. Does the Spirit quicken? Yes. Does the Spirit enlighten? Yes."

Elder Throgmorton himself admitted this in his former debate with me, and so I suppose he will admit it now.

Since, then, the Holy Spirit comes in direct, immediate contact with the heart in regeneration, no medium is between the spirit and the heart in that work, and so no means are used. This is simply unanswerable. Means is from the Latin word *medianus*, which means middle, that which comes in between. The proposition goes down before this argument, and Elder Throgmorton will never be able to lift it up with the weight of this argument upon it.

Now with this stick and with this fan I touch this blackboard. This stick representing the preaching of the Gospel and the fan re the Holy Spirit, both touching the blackboard, the board representing the sinner's heart. If it is the Spirit that regenerates, the Spirit does the work by immediate touch. So no means are used through which the power is conveyed. My contention is that the Spirit of God, whether it comes in contact the very moment the word preached reaches the heart, or whether it does not, that it is the Spirit that does the quickening. The Spirit of God does the regenerating, and as the Spirit does the regenerating, no means are used in the work of regeneration. No means are used for it is by immediate touch. If I were to throw a lasso out there and draw an interested brother up here to this rostrum, I would lasso him by means of the rope, the lasso would be between me and the thing operated upon. But if with the rope in my hand I go down to the brother and touch him with the rope and at the same time take hold of him myself and bring him up here, it cannot be said I used the rope as a means. I do it direct. How is it done? It is done by direct touch. Cannot be done by means when the Spirit of God does the work and does it by direct contact. It is certainly self-evident.

My second negative argument is that in regeneration sinners are quickened or raised from a state of death and so it is represented as a resurrection from death. Resurrection from death is accomplished by the direct impartation of life to the dead in which no medium is used. [Eph 2:1](#), "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." Verse 5 "But God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we dead in sins hath quickened us together with Christ." The context shows that the Ephesian saints have been going away from God until the very moment they were quickened. In the three instances of Jesus raising the dead, no medium came between the power that

raised the dead and the dead that were raised. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." In the resurrection of the body no medium or means is employed, for the same Spirit that resurrects the soul will resurrect the body in the same way. [Ro 8:11](#), "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."

The word "also" in this passage shows that the same will be done for the bodies in their resurrection that is done for the souls in their regeneration, and in the same manner. As the resurrection of the bodies will be without any means whatever, so is the resurrection of the dead. It is not with words and arguments and through a process of teaching, but by an immediate exertion of almighty power to raise the dead; that he can reach those that are out of the reach of all other powers; that he can do what the devil cannot do; that he conquers the devil and takes from him poor, hell deserving sinners, change the hearts by the touch of his Omnipotence, and makes them by the Spirit into what they had not been before, causing them to love God and desire to glorify his precious name. As the resurrection of the body shall be without any means whatever, so is the resurrection of the soul. God gives them life. "The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of God and they that hear shall live." [Joh 5:25](#). It is the voice of the Son of God the dead hear, and not the voice of the preachers. It is not simply the words of the Son of God spoken by preachers, but it is the voice of the Son of God himself that must cause the dead to live. If I write a letter, that letter is not my voice. There is a difference between what is contained in that letter and my voice. If I tell you something to tell somebody in your town, my brother, and you tell that one, he doesn't hear *my* voice, he hears *your* voice. *Your* voice is not *mine*. My written words are not my voice. There is a difference between one person telling what another person tells him to tell, and the voice that tells him to tell it. All hear to whom the voice speaks. They all hear and live. They hear because life is given by the power of the voice that speaks to them. Christ further says in the continuation of this passage, "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son of God to have life in himself, and hath given him power to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." So the life is not in the preacher to be given to the sinner, or in his preaching to be imparted by proxy, but in the Son of God to be given to sinners directly by the touch of his omnipotent power. So John says. "He that hath the Son of God hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON'S SECOND SPEECH

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen

I am glad to see the continued and increasing interest in this discussion in which is manifested by the presence of so many of you when so many of you are uncomfortably situated on account of the heat.

I shall spend my time during this half hour in noticing the very remarkable speech made by my worthy friend. It was remarkable chiefly because of its great distance from the issue before us. Of course, *you* may not put that estimate on it. I am just giving *my* estimate.

He began by telling you what I would not affirm, and seems to be dissatisfied with this proposition. I beg leave, however, to say that this is the proposition under discussion, and his discussion of what *he thought* the proposition ought to be, was entirely out of place. I don't mean his telling about that but his discussion of that.

He began by telling you that I would not affirm that preaching was a *necessary* means in the regeneration of sinners; that I said no Missionary Baptist, no accredited Missionary Baptist, so taught. There is a little unintentional misrepresentation in that statement! Notice the proposition. Notice the wording of the proposition that he asked me to affirm or wanted me to affirm: "The Scriptures teach that God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a *necessary* means in the regeneration of sinners. That is, he wanted me to affirm that it was *necessary on God's part*. For me to

have done that would have been to say that *God* was *so tied* that he *could not* regenerate a man without the preaching of the Gospel. This would have been to limit the power of God. I could not and do not take such a position. I explained that in my opening speech.

Then he proceeds to quote some of our authors. Of course I could not take the full statement quoted, but I tried to note them the best I could; that is those that have anything to do with the proposition. However, many of them have nothing to do with the issue, nor does my duty as to the proposition require me to notice them. Yet I want my brother to have rope, because he has got to have something with which to take up his time. He cannot meet my proposition. He cannot meet my arguments on my proposition. He can never weaken for a moment, a phalanx of scriptures that I have brought forward in support of my proposition. So he must fail.

He quoted Selvidge to show something about my proposition and to show up a statement which I made about *another proposition*. Not at all in point. Yet I want to humor you, Brother Daily, and be good to you. Well, he quotes Selvidge of fifty years ago, and had to go back to Georgia to a debate Brother Selvidge had with Elder Thompson. In that discussion Brother Selvidge, he tells us, said that God “had adopted the word as the means.” This is all right: That “this is the age of means.” That is all right. That the world is to be evangelized by means.” That is all right. I don’t think Brother Selvidge was undertaking to tie God to this means because he would not have desired to limit the power of God. You see my brother is wanting to argue another proposition.

He also quotes Brother Penick as saying that there was no evidence that there are any regenerated without the preaching of the gospel. If you know of any will you please tell us, Brother Daily? If you know of a single man regenerated in this age without the gospel, tell this audience about it. Brother Penick said he saw no *evidence*. That is not saying God couldn’t do it. Not at all. Nor that with God it was a *necessary* means.

What he quotes from me in the Potter-Throgmorton debate is to the same effect. I am abundantly satisfied with that debate. That discussion was held in July, 1887, and if I was to begin to try to count the “Old School” Baptist brethren who have come to us since then—and many of them who say that they came in consequence of the reading of that book—I wouldn’t be able to name them all. I am mighty well satisfied with that debate, and I am expecting fruit like that from this one. Yes, sir; lots of it.

I wouldn’t wonder if Brother Daily were to come to us yet. Don’t you know what Brother Todd did in 1896 at Eldorado? He debated with Brother Edmunds as one of you, now he is with us. He has the pastor ate of the Missionary Baptist church at Greenville. Where is A. M. Kirkland? He was once with you. Now he is pastor of the Missionary Baptist church at Eldorado. Where is H. E. Pettus? He was one of your bright young men. Yew he is pastor of the Missionary Baptist church at Westfield. Others have come; are here on this platform. Why should I mention more? Time would fail me. Come along. Brother Daily. You are a fine man and I would be glad to have you.

But remember, in any case, my brother in quoting these men is begging the question. If Brother Daily is not pleased with the question as we have it, why did he accept it? Was you so anxious for a debate with me Brother Daily that you agreed to deny a proposition that you believe? I think not. Then discuss this proposition and don’t try to change it to something else. That is the thing for you to do. You made a mighty speech on another and different proposition but not on this proposition.

Yes! He quoted Brother Todd, by the way, after he got through with Selvidge and Throgmorton and Penick. What was [Harry Todd](#) when you quoted him? One of your own witnesses. Where is he now? With us. How did he happen to come? He got his eyes open. Brother Daily says Todd first went to them from us. He said yesterday that Brother Todd went to them from us after he was of age. If think this is a mistake, but anyway he went to them in his youth. When he reached *mature* years he came back home.

Brother Daily says I made an argument on the parable of the sower. It wasn’t exactly an argument that I made there; at least it wasn’t one of my stated arguments; it was a part of the preliminary definitions that I was laying down. I am very glad he ventured to try an answer to what I said on that parable, and here is the main thing I want you to notice. He agrees with me that *the seed is the word, the preached word*, but he says it is not the life. Who said it was the life? He went right on and argued as if I had said that the seed was the life! I didn’t say it. I say in my proposition that *God communicates life through the seed*.

Brother Daily is trying to put still another proposition in my mouth. What you want to debate? Why don't you debate the Proposition we have? He then proceeds to say I cannot give life by preaching! And then says *that* is my argument! He looks you people in the face and says that!

I didn't say I could give life by preaching. I didn't say Brother Daily could. I said God gives life through preaching as a means. Now, Brother, come up to the trough, if you will allow that expression, and "lick salt right." It is *not* the *preacher* that gives the life. It is *God*. And *he* gives it by *means* of preaching and thus regeneration. The giving of life is *regeneration*.

Here was a mighty smart thing: He said those fowls that picked up the seed that was sown would get salvation because they had swallowed the seed which was eternal life! Wasn't that bright? Won't that look fine in the published book? "Bad off" for something to say wasn't he? He says that Brother Throgmorton *makes* the seed eternal life. *Not a word* like that, did I say Brother Daily. What I say is that *God* gives eternal life *through* the word as a means. Can't you understand that?

Well he says that I told you it is not a question of God's power! He said yesterday that it was a question of God's power. But he had another question yesterday. Do you want to go back and argue that question? Are you not satisfied? *This is not a question of power*. It is a question of *how* an all-powerful God does a thing. That is the thing. Not a question of power, but a question of method.

Now those questions. He was very kind to answer. He just came right up. Let's see:

"Do you accept the statement in the Confession of 1644 that faith is ordinarily begot by the preaching of the word?" He reads from the London confession, Fourteenth Chapter, and says he accepts *that*. *That* wasn't what I asked you. I asked about the Confession of 1644-*that* by the Seven Churches.

Then he tries to tell us there is a distinction between that out of which faith comes and the fruits of it. Certainly, there is. We will pass that until later.

"Do you accept the statement in the Somerset Confession that the Spirit, is administered by or through the [word of faith](#) preached?" "No," he says. He says he will stand against what is not taught in the word of God, no matter where it is. That is right. I do not say that these Confessions ought to be blindly followed. Here is what I quoted them for: To show you that John R. Daily is at variance with those old Confessions, and that he doesn't teach what they taught. If you want to go back on them, all right; but I am sorry to see you going the wrong way.

Now the next: "Do you accept the statement in Chapter 10 of the London Confession that it pleased God effectually to call (the elect) by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation?" "Yes, sir," he says, "as explained by the next paragraph." The next paragraph doesn't explain it at all. It goes on and explains something else. He ought not to say that. The next one neither contradicts nor explains the paragraph under discussion. Here is what this says: "That it pleases God effectually to call the elect *by his word* and spirit *out of that state of sin and death*." It is not *after* they are out of it! "Out of that state of sin and death *to* grace and salvation." Yes, Brother Daily accepts that as explained by the next paragraph! He dares me to accept the second section. Suppose I don't. I am not tied up by the London Confession. It contains much mighty good doctrine; but you folks make your boast of the London Confession. Just a few years ago you published an edition of it, which is the one I have here.

Now, Brother John R. Daily, the one upon whom the mantle fell, when that great man Lemuel Potter died—he comes up and takes issue with that old London Confession in plain words. That is the thing to do if he thinks it is wrong. But he ought not to try to cover it up. That is not saying he does of course.

"Do you agree with Chapter 14 of the London Confession "that *faith* is ordinarily *wrought* in the hearts of the elect *by the ministry of the Word*." "No objection whatever," says Brother Daily, "faith is wrought that way." Well give me your hand on that. Certainly! (They shake hands). Faith, John R. Daily says, is wrought in the hearts of the elect ordinarily *by* the ministry of the word! Is anybody regenerated without faith? No, sir. What does Paul say? "Ye are all the children (regenerated) *by* faith." *Not without faith. Not before it*. So, if faith is wrought ordinarily in the hearts of the elect by the ministry of the Word, *that faith* thus wrought is that through which God regenerates and so the elect are regenerated by

the ministry of the word. That is, *God* regenerates them through the ministry of the word. So much for those questions. I have some more for you after awhile. This debate is going to be quite a “query box” affair.

Now, as to Dr. [John Gill](#). Those of you who are at all informed know how the “Old School Baptists regard Dr. John Gill. Brother Daily says Gill’s Commentary is only worth what it is worth for what truth is in it. That is right. I show, however, that my opponent is out of line with Gill’s Commentary and I show that the old Baptists away back endorsed that Commentary. Of course we might not to follow anybody who is out of line with truth. I would rather be right than to be a Baptist—if there is any difference between them. Sure.

But my friend tries to show that Dr. Gill, contradicts himself not in the Commentary, but in a later work, “The Body of Divinity.” In this later work Dr. Gill has it that the sinner is passive in regeneration. That is right. Yes, sir, the sinner is passive in regeneration—as passive as the patient on the operating table when the surgeon uses the knife! This faith! Placing oneself *passive* into the hands of God. Then God regenerates! But he doesn’t go to a fellow and thy hands, wretched helpless and undone; perfectly passive. I am saved thou must save me! *Then* God regenerates! But he doesn’t go to a fellow and regenerate him in a saloon when he is not thinking of God and salvation; he is not passive then; he is in opposition. I tell you this doctrine that Brother Daily preaches destroys human responsibility.

I intend to read something further from the Old London Confession before this is through, on that point.

He says that Dr. Gill wrote that “Body of Divinity” in his old age. Maybe he had gotten into his dotage That great Commentary is what makes [John Gill](#) a giant among the Baptists of that age and that giant in that great Commentary: written in the prime of his manhood, and not when in his dotage agrees with my Proposition, Brother Daily; but when he came to write a doctrinal book, as I understand in his old age, so to speak. He said some things somewhat at variance possibly with his Commentary. Brother Daily said when a witness contradicts himself that forces him out of Court. You ought not to quote Brother Todd then. You know Brother Todd had come over to us and contradicted himself. What did you bring him up for? It seems that my friend will say almost anything in order to make it appear that my arguments are not what they ought to be; and then he finds fault with me for quoting such a man as Dr. John Gill.

He comes to [Joh 20:30-31](#). He says we are not discussing whether men *can* believe when truth is preached. But he says they *cannot*. He says God doesn’t help anybody but the elect; so that others cannot believe. That has nothing to do with this question. I wish I could get Brother Daily to see the real issue in this debate and come up and face it. He affirms that life is before faith, just as the peach tree is before the peaches. We all know that it doesn’t follow that the life that Christ gives is before faith in him for he says in that same passage—my brother doesn’t examine it, but just says that life is before faith because a dead sinner cannot believe because he is dead like a dead horse! But God says, “These are written that ye *might* believe. Of course that is all right. “And *that believing ye might have life through his name.*” What kind of life? The life that is in Christ. What kind? In him we have eternal life. Why don’t you teach that, brother?

But my opponent says this was written that *Christians* might believe. The idea that a man that is a Christian does not believe that Jesus is the [Son of God](#)! Why every Christian believes that Jesus is the Son of God. He cannot be a Christian without believing that. He that believeth not is condemned, the wrath of God is upon him and he shall die in his sins.” “Ye believe not because you are not of my sheep,” said Jesus. The sheep believe in him. The *mark* of the sheep is that they believe on him. Here is a man who says, “I am a sheep; but says: Oh, no; I don’t believe on Jesus. You believe not because you are *not* a sheep. See [Joh 10:26](#). My phalanx of Scripture proofs has never been touched.

He says salvation doesn’t always involve regeneration. I grant sometimes the word is used when it does not; but there are plenty, of passages where it does, for instance, [1Co 1:21](#), according to Dr. Gill, who Brother Daily says is not a good witness. The gospel is God’s power to save believers, and by the preaching of it God makes believers. Brother Daily says that just as I do. Yes, God through preaching works faith. Get through preaching works faith and immediately the believer is saved. “He that believeth hath everlasting life.” *God saves* men as I quoted, by the foolishness of preaching. He saves them from what they were before they believed; before they believed God’s wrath is upon them. See [Joh 3:36](#). A man cannot he saved with God’s wrath on him.

Brother Daily says the purification in [Ac 15:9](#) was purification from error! That those Gentiles were already God’s children! They were not believers. Can a man be God’s child and yet not be a believer? “He that believeth not is condemned already.” Brother Daily would by the vision of unclean beast that Cornelius and his company were already

God's children. That is rather far fetched. They were not believers; they were not pure. They had to be made believers; they had to be purified.

How do men become [children of God](#) .1 want to tell you it is by faith. To the Galatian Christians Paul said: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." [Ga 3:26](#). My friend has those Gentiles the children of God without faith and before faith. Don't you know that won't do? I have a parallel on one of the charts which I will show you. These Gentiles were not of God's children; that had not faith. It was by Peter's mouth that God made them believers. Brother Daily says the terms believer and unbeliever refer only to certain classes who have heard the testimony and has no reference to regeneration! In this he is away off. A believer is one that has heard the gospel and been led by God to accept it. What about an unbeliever? Where is he? Just tell me. Jesus tells where he is in the plainest terms, "He that believeth not is condemned."

Here is another admission Brother Daily makes. Coming to [Ro 10:1, 7](#) he agrees that faith does come by hearing. And we have shaken hands in that. It is settled in this debate, that the faith which is the gift of God *comes by hearing the preaching of the gospel*. Remember we have shaken hands on that: John R. Daily and I have. This settles the question about regeneration. Regeneration is by faith and we are agreed as to how faith is produced. God works it by the preaching of the word. Are you "Old School" Baptists going to follow my opponent on this? Yes, follow him on this, for in this he is right. But this is not the way his people generally preach it. He says however, that they get faith *by hearing*. And Paul says, [Ga 3:26](#), "Ye are all children *by faith*;" *not before it*.

(Time expired).

ELD. DAILY'S SECOND REPLY

Gentlemen Moderators, My Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen.

If you can just succeed in keeping cool, I promise you that Brother Throgmorton and I will do our best along that line. (It was an exceeding warm day).

He accuses me of getting a great distance from the issue in my speech which I made in reply to his; that is the proposition that we have agreed to discuss. Now part of the time, I *was* a great distance from that proposition, but I was *following Brother Throgmorton*, and if he runs a *hundred miles* from the proposition, I will follow him. So if he wants *me* to stick to the proposition, let *him* stick to it. He is in the *affirmative* now. I am going *after him this day and tomorrow*. He has agreed to affirm that the *Scriptures* teach that God employs the preaching of the gospel in the regeneration of sinners, but in his very first speech he tried to prove by *Dr. Gill* that that was the truth. So I went after him, and left the proposition far enough to turn Gill *against* him in what is recorded in the Memoirs in the "Body of Divinity" as he crowning work of Gill's life. He went into the *London Confession of Faith*. I went into *that* to follow him, and called him to state if he really believes the statement in the 2d Sec. of the 10th Chapter, and he didn't say in his last speech whether he did or not. Yes, I got some *distance* from the proposition that the *Scriptures* teach the doctrine he is advocating. He claims that I have misrepresented him. Of course he meant you to understand that I had *unintentionally* misrepresented him; at least, I *hope* that was his aim.

(Mr. Throgmorton: I *said* that Brother Daily).

If I do misrepresent Brother Throgmorton it is not my intention.

In regard to the preaching of the Gospel being *necessary* or *not necessary*. I said in the beginning of my speech you remember that that was an *important matter* in the discussion of this Question. If he says *now* that the preaching of the Gospel is *not* really necessary, why of course I will leave that matter out and say no more about it. If he will get up in his next speech and say to us that the preaching of the Gospel is *not* necessary, that God, without preachers, can get clown here in the heathen lands and save them everlastingly from *sin* and that preaching is *not necessary*, then I will just leave that out. He said it was not a matter as to whether God *could* or could not, but he has said that God cannot save sinners any more than God can lie without the sinner first believing and coming to Christ for that salvation. Now if he is willing

to take that back, we will accept his acknowledgment of error and welcome him as being that much closer to us than what he was.

He said that I had referred to a statement made by him long ago about another proposition. It doesn't matter if it was about *another proposition*. The statement that he made was: "Understand, Brother Potter, God cannot give the increase where the seed is not planted." *That* is what he said. If that was the truth *then* it is the truth *now*. If it wasn't true *then*, if he thinks it wasn't the truth *then*, let him take it back and we will welcome him as nearer to us.

He said Selvidge did not aim to limit God. How can we tell what a man means except by what he says? Selvidge said: By human language alone sinners are reached and made to experience the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration.

He said if I know any who were regenerated without the gospel tell him. *Cornelius* was one. Cornelius was said to be a devout man, which is from *eusebhv* (*eusebes*) which means *Godly, pious*. Cornelius was a *Godly* man as *eusebhv* signifies. If he was a *godly* man, he was regenerated. *There* is one regenerated without the gospel. He was a *Godly man* before Peter got to him. I know another. That was [Saul of Tarsus](#). I know what plea he will make on that, and I will let him make it first, then I will answer him. I know of a *great class* that are regenerated without the gospel. *Little infants* that die in infancy. There are *idiots* that are regenerated without the gospel. There are *deaf* and *dumb* that never hear preaching in all their lives; *they* are regenerated without the preaching of the gospel. There are *insane*, there are *heathen* regenerated without the preaching of the gospel.

In his last speech he didn't get through answering me, and so I will now lead, although he is in the affirmative. I don't think he will get through answering me at 4 o'clock tomorrow evening. I don't expect him to.

Where is Kirkland, where is Brother Willis and some others? Gone off into *heresy*. They *went* into heresy before they *left us*, and we were glad they left us after they went into heresy and if there are any others among the Primitive Baptists preaching the Missionary Doctrine we want them to leave us and *go* to the Missionary Baptists. I am willing to measure arms with him. I wouldn't be afraid to say I have baptized more missionaries than he ever baptized into the Missionary Baptists from us. I tell you, I have no idea how *many* I have baptized and if I can get these missionaries here to believe the truth before this debate ends and to come to us. I am ready to baptize them. And if I Bother Throgmorton will come to us, I can baptize him as *big* as he is.

He said I quoted [Harry Todd](#). I quoted what he said about your [article of faith](#), which says the operation of the Spirit is co-extensive with the proclamation of the gospel.

In regard to the parable of the sower, the seed and the word, he said he didn't say the seed was eternal life. He said it was the *incorruptible seed*. That is what he said in his debate with Elder Potter. God giveth the increase, he said, but not where the seed is not. If *incorruptible* seed is not *eternal life* tell us what it is! Is it life that will go out directly? Is it life that will die after awhile? Is it a life like our mortal life, that will waste away? If it is not *eternal* and *everlasting* life, *tell us what it is!* You say it is the word of God. You say it is the incorruptible seed. I don't object to you saying it is the word of God, but I do object to you saying it is *incorruptible seed*. You prove it is the incorruptible seed and tell us what it is. If it is not something eternal tell us what it is. If fowls pick up incorruptible seed and swallow it, do they not pick up that which is incorruptible? Will it not be the incorruptible seed inside of them? And if they won't go to heaven, Why not?

You said yesterday it was a question of power. Did you not say God *could* not though he *would*? Answer.

He said I made a distinction between what is produced and the thing that produces it. Do you say there is not a difference? What is it produces faith in the heart? It is the Spirit. Can faith be there before the Spirit is there to produce it?

He says the second paragraph of Chapter Ten of the London [Confession of Faith](#) refers to something else besides what is in the first section. The first and second are connected, and regeneration is embraced in both, and the second fully the position of those that framed the London Confession of Faith. Relative to the London Confession of Faith, he said he is not tied up to the Confession? I am not either. So there we are even.

In regard to the children of God being the children of God by faith, he quotes from [Ga 3:26](#), "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." So the children of God are said to be his children by *obedience*, but it is not their

obedience that *makes* them his children. 1 Cor 17, "Wherefore come out from, among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and. I will receive you. And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." How are they to be sons and daughters? By *obedience*. God's children are his children by *obedience*. It is not their *faith* that *makes* them his children but *faith* *proves* them to be his children. So *faith* is proof of the *fact*.

He says I am out of line with Gill's Commentary. He is out of line with Gill's Body of Divinity.

In answer to his question. I quoted Todd and the [article of Faith](#): That the operation of the Spirit is coextensive with the proclamation of the gospel. Cannot go where the gospel does not go. Not at all. And it can only reach a very few where the gospel is proclaimed. So that the preaching of the gospel is *necessary* in the regeneration of sinners.

Life is before faith. He says it is not; that it is not like peach trees before peaches.

He asks if it is not unreasonable to say that a child of God is brought to believe. I want to read you [1Jo 5:13](#), "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the [Son of God](#); that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." That is written to persons who believe, not that they might have eternal life, but that they might *know* they have eternal life, and that they *might believe* on the Son of God; written to children who had eternal life, that they might know. Every time you hear a good sermon it starts up anew your faith, and you go out from the house of God having your faith revived just as the grass that seems to be dead is alive and is revived by the soft summer shower. Living children of God receive a new life of joy and peace whenever they are refreshed by the gospel and enabled to believe confidently in the blessed Son of God. Often they feel cold and barren and lifeless. Like the withered grass they seem to have no life. Then as the refreshing showers of sweet gospel truth drop into their hearts they are revived, being enabled again to realize that Jesus is their Saviour and again to rest in his glorious promises. Many regenerated persons have not known what their experience meant, have not understood the things they have felt, till they have heard the pure gospel. As the gospel presents the evidences of a change of heart and holds up the glorious Saviour of sinners, they believe in him because they have eternal life in their hearts enabling them to believe. They are revived by the warmth of the sunlight of divine truth, and live in a sweet happiness that no unregenerated one can ever know. And so the passage in [Joh 20:30-31](#) is explained by John in [1Jo 5:13](#). He admits that salvation does not always involve regeneration, and then says, "Mr. Daily says that the gospel saves believers." It does because the Bible says so.

Having noticed all that is relevant of my brother's speech, I now continue my negative arguments against his proposition.

When I took my seat at the close of my last speech I was on the argument that regeneration is represented as a resurrection from death, and as that resurrection is without means so regeneration is without means., 'I was quoting a passage from the language of John which says, "He that hath the Son of God hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Continuing still, the Lord says: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth." A life-giving power must be self-existent, uncreated and divine. The same invincible power that caused the beasts of the earth and the fowls of the air to become docile and move into Noah's ark must cause the lion and the lamb to lie down together. That same power that stopped the lions mouths and warded off the unwonted heat of the fiery furnace; that woke a dead Lazarus and healed all manner of diseases, that rebuked the elements at his pleasure and caused the very devils to tremble: that invincible power which did all these things, and many more wonderful things without any instrument or means, that same almighty power must regenerate the soul.

The voice of the preacher will never be heard by the dead in sins, in a spiritual sense. The voice of Jesus by the Divine Spirit must give life before such can hear the preaching of the gospel. Even the voice of Jesus himself, in preaching his gospel, was not heard by those who were dead. Jesus said to this class, "Why do ye not understand my speech; even because ye cannot hear my words. 8:43. It was necessary that he speak to them in regeneration in order that they might be able to hear his voice in preaching. Why? It is not in the regeneration of sinners that the gospel is employed as a means. I argue from all these unanswerable facts that God does not employ the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners.

I come now to the Third Negative Argument: My Third Negative Argument is that regeneration is represented in the scriptures as a creation, and creation is the direct work of the Creator without the use of any medium agent. [1Co 5:13](#), "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature. [Ga 6:15](#), "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, not uncircumcision, but a new creature." It takes a new creation to constitute one a new creature. But not only is it implied in these passages that regeneration is a creation, but it is expressly stated in [Eph 2:10](#), "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." *Bara* in the Heb. *ktisiv* (*ktisis*) in the Greek, and create or creation in the English are the strongest terms that could be selected to express the idea of the sovereign work of God done independent of any medium whatever. We must take these words in their undiminished meaning, as they are used in the inspired writers without any qualification. We are, then, obliged to understand by this language a special divine operation distinct and apart from the preaching of the gospel. No creature assisted in his own creation or the creation of another. Regeneration is a creation. God does not employ anything as means in creation. Therefore God does not employ the preaching of the Gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners.

Argument Four: My fourth argument against this proposition is based upon the relation of two kinds of light to two kinds of darkness; the relation of the light of instruction to the darkness of ignorance, and the relation of the light of life to the darkness of death. The light of instruction is the opposite of the darkness of ignorance, and the light of life is the opposite of the darkness of death. There is great difference between the light of life, which is life itself, and the light of instruction, and a correspondingly great difference bet the darkness of death, which is death itself, and the darkness of ignorance. The light of instruction will *never* deliver from the darkness of death. The light of life *only* will do that.

John says of Jesus, "In him was life; and the life was the light of men."—[Joh 1:4](#). Again [Joh 5:26](#), "As the Father hath life in him so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." [1Jo 5:11](#)—12, "this is the record that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

The giving of this life to the sinner in the darkness of death delivers from the darkness of that death. "I give unto them eternal life." So Jesus says of his sheep. ([Joh 10:28](#)). And in his prayer he declares, "As thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." ([Joh 17:2](#)). Nothing but the light of life will ever make the dead live. The light of instruction will deliver from the darkness of ignorance, but it will never *penetrate* where the light of life is not. Paul was sent to turn the Gentiles from the darkness of ignorance to the light of instruction, and not from the darkness of death to light of life. This is very evident, because he declares that the natural man, or the unregenerated man, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." [1Co 2:14](#) The preaching of the gospel is presenting the things of the Spirit by the light of instruction. Since none can receive such things without, being made spiritual by the light of life, it follows that the preaching of the gospel is not employed as a means in the regeneration of sinners.

Argument Five: My fifth argument is based upon the teaching of the parable of the sower, as recorded in [Mt 13](#), [Mark 4](#) and [Luke 8](#). In that parable Christ represents the "honest and good heart" as "good ground into which the seed fell and brought forth fruit." I see I will not have time to finish this argument, so I want to call attention to the position my friend occupies: that the ground represents the hearts of sinners; that the preacher is represented by the one sowing the seed, and that there can be no children of God except the preacher so that seed. That in territory where the seed has never been sown there cannot be found children of God. People living in such a country until they come to death, go down to endless hell because the seed has never been sown in their territory, because they have never had the opportunity to hear the gospel preached. The incorruptible seed has never been sown in their hearts. They are not children of God, and therefore when they come down to death they are punished forever. On this map we have a representation of the part of the earth where the gospel has never been preached. We have a representation here where the gospel has been preached. We have a representation here where the gospel has been preached. Only a small portion of those who have an opportunity to hear the gospel are regenerated, a large majority are not and all that live in the territory where the gospel has never been proclaimed had no opportunity, and therefore they are not regenerated.
(Time Expired.)

CHART

ELD THROGMORTON'S THIRD SPEECH

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The first thing I want to do in this speech is to give a little dissertation on the phrase "dead in sins," on what it means to be dead in sins. I think this is a good stage of the discussion for this thought to be brought up. According to Brother Daily, a dead sinner is dead just like a dead horse; that is, the sinner dead in sins is like a dead horse, like a block of wood, like a piece of stone: just as insensible, just as inanimate to righteousness. Let us consider. Dead in sins does not mean that the man thus dead has no life in any sense. It means this: It means that he is condemned; that he has no Divine life; that he is separated from Christ and from real righteousness. That is what it means. He is dead to righteousness exactly as a Christ is dead to sin. Here is the Christian dead to sin; here is the sinner dead to righteousness; both dead just alike, only in opposite directions. Isn't that right?

A saint can be tempted to sin though he is dead to Sin. Can't he? So a sinner can be so drawn by the Spirit as to desire a life of righteousness while dead to righteousness if that is not true how can you make the other side true? The Colossians, dead to sin, were told to mortify their members upon the earth (See Col. 3 5) Saints are to resist temptation. So a man can be commanded to repent when dead to righteousness. He may be drawn from sin, just as a Christian may be drawn from sin, and we have all been that. Christians may actually commit sin. Haven't you? I have. Christians may thus do and still be *dead* to sin. Isn't that right? I want you to pay attention to that. Isn't that right?

So a man *dead in sin*, *dead* to righteousness, may he so drawn by the Holy Spirit and taught by the truth that he may desire life and seek life while *still dead* to righteousness, if that is not true how is the other point true? You never can answer that while the sun shines, nor after it is dark. Try your hand at it, and your brain, and your good spirit.

Now let us see what the Bible says: [Joh 5:40](#), "And ye will not *come* to me, that ye *might have life*." You can see how that is: Drawn by the Spirit, taught by the truth, a man dead to this Divine life may be led to desire it, and may *come* where it is and get it! But these people that Jesus talked to, would not do that! He said to them, "Ye will not come."

Brother Daily told us awhile ago that eternal life is in Christ. Yes and here were persons that would not come and get it. Of course they were dead. [Joh 6:53](#), "Then Jesus said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." How do we partake? By accepting his flesh and blood by faith. And how is faith produced? According to Brother Daily "by the ministry of the word." Unless a man partakes of the virtue of Christ's flesh by faith then there is no life in him. You can put John R. Daily down as agreed to that in open court. Where is he now?

[Joh 6:57](#), "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." *Before* he eats, he is dead, *when* he eats, he is alive. [1Jo 5:12](#), quoted by my brother, I believe, "he that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." There is the line between the living and the dead; on the one side a man is dead to sin on the other side a man is dead to righteousness, and in the one case he is just as dead as in the other *except as to directions*.

Now something else. [Isa 55:1-3](#), "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters!" (Here is a dead sinner desiring something better. He is still dead). "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come, ye, to the waters, and he that hath no money; come, ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently, unto me, and eat ye that

which is good, and let' your soul delight itself in fatness. Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear *and your soul shall live*; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David."

"Hear and your soul shall live" There is hearing in order to living, hearing before life. It doesn't mean life from a death like the death of a dead horse; not that, of course; but that the one to seek life has a life as to spiritual things, just like the life of the Christian as to carnal things. Try that Brother Daily. I will give you all the rest of the time on that. I think you will need it; and then you cannot touch it.

I have some more here from [Isa 55:6-7](#). Speaking to these same parties who are dead, yet desiring life, a thirst for life, the prophet says, "seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way and let the unrighteous man his thoughts and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him: and to our God for he will abundantly pardon." Now this is the way the Bible teaches about death in trespasses and sins. It is no such a conglomerate mess that it cannot be understood. It does not mean that you folks that are not born again are just like a block of wood, that you don't even know what we are talking about, that you are just as inanimate (according to his doctrine you are just as inanimate to the Bible and this discussion) as the body of a dead horse is to the life of the live horse. You know that is not so. Your own consciousness tells you so. I am talking to the people out there, Brother Daily. Not to you.

Brother Daily complains that I am not making any progress. I have gone as far as I want to go at present. I am going further when I get to the place; I know where the place is. Don't you bother about that. I have a fence built. I have a rampart in place. There has not a rail been taken off.

He says that in [Eph 1:1-13](#), they *trusted after they heard*, and that they were *regenerated before they heard*. He quotes from the book of Suppositions. The idea of a man that doesn't trust in Jesus Christ being regenerated, when Jesus Christ says such a man is condemned and under the wrath of God. Children of God are not under the wrath of God, they are justified.

Well he says that to quicken—I am referring now to some things he said this morning. He says to quicken means to enliven, as well as to give life. I grant that is sometimes so. Your dead horse illustration is correct as to that. You can quicken a live horse with a spur. And there is where your fallacy is. The sinner according to your position is as dead as a dead horse; he is like a stone and a block of wood. What would you think of Brother Daily preaching to a lot of tomb stones? If that gets a congregation where there is no elect that would be his crowd. They couldn't understand a thing and the Holy Spirit could not reach them; they are dead, not simply dead as in sins, but dead as a dead horse that is rotting in the field and the buzzards feeding upon him. Such a doctrine utterly repudiates human responsibility. He said no preacher could give life to a dead sinner. Who said he could? I said *God gives life. God gives life. God employs the preaching of the gospel as a means in giving life.* That is what I am arguing. He is setting up a straw man and amusing himself by throwing at him. I am here; throw at me.

In [1Co 3:5-7](#) my opponent wants to know whom every man means. Every one to whom there is reference. He didn't touch the argument. God made them believers *through* Paul's preaching. That is my point. Paul planted; God gave the increase through Paul's planting. He preached, God gave the increase. That is the point. God *used* the preaching. You see that is my proposition. You can see that. Remember Brother Daily agrees that faith is produced that way. Don't forget, either, that faith is produced *by* the ministry of the word, and that God does it.

The "Old School" brethren argue that faith is the *direct* gift of God. Yet Brother Daily has been arguing that *if* the Spirit acts directly he cannot use the word, and yet he has the Spirit giving the faith a God's direct gift. And this is going into the book. How will that look in the book?

Yes sir; it will be read that John R. Daily who teaches that faith is God's direct gift says, and shakes hands with me on it, that faith comes by the preaching of the gospel and yet in the same day he said that because the Spirit operates directly or immediately if regeneration, he cannot use the word in regeneration! Mighty bad for you, Brother Daily, but you did it yourself.

He comes to [2Co 3:3](#) where the Corinthians were the paper, Paul the pen, the Holy Spirit the ink and Jesus Christ the writer; and he said. "That is can't help-it-ism." Suppose it was. It proves my proposition, whether it is "can't help-it-ism" or not Here we have Christ using the preacher and using the Holy Spirit to imprint himself in the hearts of these Corinthians. Brother Daily says the ink doesn't change the paper. I think it makes a great difference in it. Here is a check signed by John D. Rockefeller. Just over here is a blank piece of paper. Which would you pick up? Yet he says the ink makes no difference! Could you have any crop on any soil—would there be any results? Would it be a fruitful field without seed? Never. But my friend is going to elaborate the parable of the sower. By the way I have some more questions, and I want to get back to the query box. I am going to open it again. Let us look at some of my brother's questions.

"Does God want everybody to be saved?" What has that got to do with our proposition? I am answering in the sense of desire. He does. "God will have," in the sense of desire, "all men to be saved." God has not determined it. God desires you to live a holy life every day, but you don't do it. No, sir, God's desire is not accomplished even in your case. Of course, God *could* take you and work you like a machine, but he doesn't do it.

"Does the devil want everybody to be lost?" I think "If God has more power than the devil and wants and desires to save everybody, will he not save them?" he does.

Not necessarily. The devil wants you to do wrong every day. God desires that you do right every day. But you do wrong every day. Does that prove that God has less power than the devil has? You answer that. If this means anything, I want you to have the full benefit of it. I have certainly answered you.

"Are not those born of God who love him?" [1Jo 4:7](#). Yes, sir.

"If those who love God are born of God, does the alien sinner love God?" In a general sense, no; the alien sinner does not love God.

"If the alien sinner does not love God must he accept Christ in order to be born of God?" Yes, sir. In accepting Christ he is born of God, receives God's love.

"If the alien sinner does accept Christ when he does not love him docs he not accept what he does not want?" That might be or not be. I have taken things many things I didn't exactly want, that is in the sense of desire. That question is a little ambiguous.

"Does the alien sinner have to become willing in order to be regenerated?" Don't you think so? I thought you all believed that. So often have I heard your preachers quote, "My people shall be a willing people in the day of power." (In giving this quotation, Mr. Throgmorton intones the words.) I have heard that away back when I was a little boy. Yes, the sinner has to become willing.

"Is the alien sinner regenerated according to his own will or according to God's will?" According to God's will. As to how God brings men to be willing, that is another question. Of course, he uses the word. My friend has already agreed that God uses the word in producing faith.

"If the alien sinner is regenerated according to his own will is it not the will of the flesh or of the will of men?" He is not regenerated according to his own will. Nothing of the sort. God brings him to be willing, but the process is of God.

“If you say it is of the will of the flesh or of the will of man, reconcile this idea with [Joh 1:12-13](#).” I don’t have to, because that is not what I say.

“Do the heathen without the gospel have an equal chance with those who have the gospel?” They have not. That is, those that have not heard the gospel I mean. There are men in this country who do not have equal opportunities with others. God lets one boy grow up in a community where there is but little culture; lets another boy be born where everything tends to refinement and culture. Do they have similar opportunities? No. But they each have enough, in his Place, to make him responsible. I have more of that.

Well, I have already answered this argument about the impact. You had better give up that stuff and take a doctrine that is consistent?

He says he is after me and that I have left the proposition. No. I defined the proposition and in laying down the definitions I indicated that he in denying it, was out of line with the old Confession. I was approaching the issue in this. He backed off instead of approaching it. He says he followed me into Gill and into the London Confession and he tells you I wouldn’t say whether I believed a certain thing or not. I didn’t have to. I made before the debate, a close study of the Old Confession. I haven’t taken the opportunity to look closely at the point he asked me since he asked me about it. I am sure of one thing: It does not affect the issue. The Confession is a fine old document, but I am like my friend. He is not tied to it he says. The Old London Confession was signed by the fathers. He says that to say whether preaching is necessary does not concern us. To say whether preaching is necessary does concern us, I say preaching is necessary, but it is not necessary to enable *God* to do this or that. God has all power. My opponent says this: “If Brother Throgmorton will say that God can save heathen and others without the word I will leave off.” I have said that a dozen times already that God can do it. Of course God can do it. He has the power to do it. But that is not the question. It is the method that is in question. God has the power to save through the preaching of the gospel and that is his method. He may save some the other way; I don’t say he doesn’t. Brother Daily mentioned some he thought were. I think he made a little mistake on some of them.

He tells you I say God *cannot* give the increase where the seed is not planted. God can plant the seed himself if he needs it. He says that now.

He says Selvidge made sport of the work of the Spirit. I have heard a good many things imputed to the Spirit that I don’t think the Spirit had anything to do with. You know there are extremes in all denominations as to the work of the Spirit, and people do and say unreasonable things under impulse and say they are led by the Spirit.

My friend says Cornelius was regenerated without the Gospel. I want to read from [Ac 10](#). Here is what Peter said. We will see whether Cornelius was regenerated without the Gospel. [Ac 10:36](#): “The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all). That word I say, *ye know*, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which Jesus preached.” So if they were regenerated at the time Brother Daily says, it was not without the Gospel because they knew about it.

He says Saul was another case of regeneration without the preaching of the gospel. Saul had the word direct through the mouth of Christ himself, and threw up the white flag of surrender at once, saying, “What wilt thou have me to do?” Christ used the word even from the sky. Brother Daily says the deaf and dumb are regenerated without the preaching of the gospel. I am not talking about the deaf and dumb, and we are not speaking of the after world. And the heathen. I don’t know what he would say about them, whether God regenerates them after death or when.

But he says he is in the lead! Yes, I have seen a calf in the lead, loose, and somebody after it, before today.

He says Kirkland and others went off into heresy and a year ago he said he was glad they went. He didn't say that this time. He is glad they went after they got to be heretics.

He says he has baptized more missionaries than I have of his people. I can't just now count up. I have baptized several of them, and I tell you this, judging by the way the two denominations grow, I wouldn't infer that he got very many of us. Old School Baptists don't have many converts. Their children go to our Baptist churches and to Methodist churches and under the preaching of the gospel, are converted. Then they go back and join; go back and tell what the Lord has done for them. I have known scores of cases of that kind.

Converts among them in their meetings are few. I believe so far that more than fifty per cent whom I have known to join them went from meetings of other denominations where they were converted. Of course they told their story and were taken in and baptized; they were pronounced elect and all right, and it was believed that preaching had no more to do with saving them than had the saloon. I have heard just that kind of talk.

If they are dead, as dead blocks of wood, why may not regeneration as well occur in a saloon as a church? The sinner according to my friend's view has no responsibility at all and spiritually is as well off in a saloon as under the preaching of the word. My opponent says he baptizes any that comes to him with the proper experience. Yes; they get that experience at this meeting or that and they come and tell you and you baptize them. You might have been converted at one of these kinds of meetings yourself.

He tells you that the word of God is the incorruptible seed. So do I. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." "Wherefore laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as new born babes desire the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby." [2Pe 1:21](#) and [2Pe 2:1-2](#)). The same word all the way through.

(Time expired).

ELD. DAILY'S THIRD REPLY

Brethren Moderators, My Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am delighted to know that we are all of us feeling very pleasant, and that we are all enjoying this discussion. That is what I anticipated. This is what I anticipate shall continue.

In the opening of his speech he undertook to explain what it means to be dead in sins, and said that it does not mean the man has no life in any sense. Agreed. He says that the man that is dead has no Divine life. Agreed again. He says he is dead just as a Christian, making the argument that as a Christian is dead *to* sin so is the unregenerated sinner dead *in* sins, and that as the Christian is dead *to* sin, *sins*, nevertheless, so the unregenerated sinner who is dead *in* sins may, I suppose, *be righteous*; may do righteously. What about the Christian that is dead to sin? Is it the *body* of the Christian, or the *soul* of the Christian which is made to be partaker of the Divine nature? I turn to [1Jo 3:9](#), "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God?" Now to the question. The one who is born of God cannot sin because he is born of God. Paul, in explaining how it came that he did that which he would not, said "It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." There was that in Paul that did not sin, there is that in every child of God that cannot sin, because *that* is born of God. So that the Christian, so far as he is born of God, is *completely dead to sin*. "How shall we," Paul asks in the beginning of [Ro 6](#), "who are dead to sin live any longer therein?" To be dead in sins then we agree is to be *altogether destitute of Divine life*. Now *natural* life is one thing

which we all in Adam possess. *Divine* life or *Spiritual* life is another thing which we possess only in Christ. To perform *physical* acts or *natural* acts we must possess *physical* life. So to perform *Spiritual* acts we must possess *Spiritual* or *Divine* life. Life is first in both cases. One cannot act in the natural capacity without natural life, neither can one act in the Spiritual capacity without Spiritual life. Spiritual life is given to those dead in sins by the quickening work of God, and they remain dead in sins until the moment that God quickens them. While dead in sins their course is wrong. They walk according to the course of this world until they are quickened. The very moment they are quickened they are alive, then they act in a Spiritual way and not until then.

My dear brother seemed to me to be making sport of us preachers because we dwell so much upon the power of God, using a single tone. If he is inclined to make sport of us preachers he may continue to make sport of us, but I will not make sport of him and his class. He limited the power of God. I shall pity them and not make sport of them. They are to be pitied, rather than blamed. I am in good company, my friends, for when my opponent represents me as preaching that the dead sinner cannot hear, I remember what Christ said: "Why do ye not understand my speech, even because you cannot hear my words." He can make sport of me if he wants to for contending that sinners are so dead that there is absolutely no spiritual life in them; that they are absolutely enmity against God, not subject to his will and cannot be; that they are in the flesh and cannot please God and cannot hear my preaching in a Spiritual sense; but while he is making sport of me he is making sport as well of my precious Saviour, and I am in good company. Our Saviour knew that people would make sport of him, and so encouraged his faithful disciples to preach the truth. I will not mimic his manner of preaching. I presume the tone of my voice will compare very favorably with his. I will make no sport of my brother in any sense or of his associate, and he can make all the sport of us he wants to. It will go down in the book.

He says that a sinner dead in trespasses and in sins may desire eternal life and seek life, that is, eternal life, while he is dead in sins. Now the good ground, saying nothing of the other kinds of ground, according to your illustration, according to your explanation of the parable of the sower is not changed by the seed he sows into it. Your interpretation of the parable is wrong. You call the seed sown incorruptible seed referred to by the apostle. If that is not eternal life I want to know what it is. I want to know what it is, if not eternal life, and you haven't said. He said a sinner may desire life. I deny that. They take light for darkness and darkness for light. That means they take truth for error, and error for truth. They take good for bad, and bad for good. Can a person prefer the real light when he takes darkness to be that light? Certainly not. There must be a change in the person. I deny that the sinner dead in sins can desire eternal life with a pure desire of the heart. I deny that he can seek eternal life. I deny that he has any Spiritual power to do it. God is pleased with nothing they do. The apostle says that they that are in the flesh cannot please God. You say they can by desiring life and seeking it.

He calls your attention to [Isa 55](#), "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come to the waters." The dead do not thirst. We do not drink water to get life, originally. We must have life before we can want water. Having life, originally, we may thirst for water, and we may drink water to live, just as a person may desire food if he has life. We don't feed the dead to get them to live. We feed the living. The dead cannot hunger, only the living man can hunger. We do not eat food to get life originally, we do it because we have life, and we desire that life to be sustained. But he says, quoting from Isaiah, "Hear, and your souls shall live." True enough. There is a life enjoyed in hearing the blessed gospel preached. There is a life enjoyed in obeying the commands of the Word. I believe that at the age of sixteen years I heard the commandment which was impressed upon my young heart to walk in the paths of righteousness, and in walking that way I enjoy that which I should have missed. The Word is food for the living to enjoy.

He comes to [1Co 3:3](#), and I desire your attention to more things that I have for you on that. I am already very far in the lead, but I don't have to be in any very great hurry. I don't think that he meant that I was a calf, when he said he had heard about calves being in the lead and somebody after them. Of course I don't think he meant *me*. *I am sure not*. I think a *dog* might be after a *calf*, but I don't think he is a dog. No, I don't think he is a dog. But I want to tell you this, my intelligent audience, if I am a calf and he is the dog, he is a long ways behind. He will never catch up.

Now, if I take my pen, and I have one here, and write on paper, the paper *must* receive *whatever* I *write* on it. I can write on *one* sheet of paper just as well as *another*, if I have the sheet of paper and the pen. If I were able to do it, and desired to do it, I could write on every sheet of paper in the world—one sheet just as well as another. If Christ is the writer, and the pen is the preacher, and the ink is the Spirit, and the paper represents the heart of the sinner, I ask him why every sinner under the sound of the voice of the preacher is not converted. He says they can hear, and makes fun of us for saying they can't. If they were like paper they would have to hear. His interpretation of that is wrong. I know it is wrong. Christ having died to save all, why does he not use preachers to write on the hearts of all, and thus regenerate all of them? I said the paper was not changed. I say it again. He tried to make an illustration of a check and a piece of paper that was a blank. I say so far as the paper is concerned that paper that the check is written on is just the same as the blank so far as the paper is concerned. He has the paper representing the heart of the sinner, and according to his theory there is no change in the heart of the sinner, and he can't get out of that either. As to what that does mean I shall have ample time to tell you. I have shown that he is wrong. Not while his name is W. P. Throsmorton *will he ever catch up with the calf*.

But I want to turn to [Ac 10:36](#) and read also verse 34: "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons." Who were there? Cornelius and his household. Anybody else? The company that went with him. Who were they? Some brothers of the church, God's children. They were in the congregation. He says, "But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Peter knew that the Jews would object because they were Gentiles, and the Jews couldn't understand, so the Apostle took some Jewish Christians with him. And here he is trying to explain in their hearing that those are God's children; that here Cornelius is, he is working righteousness, and by that I know he is accepted. He is devout and, as eusebhv signifies, he is godly, or good. He is one whom God hears. His prayers go up and God hears them, though he is a heathen man. And now he is a child of God. For that reason here the apostle is instructing his Jewish brethren concerning him, to show the consistency of his preaching to him. If Jesus Christ is only heard through the preaching of the gospel, as held by Missionary Baptists, he is only heard by the part of the world where the gospel is preached. The devil operates where the gospel is not preached, and also over the territory where the gospel is preached. Peter was addressing his Jewish brethren who had heard the word and knew it, and not the Gentiles, when he said, "That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Gallilee, after the baptism which John preached." The gospel had not been preached up to that time among the Gentiles throughout all Judea. Peter taught those Jews who were with him that it was proper to consider these Gentiles children of God, though the gospel had not been preached to them. Jesus said, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold." He meant the Jews and Gentiles, though the gospel had never been preached among the Gentiles. When the Apostle first went to Corinth, and God appeared to him and said, "Stay here and preach, I have much people in this city," the gospel had never been preached there before. It was a Gentile city. The truth is, God is not bound, not roped up in preachers. He is heard by all his people. I intend to defend him and champion his cause.

Talking about the two denominations growing. I would rather grow slow and grow right, than to grow fast and grow wrong. We are growing a great deal faster than a great many people think. I am not given to boasting. He says there are conversions among the Missionary Baptists. I thank God that, although they do not preach the gospel, God *can* regenerate his people among them, and *does* do it. I am glad he does work where the gospel is *not* preached. I am glad that these Missionaries, all of them that are born of God, are *children* of God. They never hear the gospel unless some old Baptist happens to go into their churches and preach it. As I am still in the lead, I have plenty of time. I was in the lead day before yesterday and yesterday. I have been in the lead today. I expect to be in the lead tomorrow. I will lead tip until four o'clock tomorrow evening, and he can follow on after me if he wants to.

I was on my Fifth argument when I took my seat, which argument is based upon the parable of the sower. The good ground is said to be the good and honest heart. How does a heart come to be good and honest? By having the seed sown? That cannot be. This ground was represented as good ground before the seed was sown. Isn't that so? Then the

good and honest heart doesn't become good and honest by having seed sown into it, because the ground was good and honest before. The ground, the heart, must have been made good in the work of regeneration. I know of no other way to state it, for the unregenerated have an evil heart. [Mt 12:35](#), "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things." Now, if there are any among the Missionary Baptists that are not born of God, you may get the *grammar* of it, you are not dead in the sense of not having *natural sense*, but you are dead *spiritually*. You Missionaries that are born *spiritually*, if you listen to the truth, which is this, The evil man out of the evil treasure never brings forth anything but evil; that good cannot come out of the evil treasure of heart; that an unregenerated man cannot bring both good, you will receive spiritual instruction. Faith is a good thing. Just as the grass is made to grow under rain, we are refreshed by preaching. That is what I gave my hand to my brother on. It is not the *dead* grass that is made to live by rain, it is the *living* grass, like faith comes out where the life has been planted. That is it. Now the evil heart, represented by the ground that is not good, doesn't produce anything that is good. But the good heart, represented by the good ground, produces that which is good. The change from an evil heart to a good heart effected in the work of regeneration, when the Lord takes away the stony heart out of the flesh and gives a heart of flesh. [Eze 36:26](#).

The seed sown said to be "The word." [Mr 4:14](#); "The word of the kingdom," [Mt 13:19](#); "The word of God," [Lu 8:11](#). It is the truth proclaimed when the pure gospel is preached. Seed, then, is a figure used to represent truth. Truth taught is not life. Life is a mysterious something which we define as vitality, while truth is a statement of what is true. The difference between life and truth is so clear that anyone can see it, even Brother Throgmorton. The seed does not mean eternal life. Some seeds fell by the wayside, and the fowls of the air, satan represented by fowls, came and devoured them up, Eternal life cannot be devoured up. Some fell upon stony ground, and were scorched and withered away. Eternal life cannot be scorched and withered away. Some fell among thorns and were choked, Eternal life cannot be choked. He said it was not eternal life. But it looks to me like he is going to have hard work to explain this matter as being anything else than eternal life, according to his position. As the truth sown has a favorable effect on those hearts only that are honest and good, made good by regeneration; it follows that the preaching of the gospel is not employed as a means in the regeneration of sinners.

I come to the Sixth argument in refutation of this proposition, which is that in order to hear or receive the preaching of the gospel in a spiritual sense, the sinner must first be *of God*; or, in other words, *must be born of God*. Jesus said to the unregenerated Jews, "Why do ye not understand my speech?" He answered immediately himself: "Even because ye cannot hear my words." If the preaching of the gospel could ever have been the means of regenerating sinners, it surely would have regenerated those who had the advantage of the preaching of Jesus. If the word when preached by him was not a means in the hand of God to cause the deaf to hear, surely it is the height of presumption for any now to claim for their preaching what this proposition lays claim to, that God employs the preaching of such preachers as a means in the regeneration of sinners, means so necessary that sinners cannot be regenerated without it.

The fact that they could not hear the preaching of Jesus Christ as he preached, asserts more than a mere lack of *will* or *disposition* to hear, it asserts positive *lack of ability* or *power*. Continuing in this discourse, Jesus says, "He that is of God, heareth God's words;" that is, he that is born of God, heareth God's words. "Ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." If two persons were under the sound of gospel preaching and one hears with spiritual hearing while the other does not, how is the difference to be accounted for? The one that hears *is of God, is born of God*, and the other hears not because he is *not* born of God. As one must be born of God in order to hear the word preached with spiritual hearing, the ability to hear cannot come by means of the preaching. To say that ability to hear comes by means of hearing is an absurdity.

In further proof of this argument I read: [1Jo 4:5-6](#), "They are of the world; therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error." That preaching which unregenerated sinners can hear with an

understanding is not gospel preaching, for the world of unregenerated sinners does not hear the true gospel of Christ, cannot hear it. This fact accounts for the large numbers which are merely of the world joining the Missionary Baptist church, whose doctrine is of the world. Their preaching is of the world.

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have come to the last day of the discussion, and it again gives me pleasure to come before you still affirming that the Scriptures teach that God employs the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. It is not necessary to enter further upon any definitions,

I guess, however, it would be well to introduce the query box again the first thing; so I have some questions I want to give Brother Daily:

Do you deny that faith comes by hearing the preaching of the gospel?

Do you deny that until a sinner believes in Jesus that he is condemned and in a state of death?

Do you deny that the failure of Christians to instruct others may be the occasion of the blindness and wickedness of those others?

Do you deny that the blood of those who die in their sins may be required at the hands of those who failed to warn them?

Do you think there will be any people in hell at last, who might have repented, in their life time on earth, had greater opportunities have been given them?

Do you hold that God in justifying a sinner employs no instrument on the sinner's part?

Do you believe that men in heathendom can attain to saving grace or repentance without the gospel? (He has really answered this already.)

When an elect sinner is brought by the Holy Spirit to feel that he is condemned and lost, is the impression true or false?

Just *when*, in personal experience, does God forgive a person's sins?

Can a child of God be tempted and drawn to sin?

Does a Christian ever actually sin, and does he suffer on account of it?

Is the Christian dead to sin?

If a Christian who is *dead* to sin may be drawn to sin and may actually sin and may suffer therefor, and still be *dead* to sin, why may not a sinner who is dead to righteousness be drawn to righteousness and take some steps in the direction of righteousness and suffer even to weeping and trembling, and still be *dead* to righteousness.

Does God want everybody to do right all the time? (I want you to listen to this closely: Does God want everybody to do right all the time?)

Does the devil want everybody to do wrong all the time?

If God has more power than the devil and wants everybody to do right all the time, do they do right all the time?

Do not those born of God love God?

If those born of God love God, does every elect man as soon as regenerated love God?

If there is any unregenerated man that does not love God, is he lost or saved?

If there is any regenerated man who has not both faith in and love for God. Have you not a man saved without either faith or love?

Is it according to the will of God that one of his elect should live on and do wickedly for years and years before he is regenerated?

If not, whose will prevents his regeneration?

Reconcile the idea that the wickedness of an elect man delays his regeneration, and show why it is that during that delay *his* will (as you put it) is stronger than God's will?

I think that will be enough for you.

(Mr. Daily: If you have any more, go ahead.)

(Mr. Throgmorton: I guess you would like to have all the time to fool away in trying to answer questions.)

Now to other business. I desire to give you an exposition of the parable of the sower and at the same time answer Brother Daily's argument on the parable.

The sower was the Lord. It seems we are agreed on that. The seed is the word. We are agreed on that. The production of the new being from the seed and the soil is regeneration. That is what he denies. He holds that the soil was regenerated before the seed ever touched it, and so got a new being without any germ!

Several kinds of hearts or hearers we have: Careless; stony ground (shallow minded); impulsive; full of worldly care; those that have open, good and honest hearts. "The preparation of the heart in man and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord;" [Pr 16:1](#). But this preparation is *not* regeneration. "Drawing." See [Joh 6:44](#), "No man can come to Christ except the Father draw him." But this drawing is *not* regeneration. God must open the heart that a man may attend to the word. See [Ac 16:14](#). But this *opening* is *not* regeneration. "Giving," [1Co 3:5-7](#), and "reproving," [Joh 16:7-9](#), are *not* regeneration. Neither drawing, nor, opening, nor giving, nor preparing, nor reproving is regeneration, Not one of them, nor all of them together. They are *before* regeneration. They are *before* faith and *without* faith. Drawing is before coming; before opening; before .attending; before reproving; before believing; not one of these first acts of the spirit is by faith, but before faith. Regeneration is *by* faith.

Listen! This soil has *no* life in it before the seed was sown. Then the proper union between the seed and the good soil was perfected, *then* there was a new life and never before. And the new life is the regenerate life when you make the heart of man the soil. In nature the seed without the soil could not produce the new life. The prepared soil without the seed could not produce it. And both together could not produce it without moisture and sunshine! *God* gives the *increase by means* of all these. *God* does the work *in* the soil *through* the seed, the sowing of which seed, he says in the parable, represents the preaching of the word.

Brother Daily says now that he gave me his hand on the idea that faith *already implanted* is called out by the word! You gave me your hand on the statement in the London Confession: "That grace of faith whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, and is ordinarily *wrought by* the ministry of the Word." That is what you gave me your hand on. While he says he is not tied to the London Confession, yet chapter 10, paragraph 1, he accepts as explained by second paragraph. I say that God "is pleased effectually to call"-how?-"*by his Word and Spirit* out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ."

Now Brother Daily says he accepts that as explained by the other. The other doesn't contradict it. I want to turn to page 54 of the Confession and read from it. "This effectual call"-how is that effectual call made? *By the word and Spirit*--this effectual call is by the word." Brother Daily, not from anything at all foreseen in man, nor from any power or agency in the creature (the word wasn't foreseen in man) co-working with his special grace; the creature being wholly passive therein, being dead in sins and trespasses, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it, and that by no less power than that which raised up Christ from the dead." This call which man thus *answers* is made *by the Spirit and word*.

Now he says he accepts that. S2 he is tied to it. So you are tied to my, proposition; glad to have you, Brother Daily. God bless you! (Shakes hands with Mr. Daily.)

Brother Daily argues that a regenerated sinner may not believe on the Son of God. And quoted [1Jo 5:13](#) to prove it. The revised version renders the passage thus: "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, even unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God." You see they were already believers and I aim wanted them to know that they had eternal life. As to the one who believes not, "The wrath of God abideth on him." [Joh 3:36](#).

Brother Daily relies much on the idea that regeneration is called a resurrection. The dead sinner cannot spiritually hear the voice of the preacher. I agree that the dead sinner cannot hear, so as to understand; cannot come; cannot repent; cannot believe--*unless* the Father draws him! That is my doctrine. He cannot believe unless the Father gives him a power which by nature he has not, and this gift of power is the first thing that is done in bringing the sinner to Christ. [Joh 6:44](#). But this drawing is *not* regeneration. If my brother says it is, it is his business to prove it. It is giving the sinner power to do that which without the drawing he cannot do. It is giving him the power to come *where he can be regenerated*.

The truth is my opponent limits God's power. He holds that God *cannot* use the preaching of the gospel on a *dead* sinner. He thinks God *cannot* use it in the regeneration of sinners. We say he *can* and *does*.

I have shown you what death in sin means. Paul explains something about it in [Ro 7:9](#). Paul was from the day of his birth alive until the commandment came to him. During that time there was nothing against him either as to Adam's sin or as to his own actual transgression. That work which Jesus Christ did, brings to every man justification of life, and brought it to Paul, so that he says, "I was alive without the law *once*; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I *died*." What does that mean? It means that when the commandment came he sinned and died, or came under condemnation. This was death to righteousness, exactly the opposite to the death of the saint to sin. My friend says there is something in a Christian which cannot sin. True, and the sinner cannot do righteousness of himself, but the saint can be *led* to sin notwithstanding, and the sinner can be empowered of God to hear and believe. Notwithstanding, *God* can do that. The sinner cannot do it of himself; but my argument is that God gives him power, and that *when* God so works faith in him (and remember we are *both* agreed that this faith is *wrought by the ministry of the word*)-when God so works faith in him, *then* he believes and *then* God regenerates him and in this there is direct impact and at the same time the use of the word. There is direct impact in producing faith and in regenerating.

Brother Daily *admits* that in the production of faith *God employs* the word. So there is direct impact and the use of the word both at the same time, as held by both of us.

Argument Nine. I want now to introduce Argument Nine. James explicitly makes the point that God employs the word of truth as a means in the regeneration of sinners. *James* the apostle does that. Let me read: [Jas 1:18](#), "Of his own will begat he us"(of his own will regenerated he us)--"Of his own will begat he us *with the word* of truth." Now let us read on and see if this is the word which is written and which is the gospel as preached. See 21st verse: "Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the *engrafted word*, which is able to save your souls. But be ye doers of the *word*, and not *hearers* only"-a *preached* word-"and not hearers on~ deceiving your own selves. For if any be a *hearer* of the *word*, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass." So you see it is the written or preached word he is talking about. "Of his own will begat he us." Isn't that my proposition? [Eph 1:13](#), "The word of truth" Paul defines as "the gospel of your salvation." See [Eph 1:13](#). The "engrafted word" ([Jas 1:21](#)) the Diaglott renders "implanted word." It is a word which we *hear* and a word which we do. So [Jas 1:18](#) is another way of stating my proposition. God begat or regenerated these sinners, with the word of truth which they heard. This is, he *employed* the *preaching* in their *regeneration*. Couple this with [Ga 3:26](#), "For ye are all the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus." Not manifestly of God, but actually the children of God 'by faith, because of his own will begat he us with the word of truth which is preached in the gospel!

God regenerated these by faith as a means. *Not before* faith; *not without* faith. And the faith came by hearing. Remember my opponent has admitted that as to faith.

I must quote Dr. Gill on [Jas 1:18](#): "But he begets of his own free will and favor, and of his rich and abundant mercy, and of his sovereign will and pleasure, according to his counsels and his purposes of old. And the means he makes use of, or with which he does it, is with the word of truth. Not Christ, who is the word, and truth itself-but the gospel which is the word of truth, and truth itself, and contains nothing but truth; and *by this* souls are begotten and born again; see [Eph 1:13](#); [1Pe 1:23](#); and hence ministers of it are accounted spiritual fathers." Plainly according to Dr. Gill, and according to James, and according to my proposition, *God begets* sinners, *God regenerates* sinners with the word of truth, which word or truth is preached in the gospel.

But let us return to the fact that Brother Daily tries to make much of the idea that regeneration is called a creation. That does not prove that God does not employ the word in it. My friend says: "No creature assists in its creation." True faith puts us passive into God's hands and God does the work; but he uses the word. This is fully explained in [Eph 2:8-10](#). There is creation through faith. The *creation* in Christ and the *salvation* are the same. But how are they? *Through* faith; *not before* faith; *not without* faith. I don't want you ever to forget that; but *by faith*. So the creation is by faith. God does the creating through faith which is wrought in the hearts of the elect by the ministry of the word. Brother Daily has shaken hands with me on that. Therefore in regenerating sinners, *God employs* the preaching of the gospel.

Brother Daily seems to feel hurt that I used the "old tune" in quoting, "My people shall be a willing people in the day of my power," and let on as if I had made fun of his voice and as if I claim to have a better one. I had no reference to your voice, Brother Daily. You have certainly as good a voice as I ha\'e. I wish God had given me a better one. I only used the "tune" as a little matter of pleasantry, and I have often said I would give a dollar to hear one of those old brethren preach again with the tune, as I used to hear them. Please don't cry; I didn't mean to hurt you or to make fun of you.

Brother Daily says there must be life before there can be hunger and thirst. That is so in nature; but we are talking about spiritual things. There must be hunger for the divine life and thirst for the divine life before it can be had, and there must be the eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood that it may be had. [Joh 6:53](#), "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of God ye have no life in you." Eating and drinking are in order to the life. Don't forget that.

I mentioned a calf who was on the run. Brother Daily don't think I meant to call him a calf, but he takes it that the calf represents him. All right; take it that way. Then he insinuates that if he is the calf I am the dog after the calf. A pretty good turn, and I was amused; we all were; but this is good for my point. The business of a shepherd dog after a calf is to

overtake him and bring him in if possible, and the calf has to run mighty fast if the dog does not get him. But Brother Daily says he is going to keep running till four o'clock this afternoon. Some years ago, when the Republican and Democratic platforms had been adopted, and nominations made, the Chicago Herald was not taking a very aggressive stand as to certain candidates who were before the people of Illinois for Governor. The editor was asked to explain, He said: "The Democrats have nominated So-and-so for Governor of Illinois, and the Republicans have nominated So-and-so for Governor of Illinois. The Herald takes to the woods." Of course, if Brother Daily takes to the woods and doesn't try to bother my ramparts at all, I will just let him run.

He says when paper is written on it is still paper. Sure, and when a man is regenerated, isn't he still a man? He has not changed in the animal sense at all. He is the same man, but a changed one. A check is written on paper; it is still paper, but mightly changed. I have shown him the difference. There is something *in* the paper and *on* the paper that wasn't there before. So when a man is regenerated there is something *in* him and *on* him that wasn't there before. But he is still a man. My friend says that God is not wrapped up in words nor in preaching. I have said all the time that God wasn't confined to preaching, but that he uses preachers and uses words: That is his *method*, as we have seen in James.

Speaking of the growth of his people, Brother Daily says he would rather grow slowly and grow right. So with us. I would rather grow slowly and grow right, but we have been getting men from among their best. I mentioned some yesterday. They are Kirkland, Willis, Mitchell, and Pettus, and many more. Perhaps all I have just named are on the platform here. Preachers all of them. I count that pretty good growth. Vole will be glad to get Brother Daily and all these nice, good-looking men here, when they get right, and I hope that some of you, after you have heard the debate and read the book and gotten the vision of what the preacher ought to be, will see something you haven't seen.

But he says a sinner must be of God to hear. But he cannot be of God in the sense of regeneration till he believes. He says "every one that doeth righteousness is born of God." But men don't do righteousness till they believe. Believing is not working righteousness. [Ro 4:5](#), "But to him that *worketh not*, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Faith is the very opposite of working righteousness.

But now hear this! Brother Daily says Missionary Baptist preaching is of the world, and that is why so many join us! You preachers understand. Yet isn't it strange that God chooses to regenerate so many for you people in *our* meetings? Why doesn't God pick out some other place? "Why doesn't he select a saloon or some other such place? God seems to make it a point to get to men right in the midst of the preaching which my friend says is of the world and there convert them. Ah, brother, it is under the preaching of the gospel. Has God changed his plan? I would almost guarantee that there have been "Hardshell" preachers attending this debate who were converted in our Missionary Baptist meetings. Some of them flew around mightily, too! I would guarantee it; and I guess I could prove it. This was because that in our meetings God's covenant was preached as taught by the Old London Confession. "It pleased the Lord to make a covenant of grace wherein he freely *offereth* unto sinners life and salvation, by Jesus Christ requiring of them (the sinners) faith in him that they might be saved." Old London Confession, chapter 7, paragraph 2. You are not tied to that, are you" Brother Daily?

No; he is not tied to that, except as to my proposition. Although he is denying it, he has shaken hands with me on the statement that faith is wrought of God in the hearts of the elect by the preaching of the gospel, by the preaching of the word. Not only *by* the spirit, but *by* the *word*. But this last from the Confession, I suppose makes a little too large a dose for him. Let's see that again as to what this covenant of grace does: "It pleased the Lord to make a covenant of grace wherein he freely *offereth* unto sinners life." This offering of life is to that man that is as *dead* as "a dead horse." Brother Daily says there is no use of it, but the Old London Confession, which is the boast of Old School Baptists, says that God offers to sinners in this great covenant life and salvation by Jesus Christ and making requirements of them at the same time-*requiring* of them faith in him *that they might be saved*.

And how does God work this faith in them? That paragraph goes on and tells that he guarantees to work it. Chapter 7, paragraph 2. I want you to remember that point, that it is in the covenant of grace that God offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him that they might be saved.

So this rampart which I have builded of these scripture texts-this fence which I have builded from passages contained in the word of God-remains intact in spite of the ingenuity, in spite of all the argument my friend has been able to bring. It still stands that, believing, *we have "life through his name."*

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY'S FOURTH REPLY

Gentlemen Moderators, Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As to the little pleasantry that my dear brother has raised relative to the calf, my retort is a matter of pleasantry too, that a *dog* might be after the *calf*. In referring to it again this morning, he speaks of himself as a shepherd dog after the calf. I deny that he is a shepherd dog; in this instance it is a long-legged calf and it is a bench-legged nest. And the bench-legged fiest and the long-legged calf have become so domesticated together that they are perfectly familiar, and the long-legged calf is just running from the bench-legged fiest through fun, because he can keep ahead without any trouble. Whenever he gets ready he just turns around and says *ba-a* to the bench-legged fiest. I had not intended to make any reference to this matter again, but as he has referred to it again this really reminds me of the boy that yoked himself up with a calf. It was on Sunday morning, and he told his pa he was going to yoke up with the calf. His pa was out to "latch the fun, and finally the boy and the calf were yoked up. The calf walked around for a while very docile, and finally began to run, and ran faster and faster, and there the boy was yoked up with the calf, and just in front was a stump all splintered up, and the boy began to call to his pa, "We are going to straddle that stump!" But instead of straddling the stump the calf struck the stump, and dragged him over, and went on with him. He has struck the stump, and he is just dragging along at his end of the yoke.

I want to say, relative to the questions he propounded at the beginning of his speech, that I have some matter that I want to introduce in this speech, so I will not attend to these questions just now, but promise to attend to them later on. I have some important matter I wish to introduce. I wish first to notice, however, some of the answers he gave to the questions I asked in writing. "Does God want everybody to be saved?" He said, Yes, in the sense of desire. But he tried to make it appear that while it was God's pleasure, God's pleasure is not always performed, because we do not perform his pleasure. He is undertaking to make that appear because I have pressed him to know if God always does his pleasure. The question is not, do we always do God's pleasure. The question is, does God always do his pleasure. I may not do the pleasure of God, Brother Throgmorton, may not, but the question is not as to whether we do, but as to whether *God* does his own pleasure. If God desires the salvation of all sinners, if it is his pleasure -and God save's sinners-the question is not do they do his pleasure, but will he accomplish his own desire. He says: "I am God, and there is none else." "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." If God saves sinners, and it is his pleasure to save *all* sinners, *will he not save them?* If God has more power than the devil, and wants to save everybody, will he not save them? He said not necessarily. See how evasive that answer is. It will appear in the book.

As to the seventh question: "If the alien sinner does not accept Christ when he does not love him, does he not accept what he does not want?" He says it might or might not be. The sinner might accept what he does not want. Is it not a fact that he accepts what he does not want if he accepts Christ when he does not love him. That answer is evasive.

The New Hampshire Confession of Faith of 1853 is generally accepted by Missionary Baptists as their Confession of Faith. I notice that Mr. A. Malone, in his book entitled "The Issue," says: "We believe that, in order to be saved, sinners must be regenerated, or born again; that regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind; that it is effected in a manner above our comprehension, by the power of the Holy Spirit in connection with divine truth, so as to secure our voluntary obedience to the gospel." Of course he will say that he accepts that, and I have objections to that part of it, but the confession goes on to say, "And that its proper evidence (the evidence of regeneration) appears in the holy fruits of repentance and faith and newness of life." Now, while I object to the term "in connection with divine truth," in this statement, I call attention to the plain declaration in that statement that repentance and faith and newness of life are holy fruits of regeneration, and that they are proper evidence of regeneration.

I now have some questions that I desire to submit to Brother Throgmorton:

Question One: Are infants who die in infancy regenerated? If so, how? If not, how are they saved?

Question Two: Is opportunity the measure of responsibility?

Question Three: Are heathen who die without ever having heard the gospel saved or lost? If saved, how? If lost, why?

Question Four: If the true light, which is life, lighteth every man that cometh into the world, in the sense of all the human race, why do you and your people teach that millions of heathens are going down to hell in gross darkness for the want of the gospel?

I desire to give you some things now relative to the relation of faith in the work of the eternal salvation of sinners, as that matter was brought in, and as my brother is insisting upon faith being a necessary condition in order to the reception of eternal life. Faith is not a condition or cause of salvation in the sense of the quickening or regeneration of the soul. Having faith in a fact cannot be performed from the expectation of reward. One cannot make up his mind to believe what he does not believe for the desire of reward for believing it. From this plain and indisputable fact it is clear that faith cannot be a condition in any sense whatever. *Belief* in a fact comes from *being convinced* of the fact, and the believer is *wholly involuntary, necessarily so*. This is *simply indisputable*. *Faith* in a fact has nothing whatever to do with its *being* a fact, and the belief of a falsehood does not make it a fact. Salvation in regeneration faith has nothing to do with, because it is a resurrection from death, a new creation in Christ. After this resurrection or new creation, faith is produced as a fruit of the Spirit in the heart ([Ga 5:22](#)), for with the heart a man believeth unto righteousness ([Ro 10:10](#)), a heart made good so as to bring forth good things ([Mt 12:35](#)). By faith the mourner, whose heart has been tendered by the work of regeneration, who is really in a blessed state already ([Mt 5:4](#)), by faith the mourner is delivered from his trouble and made to rejoice. This faith is God's gift to him, and not a thing exercised by him. Phillipians 1:29. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." [Eph 2:8](#).

Now with reference to that, he made an argument in his last speech that [Eph 2:8](#) and [Eph 2:10](#) were connected in such a way as to show that it is *through* faith that we are created anew. I deny that. The salvation that is mentioned through faith is that which delivers us from our troubles, doubts and fears. That comes through faith. But the creation here is the new creation in Christ, which cannot be through faith, because it is unreasonable to say that creation is performed because of the faith of the thing created. It is absurd. It ought not to be called creation. It is unreasonable. There is a salvation that is by quickening with which faith has nothing to do. Hence the Apostle says, in the verse preceding, of this chapter, "By grace are ye saved," without saying anything about faith. In the eighth verse of this chapter the Apostle has special reference to the enjoyment we receive from the faith, rather than the actual creation itself.

He said: "Does God want everybody to do right all the time?" Of course taking the position that God does want everybody to do right all the time, but using that to show that God's desire is not always accomplished, To be sure God's pleasure is not always accomplished in what *we* do. Is God's desire always accomplished in what *he* does-not as to what

we do, but as to what *God* does? Will he regenerate all whose pleasure it is his to regenerate? If not, does God do all his pleasure? It is in regard to what *God* does, and not to what *we* do, that I am inquiring about.

In regard to the parable of the sower, he says the production of regeneration is from seed and soil. He didn't prove that. We just have his word for that. Here is the soil. Here is the seed. It possesses life. The seed is put in the soil. He says the life of the seed and the soil together produces a regeneration. Now what is the thing regenerated? He has already said that the ground is the heart of the sinner. Is the ground changed by that generation of seed in the soil? Is it? Is the heart of the sinner changed? No. He denied that the life in the seed sown is eternal life, when I charged him with teaching that fowls swallow eternal life, and yet he says the seed has the life that produces the regeneration. It is life that produces the regeneration, and yet it is not eternal life. I think that was a dodge of his to escape the ridiculous conclusion, and he knew no other way to dodge than to take that dodge. I am inclined to think he meant eternal life was in the seed, for he afterwards talked about the seed being incorruptible seed, and said this is the same seed. That is not an illustration of regeneration at all. Not at all. Where the ground is good, where the heart is good, good and honest, made so by the grace of God in regeneration, we may sow the word of divine truth, and that word will be seen manifested in the life and character of those that hear it, good and honest hearts that can hear—a growth, a development, a manifestation. That is what our Saviour teaches in the parable, and there is no absurdity connected with that idea of it, because that is the true idea. But he will never escape the absurdity of his position while he lives. There are different kinds of ground; only one ground is good. It represents the good and honest heart, and if that is not a regenerated heart, I ask what it is. If it is not a regenerated heart, what is it? Please say what it is. He says preparation of the heart is not regeneration; drawing is not regeneration; opening the heart is not regeneration; reproving is not regeneration; then it is hard for us to find out what his idea of regeneration is. I want to say I attended a debate when Elder Penick and Elder Tant debated. And Elder Penick took the position that opening of the heart was regeneration, and he undertook to prove by that that the Spirit of Gael in regeneration operates in a manner distinct from, as well as in addition to, the spoken or written word. Brother Throgmorton doesn't have to accept Brother Penick's position. I only stated that to show that Elder Penick was more consistent than Brother Throgmorton, who says all these are before regeneration. The preparation of the heart is before regeneration. Then regeneration doesn't prepare the heart. Doesn't make any change in the heart. The heart is prepared before it is regenerated. What does regeneration do for it? If the heart is prepared before, what does regeneration do for it? I want you to come up and answer that. You may have more of that later on.

In regard to what I gave my hand on, as contained in the London Confession of Faith. The first section of chapter fourteen says: "The grace of faith whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their soul is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word." Mark you, "the *grace of faith*." Not regeneration, but the *grace of faith*. "The grace of faith is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word, by which also, and the administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper, prayer, and other means appointed of God, it is increased and strengthened." Now that article needs an explanation. He gives his explanation to it, but I gave him my hand on that article with the idea that I was to have my explanation of it. The explanation is clearly just what the article means, and is that faith is a *grace*; faith is a *gift*; faith a *fruit* of the Holy Spirit. It is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word, and I explained in the sense as of water and rain falling upon the grass that was seemingly dead, that grass is revived, refreshed, brought out, developed, so under the preaching of the gospel the *faith* which the Spirit produced there (it is a fruit) is brought out and developed. That is what I gave my brother my hand on, not on his particular interpretation of that section of the article.

Death in sins is not death like a dead horse in all respects. Why, no; a man dead in sins is not dead in every sense. I said that. I say it again. A man dead in sins is alive naturally, and may be naturally very intelligent, and may naturally do many things. But my position is he does not possess divine life, and my brother admits that. He is so dead that he is *just dead*; he is *so dead* he has *no life*; *so dead* he has *no divine* life; he is *dead* in trespasses and in sins. There are no *degrees* in *death*.

On [Jas 1:18](#), "Of his own will begat he us," I desire to give you something. Instead of honored instrumentalities, the whole power of begetting is here ascribed to God's own will alone, that is, to the sovereign, immutable will of Jehovah. In [Re 19:13](#), we read, "And he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called the word of God." In [Heb 1:2](#) we are informed that God made the worlds by Christ, and in [Joh 1:3](#) we learn that this was accomplished by the eternal *logos*, the word that was with God and was God. This wonderful work of creation was performed of God's own will, without the help of means or instrumentalities of any kind. This divine word in essence, the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever, is to be distinguished from the word in mere description, as the preaching of the gospel is. When the omnipotent one speaks direct, there is a power which belongs to the word thus spoken which imparts life to the dead, as when Jesus spoke with a loud voice at the grave of Lazarus. When that voice said "let there be light," immediately light sprang forth. This is altogether different from the public proclamation of the gospel. What the word of God does as spoken by him is a creative work, a work never assigned to his ministers.

I desire to come now to my Seventh Negative Argument:

Whatever is essential to regeneration in any case is essential in all cases. There is but one method of regeneration. If the doctrine of this proposition is true, therefore, the heathen who never hear the gospel, and the infants, and insane who cannot hear it, are left out and never can see or enter into the kingdom of glory.

If, as Brother Throgmorton argued in his debate with Elder' Potter, and as he still argues, God cannot give the increase without the incorruptible seed, and the seed is planted by preachers alone, then that is the only method of regeneration, and no sinner can be eternally saved without it. This method cannot reach the heathen who never hear the gospel preached, or infants and insane and the idiotic who cannot hear it intelligently. It is upon the theory that thousands of heathens are sinking down to endless death every day because the gospel does not reach them that the cry goes forth from Missionaries continually for more money to help send the incorruptible seed to them. God cannot save them, according to this theory, because the incorruptible seed is not carried there and planted by preachers, and preachers fail to get there with the incorruptible seed because the people fail to furnish the money to send it to them. According to his system there are millions of souls in the agonies of hell today who would be in heaven if enough money had been given to carry the Missionary work. To illustrate that, suppose that a baker in this town should have a great amount of bread on hand. Suppose a family five miles from this town are starving for bread. Suppose they do not know the bread is in this place. Suppose they cannot get here if they knew. Suppose someone took the bread from the baker and carried it to the starving family. Who deserves the greater honor? Who deserves the greater credit? The one who has the bread in the bakery, or the one who carries it to this starving family? If that represents the provision as having been made by God, Christ and the Holy Spirit, but no one can receive it unless the preacher carries it, why would not the preacher have greater honor and have greater credit for saving the lost, for carrying the gospel? Surely he would. The provision will amount to nothing. What God has done, what Christ has done, what the Holy Spirit has done, will amount to nothing in the case of the sinner who has never heard the gospel preached. The preacher must carry it to him. The credit belongs to the preacher for carrying that which he could not have without he carried it to him. Let us take this home to ourselves and give it a personal test. How would you like to be one of those ignorant heathens, with no chance of salvation only through the preaching of the gospel, with no incorruptible seed in reach, and no one to sow it if there were, and be dependent upon a people who live in luxury, who believe your salvation depends upon them, who have to be begged at continually to give for this purpose, and who give but a few cents a year to get the incorruptible seed to you? Had you not rather risk your case with God who is found by them who seek him not, who is made manifest unto them who ask not after him? How can any Missionary who believes that doctrine rest for a moment? Look at the preacher who gets \$10,000 a year for preaching in this country, who could live well on \$1,000 and give \$9,000 to send the incorruptible seed to heathen lands. Look at the proud, finely dressed lady, who pays \$75 for a dress and \$25 for a hat, and who must have a change of apparel every time she appears in society. She lives up \$10,000 a year in gaudy dress, while it is her creed that thousands of heathen are going down to endless woe every day for lack of money to

send the incorruptible seed to them. Look at the wealthy banker, who rides in his auto that cost \$5,000 and who pretends to believe that his money would help send the incorruptible seed to the heathen. Look at the missionary church edifice in the city, which cost \$100,000, with furniture to correspond, and a pipe organ that cost \$10,000, the whole amounting to \$150,000 or more. It was erected and equipped by a congregation who have been taught to believe that their money will help to get the incorruptible seed to perishing heathens and keep them from sinking into an endless hell.

I assert again that whatever is essential to regeneration in one case is essential in all cases. Infant-s cannot be reached by the system I am opposing. On the plan of regeneration laid down by this proposition they cannot be born again. The incorruptible seed which my friend declares is sown by the preachers alone cannot reach them and enter their little hearts if the theory of my opponent be true.

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON'S FIFTH SPEECH

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I wish that the bankers and many other moneyed fellows could have been here to have heard Brother Daily's speech. It might have done some of them good. But what has that got to do with that proposition on the chart? Do you know? How my brother can debate when he goes off dear away from the question! That is one of his methods.

"Does God employ the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners?" That is our issue. It is not, *Can* he regenerate an infant without the preaching of the gospel? nor is it, *Can* he regenerate an idiot without the preaching of the gospel? Nor is it, *Can* he regenerate the exceptional case? That is not the question.

I admit those are great questions, but they are not now before us. Brother Daily, what is the matter with you? Why do you want to debate a question not at issue? But the calf has got to run, you know. Don't I look a good deal like a fiest dog? I think you are wool-gathered, Brother Daily. If you had said hound-dog-I thought maybe you would get off the hound-dog on me-you had a good opportunity to have made a good one on me, or on yourself. As to the boy that was yoked up with the calf, I don't see the application here, only to tell it and make us laugh. I thought that in that yarn it was an old man yoked up.

The higher critics are finding new versions for everything. So I guess I will turn you over to the higher critics on that story.

(Mr. Daily: I am a *high critic*.)

He says, "I may not do the pleasure of God, but does *God* do *his* pleasure? God says he will. 'I will do all my pleasure.'" The -meaning is he will do all he has determined to do, but God doe~ not bring to pass everything he desires. Brother Daily admits that he may not do all the pleasure of God. Does God desire you to do right all the time? That is God's desire. Brother Daily doesn't do right all the time. So God's desire is not brought to pass. Then why not the same in other cases?

Well, he quotes the New Hampshire Confession, and, as I think; misconstrues it. That Confession says the evidences of regeneration are "manifest in the holy fruits of repentance, and faith and newness of life." That doesn't mean the regeneration is before repentance and faith, but that the fruits which grew out of repentance and faith and newness of life are the evidences of regeneration. So I accept the article just as it is. He doesn't dwell on that part of it which says

that regeneration is "effected by the Holy Spirit operating in connection with divine truth." He doesn't agree with James, Jesus and John. He doesn't agree with the London Confession which affirms my proposition in nearly so many words. He says faith has nothing to do with regeneration. Don't that beat you? Faith, God's direct gift, has nothing to do with regeneration which is God's direct work. They have nothing to do with one another. Two different works!

I thought you said, Brother Daily, that righteousness was a fruit. Doesn't fruit have anything to do with the tree? That is going in the book. Faith is God's gift? Certainly. Faith is God's direct gift, but that is not the issue. The issue is whether faith and regeneration are inseparably connected in God's method. My position is that faith is necessary to regeneration because "ye are all the children of God by faith." How are you going to be regenerated without faith, if it is *by* it? And if it is as he says that faith is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word, how are you going to get away from my proposition?

My opponent proceeds to deny that salvation in [Eph 2:8](#) means creation. The salvation in [Eph 2:8](#) and the creation in [Eph 2:10](#) I say are the same. He admits salvation is through faith, but he says this means deliverance from our troubles. What are our troubles? What is our trouble? Sin. We are under wrath. We are under the curse. We are dead in sins. And salvation delivers us from these. How? *Through faith*. How do we get life from the dead? By regeneration. Of course the creation and the salvation are the same.

But he says that it is unreasonable that a creature should have anything to do in its own creation. That is his idea. "Create in me a clean heart, O God," says the 51st Psalm: the verse I cannot now give you exactly. Here David says, "Create in me a clean heart, O God." Didn't David have anything to do with that? If any are athirst, or hungry or seeking, - if he prays for God to create a new heart in him, it would be unreasonable, according to Brother Daily. The creature is absolutely unconscious in the matter of creation, according to him.

He tells you that in explaining the parable of the sower I go far astray. It seems he can't understand me. I said that *God*, through the seed, and through the soil, and through His gifts of moisture and sunshine and heat, produced the life and brought the fruit. God produced the life in the new grain through the seed, using all the other things. So *God employs* the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. That is his means of giving life. Not that the preaching is life; not that the word is the life; not that the seed is the life. *God gives the life through the seed*.

Brother Daily has said-I don't know how many times has said-that I hold that the incorruptible seed means eternal life. I did not say that. I think everybody else understands my position. If you want to keep bleating up that tree (I can't say *barking*, because I am the dog), I can't help it. I think the people understand. When he says he thinks I dodged here or there, I think he is mistaken. I don't believe I did. A difference of opinion.

I have now Argument Ten, which I want to give you. It will be along the line of the argument on [Jas 1:18](#). Peter specifically teaches that we are born again by the word which is preached. [1Pe 1:23-25](#): "Being born again (regenerated), not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." (God's word shall not pass away; it will live forever.) "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever." (It shall not pass away; it shall stand forever.) "And this is the word which by the *gospel is preached unto you*."

And by that word we are born again. To prove to you conclusively that the word here means the word we preach, let me read right on into the next chapter. You know in the original the Scriptures were not divided into chapters. "Wherefore, laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the *word*, that ye may grow thereby." You have been born again of this incorruptible seed, and you are to "desire the sincere milk of the word"-the same word-"that you may grow thereby." If this does not prove that the word here means the word that is preached, nothing can be proved by language. In the Greek it is *logos* (logos) in verse 23;

‘phma. (rhema) in verse 25; logov (logos) in 2:1. Logov (Logos) rarely means Christ Himself. ‘rhma (rhema) never means Christ. Logov (Logos) sometimes does, but it does not so mean here.

Peter says he is speaking of the word ‘rhma which by the gospel is preached, and that by this word logov we are regenerated or born again. The scriptures teach that God employs the preaching of the gospel (this same word) as a means in the regeneration of sinners. Not that the word itself does it. Not that. Not that *we* do it. *God* does it, using the word as a means, just like Peter says.

Brother Daily says that it is mighty hard for him to find out what I mean. I thought I made a fine lot of definitions at the start, brother, which you agreed to, as I remember. I said that regeneration was the communication of the divine nature. The impartation of the divine life to a human soul-that is regeneration. Of course, the regenerated man is the same, but he is a changed man, with a new life and a new nature. That is regeneration. The question before us is: *How* does God do it? *What* is God's *method*? Not what God *can* do, but what is his *method*? God could make an oak without an acorn. He did once; but now he uses the acorn. God *could* regenerate the Chinaman in the heart of China without anything in the way of means that we know; but whether he does it or not, I do not know. His method is that stated in my proposition, and in the London Confession, and in [Jas 1:8](#). This is what I am here to prove.

He says now that the London Confession, chapter 14, needs explanation. He ought not to have shaken hands with me till he made his explanation. He says he gave his hand on the explanation. That is a funny way-having a *written* contract and needing an explanation of it. A poor way to try to get out, Brother Daily. Then he says that faith is a grace. I grant it. It is a fruit of the Spirit. He says it is originally wrought by the ministry of the word. How does that get him out? It gets him in again. His explaining that it is a grace, a fruit of the Spirit, doesn't help him a bit. If that is true, this fruit is wrought by the word, and this fruit is necessary to regeneration. He has surrendered the question. "Ye are all the children of God." How? *By faith*," which my opponent says is wrought by the ministry of the word.

Then he says that the London Confession article doesn't mean the working of faith in the sense of producing it, but that it is more like when the rain comes down and brings out the grass that is withered. That is not the point. The article which he has agreed to says "*wrought*." The rain doesn't work the grass; the grass is not *wrought* by the rain. This faith is *wrought, produced by* the ministry of the word. That is the language of the Confession. And this will go into the book in cold type.

"Well," says Brother Daily, "the dead sinner is not in all respects like a dead horse, but he doesn't have divine life." We are agreed on that. The sinner doesn't have any divine life at all, but he has other phases of life. Mental life, moral life, animal life. Take a man that is as blind as a bat. You can talk to him about sight and the blue sky, and get him to understand there are such things. And possibly he may desire sight and to see the sky. And God does put it into the heart of sinners that are *dead* to divine life the desire for divine life, and when a man so wrought on cries to God for life, God gives him life. When he is led by the Spirit to repent of his sins that he may know Christ and accepts Christ as his, then he *has* Christ and all that is in him. "He that hath the Son *hath life*; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." He has not divine life. That is the idea. He has animal life, and moral life, and mental life, but not divine life.

My brother comes to [Jas 1:18](#). He says that the begetting there is ascribed to the power of God. That is right. That is what my proposition says. "Of his own will begat"-that is the same as regeneration-he has agreed to that. "Of his own will begat he us." How? That is the question. "With the word." That is what my proposition says. *God employs the preaching* as a means.

My friend undertakes to prove that "word" means Christ because it is "logos." I read the whole connection in order to show that interpretation is not correct. Give me your ears, Brother Daily. "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." You say, "with himself, Jesus Christ." I say it means the word that is preached. Read on: "Wherefore, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to *hear*." Hear what? The word. "Slow to speak, slow to wrath, for the wrath of man

worketh not the righteousness of God." The reason the saint should be thus is because he has been begotten "with the word." So he should be swift to hear it. But read on: Wherefore, lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted (implanted) word." (Paul says, "I plant, God makes it grow.") "And receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." Next verse: Be ye *doers* of the word." (That means the word we preach; we *do* the word; we *do* the preaching.) "And not *hearers* only, deceiving your own selves. For if any man be a hearer and not a doer he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass." Now I think I have proved that the word in [Jas 1:18](#) means the written word, the preached word; and, therefore, I have proved that God employs the preaching of the gospel, or written word, or spoken word, as a means in the regeneration of sinners. "Of his own will *God* begets us with the word of truth." Almost the language of the proposition. Exactly the meaning which Dr. John Gill, the prince of commentators and the greatest scholar of his age, gives as the correct interpretation. And that will go in the book.

Brother Daily comes to what he calls his Seventh Negative Argument. He says, "Whatever is essential to regeneration in one case is essential in all cases." That means that *God cannot* do otherwise. He is limiting God in this controversy. God *cannot*, he says, do any other way except in this way that he mentions. Now here is the way it looks to me: God, according to his divine method, *employs* a preacher. *God*, being Almighty, may go outside of that means and regenerate in exceptional cases, such as heathen, infants, insane, and so on. We are not talking about those who are not actual sinners, though.

My opponent says there would be souls in heaven today, according to my doctrine, if money had been furnished to send them the gospel, who, as it is, are lost in hell, *and* didn't he tip-toe? Now suppose that was so. I reckon he was trying to get even with me for showing him up so. Why didn't you say, "Pull down the curtain"? Again I say, let us have the truth, if the heavens fall. If what he says is true-I don't admit that it is, but grant that it is-what has it to do with my proposition? Nothing at all. Not a thing. So we have time wasted.

Then he makes the bread illustration. If a baker has bread and a family are starving and a messenger carries the bread to them, to whom would the starving family be under the most obligations, the fellow that took it to them, or to the baker who had and sent the bread? He thought, if anything, they would be under more obligations to the man that took it to them. Suppose I grant that; what has it got to do with our proposition? God (he is sovereign, and he uses means to carry out his decrees as the Old London Confession says) that has provided, the same God that makes the decree, can just as easily, if he will, carry it out by *that method*, and if the preacher isn't there, we haven't been faithful enough to the great commission to send him there. As Dr. John M. Watson says concerning the matter, "We have violated our commission." Yes, we have done it.

I want to read to you what the brethren who subscribed to the Old London Confession said: "May not the gross ignorance and instability of many, with the profaneness of others, be justly charged upon their parents and masters, who have not trained them up in the way wherein they ought to walk when they were young, but have neglected those frequent and solemn commands which the Lord hath laid upon them, so to catechize and, instruct them that their tender years might be seasoned with the knowledge of the truth of God as revealed in the Scriptures; and also by their own omission of prayer and other duties of religion in their families, together with the ill example of their loose conversation, having inured' them first to a neglect and then contempt, of all piety and religion. We know this will not excuse the blindness and wickedness of any, but certainly it will fall heavily upon those that have been thus the occasion thereof; they indeed die in their sins (that is, those that have been neglected), but will not their blood be required of those under whose care they were, who yet permitted them to go on without warning, yea, led them into the paths of destruction?"

Those old brethren taught the very same thing that my opponent says we do—that by our neglect of those that ought to be taught, their blood will be upon us, when they die in their sins. Of course they are not excusable, but we are responsible for not having done what we ought.

Again Brother Daily went after the bankers and high-salaried preachers. That is all right. I say go after them. I don't think much of the religion of a man myself who wouldn't give to spread the gospel. I am like Dr. Watson on that. *We* have "violated our commission," in a measure, and *you* people are violating it altogether.

Here are a few questions I was about to forget to notice. He asks: "Are infants who die in infancy regenerated?" What has that got to do with our proposition? It is about as much akin to my proposition as the moon is akin to a green cheese. If it is akin, how? I believe that all who die in infancy are saved; and I think God gives them his own nature and fits them for heaven. I don't know how. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." If God does not give them his own nature, how are they saved? Giving them his own nature is regeneration.

"Is opportunity the measure of responsibility?" Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

Are the heathen who die without ever having heard the gospel saved or lost?" If they have sinned, and God has not gone outside of his *method* as laid down in the book, and given them faith and through that faith regenerated them, they are lost, of course.

"If lost, why?" Not because they have rejected Christ, but because they have sinned.

"If saved, how?" Like we are. The Gentiles who have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law. That is the doctrine. If one of those heathen over there should, by the providence of God and the inward teaching of God, be led to trust himself upon the mercy of God, a; a sinner lost, having violated that law which he is bound by, the mercy of God would save him, Whether such a thing occurs or 'not, I don't pretend to' know. It may occur. I pray God that it may.

"If the true light which is life, lighteth every man that cometh into the world, in the sense of all the human race, why do you and your people teach that millions of heathen are going down to hell in gross darkness for the want of the gospel?" I think that is a little far fetched. Now Christ is the true light; there is no doubt about that. But my time is up. We will attend to this later, maybe. Thank you.

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY'S FIFTH REPLY

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Before proceeding to notice the speech to which you have just listened, I call your attention to the contrast as presented on this blackboard between the Bible teaching and the teaching of my worthy opponent:

BIBLE

A corrupt tree (alien sinner) cannot bring forth good fruit.

"Ye (alien sinners) cannot hear my words."

"He that knoweth God, heareth us."

"He that is of God, heareth God's word."

"The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God."

THROGMORTON

A corrupt tree (alien sinner) can bring forth good fruit.

Alien sinners can and do hear in order to obtain eternal life.

Alien sinners hear us.

Alien sinners hear God's word.

The natural man can and does receive the things of the Spirit.

According to the Bible: A corrupt tree, alien sinner, cannot bring forth good fruit. According to Brother Throgmorton's position, a corrupt tree, alien sinner, *can* bring forth good fruit, the fruit of *faith*, for instance. According to the Bible Jesus says, "Ye, alien sinners, cannot hear my words." Brother Throgmorton's position is, alien sinners can and do hear in order to obtain life. According to the Bible, he that knoweth God heareth us. Brother Throgmorton's position is that alien sinners hear us. According to the Bible, "He that is of God hears God's word." According to Brother Throgmorton's position, alien sinners hear God's word. The conclusion from these two terms, by completing a syllogism, would be: Therefore alien sinners are of God. According to the Bible, the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God. According to Brother Throgmorton, the natural man can and does receive the things of the Spirit of God. This will go into the book. From what Brother Throgmorton and I say about the book there will evidently be a great deal in it. We are trying to advertise the book.

In reference to my last argument, which I had not finished when I took my seat, the brother asked this question: What has his argument to do with this proposition? My argument kills the proposition. It shows the proposition to be false. It shows it to be absurd, because God would not set on foot a scheme of salvation that he knew would be so ineffectual in accomplishing the work that it would be his 'pleasure to accomplish in the salvation of sinners. That is what the argument has to do with this proposition. He says that God can regenerate without the gospel. But he said in his debate with Elder Potter that God does not give the increase except where the seed is sown. If he does not do what he can do, will he ever do it? In reference to the state of the heathen he says if God should go out of his method as set out in the Bible that he might regenerate some of the heathen; but he has said God doesn't do it. Then if God does not do it, will he ever do it? Will one of the heathen ever be saved who never hears the gospel preached, if God doesn't give the increase except where the preacher goes and sows the seed? Alluding to himself: "Don't I look like a fiest dog?" When I said that if he is a dog he is merely a bench-legged fiest, I didn't have reference to his stature—a stature over six feet and four inches tall, beating me just a shadow. I had reference to his success in this debate. He is far behind and can't catch up.

He says I might not do the pleasure of God. "Brother Daily," he said, "God does not bring to pass all he desires." Now, *my* not doing the pleasure of God, and *his* not doing the pleasure of God, is not something that *God* brings to pass, but something we bring to pass. I am talking about what God brings to pass. I am talking about what God desires to do according to his own pleasure. Now if it is *his pleasure* to regenerate that sinner, will he not do so? I am not talking about what *that sinner does*; I am talking about *what God does*. He says he will do all his pleasure. If it is his pleasure to regenerate *that sinner*, will he not do his pleasure? And he will regenerate every sinner whom it is his pleasure to regenerate, or he will not do his pleasure.

In reference to faith and regeneration, he said this: It is a fruit, but has the fruit anything to do with the tree? The fruit has nothing to do with producing the tree, and if the faith is fruit of regeneration, faith has nothing to do with producing regeneration. Now notice: He says that I take 'the position that faith has nothing to do with regeneration. I did take the position that faith has nothing to do with regeneration so far as producing it is concerned. Then he says, "Yes, it is a fruit." But does the fruit have no relation to the tree? Oh, yes. But what relation does it have to the tree? It doesn't *produce* the tree. The peach does not *produce the peach tree* that *bears* it. So if *faith* is the *fruit of regeneration*, *faith* does not *produce* regeneration. Regeneration must be *first*, if faith is the *fruit* of regeneration. You said that faith is the fruit of regeneration.

(Mr. Throgmorton: I think not. I did not say that.)

"He that believeth," John says, "is born of God." If that is true, he does not believe in order to be born of God. The position cannot be true that he that believeth is born of God and the position be true at the same time that men believe in order to be born of God. That last position requires that the believing be *before* being born of God. If believing is *before* being born of God, then it cannot be said that he that believeth is born of God. It is like we were to undertake to ascertain whether a man, who is apparently dead, is really dead or not, and we examine the man. He lies before us, and we find him breathing, and we say: He breathes. He is alive. Therefore this man is alive. He wasn't breathing to get life. His breathing was the evidence. So he that believeth hath everlasting life. The believing is the evidence of it. He came over, you remember, all this in his last speech; the statement that you are all the children of God by faith. You remember my answer to that. We are said to be children by obedience. I proved that. Not that our obedience makes us to be the children of God, but that it manifests that we are, and so we are the children of God by faith, because faith *manifests* that we are. Wherever I find one believing, giving evidence by a shining faith, I am convinced by the faith I see that he is a child of God, and therefore is a child of God by faith, *manifestly*, just as we are children of God by *obedience* manifestly.

In reference to [Eph 2:8](#), where I said, or in regard to which I said, that faith is what relieves us from our trouble, he says, what is our trouble? Listen! We are never troubled on account of sin when we are dead in sin, because the dead are not troubled. The very first cry of the troubled one is evidence of life, and hence our Saviour said: "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." Your mourning is not what brings you life, but is evidence that you are already in a blessed state, and comfort is going to follow. And so the dead in sin, whose hearts are enmity against God and despise the truth, and are in sin, are never in trouble. You never heard a person who was dead in sin troubling over it. It is never until his heart is touched that he becomes troubled, and the first cry is evidence of life. Crying comes from life, and not from death.

But he turns to [Ps 51](#) and gives a little part of David's prayer, wherein he says: "Create in me a clean heart." That doesn't allude to regeneration at all. David had committed an enormous sin, and he felt the guilt of that sin and desired that God should give him a disposition never to sin that way any more; to cleanse him from that guilt in his actual experience; that he might realize God's love in his heart, notwithstanding the great sin. It has no allusion to regeneration.

In reference to the seed planted in the soil, I suppose he means if it is corn that the corn stalks are children of God. I suppose that is the lesson he aims to get. That there will be just as many children of God as there are good seed sown. But I want to know if the children are the stalks, is not life in the seed? The sower sowed the same identical life, and is not that eternal life? Let him come to that and answer it. His explanation of the parable of the sower is wrong. I had it in my mind to quote a proverb: "The legs of the lame are not equal; so is a parable in the mouth of fools." But maybe I had better not quote that. It might not read well in the book.

He calls your attention to [1Pe 1:23](#), "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." The Bible is not the word that liveth and abideth forever, and preaching is not that word. It was many centuries from the beginning of time until the first word of the Bible was written. Besides, life is not in it. It never was in it. It was never intended to communicate life, neither the Old Testament nor the New. That is not the design of the Bible. A distinction is made between the preaching and the word itself. He is the incorruptible seed. In his life we have life. We cannot give him, however, to others. We haven't the power to do that. No more power for that than we have the power to raise the dead. The Jews made the same mistake my brother is making. Jesus informed them that the Scriptures only *testify* of him; that *he* is the life. Mere testimony of this word, this eternal life, will not *impart* the life. There must be a communion of the life itself. "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." He did not say he would authorize and empower the *preachers* to do it. He said, "I will." Regeneration is the impartation of divine life. Doesn't that come before the spiritual action of the sinner? He said God could make an oak, that he did once.

That must be in his head of supposition. How does he know but that God made the acorn first? All that is in the oak tree, so far as life is concerned, is wrapped up in the acorn.

He said as to faith, it is a fruit of the Spirit. If it is a fruit of the Spirit, the Spirit must be there before the fruit is produced. If the Spirit is there before the fruit, eternal life is there-or else the Spirit is a dead thing. Come to that. If it is a fruit of the Spirit, the Spirit must be there before the fruit. If the Spirit is there eternal life is there, if the Spirit is eternal life. He said dead sinners do not have divine life. When they have the Spirit of God, when they produce the fruit, I want to know if they don't have eternal life then?

What is essential in one case is essential in all. I am not limiting God. I say again what is essential in one case is essential in all. He is taking the position that it is absolutely essential. He takes the position that there can be no increase without the preaching. That the preaching must be done. If it is essential in one case, it is essential in all. And as to the infant, he says God may change its heart. I say if his doctrine is true he cannot. I say if his proposition is true that preaching is the means in regeneration, God cannot reach the infants. Why? Because God cannot reach the little infant by the preaching of the gospel. As to the way the little infant is saved, we can know if we can find out how the *adult* is saved. [Mr 10:15](#), "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of heaven as a little child; he shall not enter therein."

The Spirit reaches the heart by direct contact. It reaches the heart of the heathen by direct contact. It reaches the heart of every sinner regenerated, and therefore no means comes in between the thing operated upon and the thing operating. So God is not limited. It is all by direct contact. He does according to his own will.

I had not finished my argument when I took my seat. I will finish that. How much better, how much sweeter is the truth as taught in the word of God than the ridiculous system we are now examining. There is but one method of regeneration, and it reaches to the farthest borders of the continents, to the most remote islands of the sea. It touches the hearts of impenitent sinners, turns their impenitency into sobs and tears, their unbelief into a confiding, loving trust. It pierces the hearts of the little babes as well, and gives them a birth of the Spirit by which they are made spiritual and prepared to see and enter into the kingdom of heaven. It is the sovereign Spirit of God that quickens in all these cases. It gives life to the dead in sins and they live, for life eternal is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord. And the Ephesians, the Apostle wrote that they had been going the wrong way until the very moment God quickened them. They didn't turn in order to get the quickening done. The Ephesians didn't turn in order to get God to quicken them. They didn't turn and long after life, seek after life, in order to get God to quicken them, but according to the Apostle they were going the wrong way until the very moment that God quickened them. That turned them about. "For his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ." Not when we were seeking him, but when we were dead in sins, when we were going the wrong way. And when they were out of the reach of the preaching of the gospel, and the preaching would have been as a dead letter, God went into the chambers of the soul and quickened them, changed their condition from death to life. The system we are examining in making this argument-or rather refuting-gives man too much glory and God too little praise. The true plan of salvation gives God all the glory and man no praise. I know it is humiliating to proud mortals, but it is God's way. All who are finally saved in glory will have been born again from above, of God and not of man. Not of the will of man, not of the will of the flesh, but of God.

I want to draw a picture here. I sketch a continent of wealth, inhabited by people who live in luxury, who believe their money will send the incorruptible seed to an island just across the sea, where heathens are in darkness and dying and sinking down to endless suffering because that seed does not reach them. A rich man dies in the favored land and goes to heaven. On the heathen shore a poor man with his wife and infant are dying with starvation. The infant is saved upon some other plan than the one stated in this proposition we are discussing. But it is impossible for the adult to be saved upon any other plan, for the preachers alone plant the incorruptible seed, and no preacher has ever planted that seed in the hearts of these heathen parents. As they die, they sink down to the bottomless pit of endless despair, while their

babe rises to the dimes of immortal glory. Why did the rich man from the Christian country ascend to heaven while two poor parents in the heathen land sank into endless misery? Why did these parents land in the fiery domains of woe while their babe entered the sunny realms of everlasting delights? The everlasting separation, according to this theory, is because the rich man in the Christian country did not do his duty. The poor parents separated from their darling babe, and consigned forever to the regions of helpless despair, while the rich man basks in the smiles of his approving God, all because the rich man did not send a preacher to that heathen island to plant the incorruptible seed. I reckon if people want to believe that doctrine and spend their money to support those who teach it, they may, but excuse me from accepting it. It is irrational, and will not stand the test of logical investigation. It is unscriptural, and sinks before the light or divine truth.

I remember reference is made to certain ones in [Ac 19](#). The seven sons of Sceva tried to cast out evil spirits by using the name of Jesus Christ and of Paul, "We adjure you by the name of Jesus Christ whom Paul preacheth." I remember in their case the evil spirit said, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but *who are ye?*" It may be that these preachers, in trying to get the evil spirits out, in order to save sinners, may be addressed in that way, and they may ask, "*Who are ye?*" and that the strong man armed will keep his palace till the stronger comes upon him. The stronger is not Brother Throgmorton, is not all the preachers in line with him put together. The stronger is Jesus Christ, my blessed Saviour. The strong man armed will never be unarmed by them. These men cannot cast out the evil spirits in the one case, or instill the good Spirit in its place. It does not depend upon them. No, my precious friends.

If I have time I will at least *notice* my next negative argument, because I will not get through with the preparation I have made. My eighth argument to the utter overthrow of this proposition is founded upon the absurdity of the idea that Satan is unbounded in his field of operation, is not dependent upon human aid or books, but operates everywhere by his own personal presence. All around the world and in all ages of the world, from the beginning of the human race down to the end of it, Satan is bringing ruin. He is dragging sinners down to hell according to the system which this proposition expresses: God cannot get where the preacher cannot take him. He gives Satan the advantage of him by allowing him to encircle the whole world, while God, who would save them, cannot do it, because the preacher does not take the incorruptible seed there! The devil, then, not having tied himself up in any book, or limited himself to any territory by human agencies, is in every part of the world, dragging people down to hell by the thousands every day, while God cannot reach the vast field of his operations because no preacher is there and no Bible has been circulated among the people! Elder Throgmorton, remember, said, in his debate with Elder Potter, that God has made the preaching of the gospel and other things inseparable in the conversion of sinners in all lands, countries and nationalities, since the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Page 6. So it will not do for him to say that God may go there if the preacher doesn't. He has taken the position that God *cannot* do that!

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON'S SIXTH SPEECH

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Brother Daily gave you some contrasts, as he thought, in his speech a while ago. I don't think really that the contrasts exist altogether as he stated them. For instance, he says that "Brother Throgmorton takes the position that the alien, the corrupt alien, can hear and understand, and that the Bible says he cannot." What Brother Throgmorton says is that the alien can understand when God helps him and not without God's help. He didn't represent me correctly. So as to the rest.

I want this to be remembered: I say that the first thing in order to the conversion and salvation .of a sinner is the drawing of the Holy Spirit. In other words, God moves *first* in the bringing of the sinner to Christ. God *draws* the sinner and then the *sinner comes*. Without that drawing the sinner cannot come. But, remember, drawing is God's act and coming is the sinner's act. *The sinner does the coming*.

Now for some contrasts I want to show you:

CHART

On this side

John R. Daily.

On this side

Confession of 1644.

Confession of 1656.

Old Philadelphia Confession.

Dr. John Gill

Dr. R. W. Fain

Dr. John M. Watson

On one side is John R. Daily. On the other side is the Confession of 1644-the Old Baptist Confession of seven churches, 1644; the Somerset Confession of 1656; the Old London Confession; the Old Philadelphia Confession; Dr. John Gill; Dr. R. W. Fain; Dr. John M. Watson. Now with some of these Brother Daily professes to agree, but he denies my proposition, and all these agree with my proposition. And that will go in the book. I will furnish the stenographer a copy of the chart if she desires.

And here are some contrasts between John R. Daily and the Bible:

CHART

JOHN R. DAILY

Regeneration before faith and without faith.

God saves before and without faith.

Life that we may believe.

God does not use the written or spoken word of truth in regenerating sinners.

THE BIBLE

Children of God by faith.

Saved by grace through faith.

Believing that we may have life.

God begets (regenerates) us with the word of truth.

Here are certainly contrasts. There is John R. Daily on that side. John R. Daily says, "Regeneration before faith and without faith." The Bible says, "Children of God by faith." It doesn't take more than half an eye to see that, does it?

"God saves *before* faith and *without* faith," says John R. Daily.

The Bible says, "Saved by grace *through* faith." *Not without* it; not *before* it.

John R. Daily says, "Life that we may believe." You have got to have life, divine life-you may have animal life, mental life, and moral life; but he says you have got to have spiritual life, the divine life in order to believe! The Bible doctrine is this: "*Believing* that we may have life." You can see that, can't you? Just like that is our contention. One is "life in order to believe,"- and one is "believing in order to life." And one is Bible and one is John R. Daily.

John R. Daily does *not* use the written or spoken word of truth in regenerating sinners. The Bible says, "God begets (regenerates) us with word of truth." I think that is as complete a contrast as I ever saw between the two things. So much for contrasts, Brother Daily.

Now let us see where we were. Getting so much stuff in my notes here gets them a "little mangled up," as the fellow said.

About Brother Penick. I am inclined to think you misunderstood Brother Penick, Brother Daily.

(Mr. Daily: I think not.)

I believe that God's "opening the heart" is the first thing that is done in bringing a sinner to Christ, and that it is equivalent to drawing. God opens the sinner's heart. His Spirit does that. The Holy Spirit does that absolutely and directly, and may do that in the absence of all means. Many a man's heart is opened in the absence of the word of truth; but that opening is not regeneration. Lydia's heart was opened that she attended to the things that were spoken or Paul. One of the things was to believe the message.

And Brother Daily thinks that according to my doctrine God *cannot* regenerate without the word of truth or seed of the kingdom in any case. Suppose that was possible. Isn't it just as possible for God to provide the seed and sow it in a heathen's heart as it would be to regenerate him without the seed? My friend wants to limit God. He thinks it possible for God to regenerate without seed, but *not* possible, he thinks, for God *to furnish the seed*. Remember we are talking about the *method* that God uses, and if I show that this is the ordinary method as in every case of New Testament it is conversion, it appears my proposition is sustained.

When he spoke of me as a fiest he had no reference to me as to physique. He says it was my inability to follow-and yet he had me right after him, my level best!

He says our not doing God's will is not the question. Of course that is not the question in debate. The question in debate is in the proposition on the chart. You, Brother Daily, are springing all sorts of questions in this discussion, instead of confining yourself to the particular question before us. If *God's will* is for *you* to do all right all the time-if that is his will, according to your doctrine, will not God *make* you do it? If he doesn't, God's will isn't done, is it? Surely not.

He has been quoting [Isa 46](#). I want to read a little of that. Here it is. [Isa 46:9-11](#). I will read a little further than he did: "Remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me. Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient time the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure: Calling a ravenous bird from the East, the man that executeth my counsel from a far country; yea, I have spoken it, I will bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it." So if God has purposed to save his elect wherever they are, *he is just as competent to send a preacher as he is to send a ravenous bird*.

Now we are both agreed that faith is the fruit of the Spirit as produced by the Spirit; and you have agreed, Brother Daily, that it is not produced by the Spirit without the word; you have agreed that the Spirit and the Word work faith in the hearts of the elect! Brother Daily agrees to that. We are both agreed that faith is a fruit of the Spirit. The Spirit puts faith, works faith in the heart of the elect *by the ministry of the word*, but faith is not a *fruit of regeneration*. Being a fruit of the Spirit, it is that *by* which regeneration takes place. Thus God's Spirit effects regeneration. Do you understand? God regenerates, but he regenerates *through* faith, *by* faith. "Ye are all the children of God by faith" if children at all. And

Brother Daily says that whosoever believes is born of God. But he says the birth is *before faith*. You ought to know better than that. Necessarily that is not true. What is believing? Accepting. See [Joh 1:12](#). Accepting him or receiving him and believing on him are the same. Whoever accepts any gift has the gift, hasn't he? Does he have it *before* he accepts it? Huh? No, sir; the acceptance is in order to the possession of it. Whoever believes is born of God, and he is born *by* believing and the two things are simultaneous. The one doesn't exist without the other. You cannot have the two separate. The accepting and the having are simultaneous, but the accepting is in order to the having. The same way with faith in Christ and regeneration.

But Brother Daily tells us that we are children of God by obedience *manifestly*. He has to read that word "manifestly" into that passage in Galatians. Of course he has found a place where God says, "You my sons and daughters," and that refers to *manifest* sons, because they were already sons, as we know, and were children of God by faith, actually before. Remember the difference between manifest and actual. Remember always every statement in any book is to be taken literally, unless the sense compels the contrary.

We have it here now. Brother Daily says we are never troubled by sin until made alive. Then what is the matter with us? What have we to trouble about if we have eternal life? Instead of troubling we ought to be rejoicing! Sure! Instead of that, you have a man going around saying, "Lord, have mercy upon me; I have got religion!" -- crying and troubling about it, when he ought to be rejoicing. If the Holy Spirit makes a man believe he is lost when he is saved, what does the Holy Spirit do in doing that? Doesn't he tell a falsehood? When you was already saved, didn't he make you believe a falsehood? Brother Daily, that is what your doctrine teaches.

The Holy Spirit makes a man feel he is lost and undone, and then leads him to believe in Jesus Christ, and then to have life, and rejoice because he has it.

"Well," he says, "it is absurd to think that a creature can have any desire for its own creation." Yet I called his attention to [Ps 51:10](#), and he didn't get in a thousand miles of it. David said: "Create in me a clean heart, O God!" Here was a creature desiring his own creation. He says he makes the creation of a dead sinner just like the creation of the heart. Then this creation that David prays for, a heart, the creature that wants to be created *prays* to be created-"Create in me a clean heart, O God!" Don't you see that answers it?

Here is the sinner crying for a new creation of his own heart. Brother Daily says he supposes that I think that if corn is planted it will grow up children of God. I suppose he is competent to suppose anything he wants to; and I thought of two proverbs just as he said that: "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest ye become like him"; "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit." Don't take that to yourself, because it might not be parliamentary to apply it to you, but I thought of the proverb, you see. There is hardly any game but that two cannot play at, you know.

The idea of his supposing that I thought if corn is planted it will grow up children. Does he really suppose I thought anything of that kind? That was a pointless joke you got off, Brother Daily.

In [1Pe 1:23](#), my opponent tries to show that the "word" means Jesus. But did he examine my proofs? Remember our rule of controversy here-Hedges' Rule of Controversy-that it is the duty of the disputant to examine the proofs presented by his opponent, and show if he can that they do not contain the terms of the proposition to be proven, or their equivalent. He didn't do that.

I must call your attention to the facts. I proved that the "word" in [1Pe 1:23](#) was incorruptible. I proved from the connection that it is the written or spoken "word." It is the "word" that is preached by the gospel; it is the word that is the sincere milk for babes. Yes, sir, just by a wave of the hand he passed it by and affirmed that the "word" in all that

connection means Jesus Christ. If you are going to take his word for it, he proved it, but if you are going to take Peter's word-the word of the Holy Spirit-he didn't prove it; nothing of the kind.

He tells us Jesus says, "I give unto them eternal life." That is right, and I believe it. He didn't say, "I give to the preachers to give this life." Who said he did? What are you after now? Why do you make a straw man here and throw rocks at him? Come after me; I am not straw, and I never said that at all. I never said the preacher could give life. How absolutely you missed the issue!

But Brother Daily wants to know if the oak was before the acorn. There have been a great many who have philosophized on which was first, the hen or the egg, and I don't know whether it is settled yet. But I read this about the tree: "The earth brought forth the tree, yielding fruit" ([Ge 1](#)), "Whose seed was in itself after his kind." The tree was *first*, and the seed *in* the tree and *not* the tree in the seed. That is where I get it. That helped you to fill up your time, brother. But Brother Daily says: "If sinners have the Spirit, they have life." But they do not have the Spirit in the gospel sense. The Spirit works on them, but there is quite a difference between having the Spirit and being wrought upon by the Spirit. The *world* cannot receive the Spirit, but the Spirit operates on the world. He draws, he opens, he reproves, he gives; but having the drawing, having the opening, having the giving, having the reproofing, is not having the Spirit. It is having done on you what the Spirit does. Those things are the work of the Spirit.

My opponent says again that I have taken the ground that unless the preacher preaches there *can* be no one saved. How will this look in the book? I have said nothing of the kind. How will such a statement look in the book, iterated and reiterated?

Again Brother Daily affirms that where there is impact no means can be used, but he has drowned himself on that in making faith the direct gift of God and in admitting that it is wrought by the word. You yourself, Brother Daily, *in this discussion*, make faith the direct gift of God, and yet have it wrought by ministry of the word. Why not have direct impact and have means in giving life or regeneration? He can make answer to that and it will be in the book. Another advertisement, Brother Daily.

In regeneration life is given. That is the sum and substance of regeneration. He tells us that God quickens the sinner when the sinner doesn't want him to. God just runs a man down and *makes* him take it! This is my friend's theology. That may be the way of it, but the book doesn't teach it; not a bit of it. "My people shall be a willing people in the day of my power."

He gives us a picture of a rich man that went to heaven and a poor man that went to perdition from an island. And this rich man was to blame because the gospel hadn't gone to that poor man. The way he did soar! he was actually eloquent.

I could begin now and tell how that, according to his position, there are millions and millions that are now in torment because Christ never died for them, and that they are lost forever. There are little infants in their mother's arms for whom Christ never died, and they are to grow up and go to hell forever, with not the remotest chance to get to heaven. And what would that have to do with this proposition? Not a thing. That is not in this issue. It was *in* the former proposition, which was about the death of Christ. This one is about the *method* of salvation.

He tells about the seven sons of Sceva, and compares Missionary Baptists to them. If there is anything in that for you folks, you may use it, of course. He reiterates that according to us *God cannot* save sinners because the *preacher* doesn't get to them. We *never* said that. We say God's method is like my proposition. That is what my friend evades; instead he makes straw men and throws stones at them. He tells us the devil thus has the advantage over God Almighty.

I have another argument here I want to present, if there is time. Paul teaches clearly that God in regenerating sinners uses both the preacher and the preaching of the gospel. That is not saying he cannot do the thing some other way. Not

at all. That is not in this issue. But such is his method. [1Co 4:15](#), "For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel."

Gennaw (Gennao) is the Greek word rendered "begotten." It is also the word rendered "born." In regenerating these Corinthians *God* employed Paul and Paul's preaching. Paul begot them *as an instrument or means* which God used. An ax is the instrument in cutting down the tree. Sometimes we say the ax cuts down the tree. I want to quote Dr. Gill as sustaining my interpretation of [1Co 4:15](#): "For in Christ Jesus have I begotten you, through the gospel; which is to be understood of regeneration, a being born again, and from above; of being quickened when dead in trespasses and sins; of having Christ formed in the soul; of being made a partaker of the Divine nature, and a new creature." That is what Dr. Gill says. He says further; "The apostle speaks this of himself, only as the *instrument or means* which God made use of in doing this work upon the hearts of his people." That is exactly my proposition. We have the Apostle Paul; we have Dr. John Gill; we have my proposition. Brother Daily says nay. As to the value of his proofs, that is another question. I have another one here which I will give you, because I want my friend to have full opportunity to examine all my twelve pillars.

Argument Twelve.-The salvation to which God's children were chosen from the beginning, is through the word of truth as a means. Now there have been a great many dissensions among the brother's people on the means question. I heard of some brother telling his theory-it seemed he was a preacher of that order -about what he thought. He said he didn't think God needed any means. If he wanted to burn a hole through a board he could burn the thing through without using any red-hot poker, or anything of the sort. And that didn't prove a thing!

Listen: [2Th 2:13-14](#), "But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." Now who did that? God! God chose them from the beginning. God loved them. To what did he choose them? Salvation. Through what? Sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. Remember we are both agreed that God works that belief in the heart by means of the ministry of the word. Paul says, "God has called you by our gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Belief is wrought in the heart through preaching. [Ro 10:17](#); [Joh 20:30-31](#). "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written that ye might believe"-and then what? "And that believing ye might have life through his name." My friend says he already had life before believing. The difference is between him and John; between him and Paul; between him and Jesus.

I desire now to quote from [1Th 1:4-5](#) to show how in the case of the Thessalonians the preaching worked and was employed: "Knowing brethren beloved, your election of God. For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sakes." The gospel came *in word*, but also *in* that which *employed the word* in regenerating. This is involved in the statement concerning power and concerning much assurance.

Thus it is, my brethren and friends and Brother Daily, that I have presented to you *twelve pillars* hewn out from the word of God, clear and unmistakable in their meaning and invincible in their strength.

(Time expired.)

ELD. DAILY'S SIXTH REPLY

Brethren, Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The first thing I shall attend to will be to answer the questions that my worthy opponent handed me this forenoon:

"Do you deny that faith comes by hearing the preaching of the gospel?" No. *Creed* faith does come that way.

"Do you deny that, until a sinner believes in Jesus, he is condemned and in a state of death?" I do. He is in a state of death until quickened.

"Do you deny that the failure of Christians to instruct others may be the occasion of the blindness and wickedness of those others?" Not the occasion of their *spiritual* blindness.

"Do you deny that the blood of those who die in their sins may be required at the hands of those who failed to warn them?" People go to hell for their *own* sins, not the sins of *others*.

"Do you think there will be any people in hell at last, who might have repented in their life-time on earth, had greater opportunities been given them?" No: for repentance is *evidence of life*.

"Do you hold that God in justifying a sinner employs no instrument on the sinner's part?" We are not contending about justification. Stick to the proposition.

"Do you believe that men in heathendom can attain to saving grace or repentance without the gospel?" Men in heathendom are *regenerated* by the Spirit of God without the gospel.

"When an elect sinner is brought by the Holy Spirit to feel that he is condemned and lost, is the impression true or false?" True.

Just when, in personal experience, does God forgive a person's sins?" We are not discussing forgiveness of sins.

"Can a child of God be tempted and drawn to sin?" He can.

'Does a Christian ever actually sin? and does he suffer on account of it?" He does.

"Is a Christian dead to sin?" He is.

"If a Christian who is dead to sin may be drawn to sin, and may actually sin, and may suffer therefor, and still be dead to sin, why may not a sinner who is dead to righteousness be drawn to righteousness and take some steps in the direction of righteousness and suffer even to weeping and trembling, and still be dead to righteousness?" Because he is in a state of death or complete enmity till quickened, as the Ephesians were.

"Does God want everybody to do right all the time?" Yes.

"Does the devil want everybody to do wrong all the time?" Yes.

"If God has more power than the devil, and wants everybody to do right all the time, do they do right all the time?" No.

"Do not those born of God love God?" Yes.

"If those born of God love God, does every elect man, as soon as regenerated, love God?" Yes.

"If there is any regenerated man who does not love God, is he lost or saved?" If regenerated, he is saved.

"If there is any regenerated man who has not both faith in and love for God, have you not a man saved without either faith or love?" If he is regenerated, he is saved.

"Is it according to God's will that one of his elect should live on and do wickedly for years and years before he is regenerated?" God regenerates when he gets ready to.

"If not, whose will prevents his regeneration?" Nothing can prevent his regeneration when God gets ready to regenerate him.

"Reconcile the idea that the wickedness of an elect man delays his regeneration, and show why it is that, during that delay, his will (as you put it) is stronger than God's will?" Nothing can delay his regeneration when God regenerates him.

He says I might fool away my time answering those questions. It was fooling away my time, for there wasn't anything in the questions.

He says the first thing is the Father's drawing. Drawing is God's act, coming the sinner's act. Does the sinner *come* and *get* God to draw him? Which is *cause* and which is *effect* in this? God does the drawing. Does God draw him because he comes? No. Does he come because God draws him? Yes. What is the cause? God's drawing. What is the effect? The sinner's coming. If God *draws* the sinner he *comes*. Whenever effect intended is not produced, the fault is not in the effect; the fault is in the *cause*. Study the law of *cause* and *effect* a little more.

He brought up again some of the statements of Dr. John Gill and Dr. John Watson, when I showed in the beginning that Dr. John Gill in his *stronger* works, his *most mature* works, was squarely on my side, and *positively contradicted* things he said in his *earlier* works. I brought Dr. John Gill against Dr. John Gill, and so set him aside in this court. When a witness contradicts himself, his testimony is set aside. A drowning man will catch at a straw.

He says John R. Daily contends that life is before faith and without it. My contention is that faith is because of life, because he that believeth is born of God. His being born of God is the *cause* of his believing. Faith doesn't come from death. Faith comes from life, and *eternal* life at *that*. Faith is the evidence or fruit of the Spirit, and the fruit of eternal life. Then he quotes "children of God by faith," when I have answered that argument two or three times already, which the book will show. The other supposed contrasts have already been set aside in the arguments I have made.

But he said the Lord's opening Lydia's heart was not regenerating her. He and I differ about that. The difference is between Dr. Throgmorton and Dr. Daily. We just *differ*, that is all. My position is that when God opened Lydia's heart he gave Lydia love in her heart and faith in her heart for those things spoken by the apostle. She had faith and love, and one that loves is born of God. The opening of the heart is the work of being born of God, and the love comes from that; not from the *dead* heart, but from the open, *living* heart. He said God can provide the seed and sow in heathen lands, but he has said he never *does* it. He said God never *gives* the increase unless the *preachers sow the seed*. He has said God *never* does. If he takes back what he said, we will welcome him over on the side of truth. If he takes the position now that God *ever does* regenerate sinners where the *gospel is not preached*, he goes back on the position he has taken that God never does regenerate sinners where preachers never get to the people. Either he was wrong in his *former* position, or he is wrong in his position *now*. The fact is, his construction of the parable of the sower and his construction of [Ro 10](#) places him now where he was when he had his debate with Elder Potter, when he said: "God has made these things inseparable in, all ages of the world, and never operates outside of where the preacher preaches." There is business along this line. I want him to say whether he stands where he did then, or have you changed in your opinion? That will go down in the book.

He says if it is God's will, will he not make me do right? God is not around making us *do* everything we do. I tell you that. No, sir. You cannot hold God responsible for your actions, sir, in the way of making you do what you do. Not by any means. But, sir, whatever it is God's will that *God* shall do, *God will* do, whether *you* do his will or *not*. Faith is the fruit of the Spirit, but not without the word, he says. Does the word affect the heart favorably without the heart believes the word? While the heart is in unbelief, can it affect the heart favorably? Does not the heart have to believe it first before it can receive the preaching favorably? He takes a good deal of time talking about the 'word.' It is the *preaching* that he has to prove is used as a means. He would have to prove, in order to prove his proposition, that God employs the *preaching* in the regeneration of sinners. Is not regeneration effected by the Spirit? And when the Spirit is in the heart, is

not eternal life there? Faith is the fruit of the Spirit? The Spirit being in the heart is what causes the heart to believe; and if the Spirit being in the heart is what causes the heart to believe, isn't faith the fruit of eternal life, and isn't the tree before the fruit? But he says in reference to John's declaration, that he that believeth is born of God, "You can be born if you will just accept it." The idea of accepting a birth is preposterous. Being born is not accepting a gift. Being born is *being born*. We are passive in it, and when we are born we may believe and not before. I stand right there in this contention. When we are born we can believe and not before. One not born of the Spirit doesn't believe, not until he is born of the Spirit. His believing is a *fruit* of it, just as a person's breathing is evidence of his being born naturally.

He is perfectly astonished that I thought he meant that the corn growing up in the field represents the children of God. I was just trying to find out what he did understand the parable of the sower to mean. In the first place he had it that the ground was the heart. I showed that the *good* ground was the *good* and *honest heart*. I showed that that meant a *regenerated* heart, and to this hour he has not replied. I don't think he will reply in his next speech, for I don't think he knows how. But he cannot, to save his life, tell what represents the children of God in that parable, according to his disposition of it.

In reference to the word "incorruptible," I want to say to you that the *preaching* of a thing and the *thing itself* are to be clearly distinguished between. When I *preach* Christ my *preaching is not Christ*. Paul said that we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord. Their preaching was not Christ; it was not their *preaching* that regenerated sinners; it was the *Christ they preached*. It is not our *preaching* that does the work. We preach the Spirit of God; we preach *his* salvation. It is that which we preach, and not our preaching, for there is a distinction between our preaching a thing and the thing preached by us.

He spoke about my throwing rocks at a "man of straw." It is the man he has set up here, because that is the thing I have been throwing at all the time. If he wants to call it a man of straw he may. I don't know but that is about so.

He says they do neglect the Spirit when the Spirit operates in the heart. Without the Spirit in the heart there is no faith there. If the Spirit is there they have the Spirit. The very idea of a person having the Spirit in his heart and the person not knowing it! He says there can be regeneration without preachers. But he has taken the opposite position.

I come now to his 11th Argument, which is that Paul teaches that God uses both the preacher and the Spirit in [1Co 4:15](#). To this I desire your attention briefly. This is the only text in the Bible that has the slightest appearance of favoring the doctrine expressed by this proposition. It requires, therefore, a careful investigation. The question involved is whether Paul meant that he had *actually regenerated* the Corinthians, so that they were his children by regeneration, or whether he used the term *sons* and *fathers* in the same sense as he does in speaking of fathers and mothers in the church. One thing is in the text beyond dispute: He claims to be the *father* of such as he had begotten. No begetting of his could make them the children of any other than himself, nor did he claim beyond this. He says he begat Onesimus in his bonds ([Phm 1:10](#)), and in the same sense he claims Onesimus as his own son. In the same figure of speech he calls Timothy and Titus his sons. It was not that he claimed to be the cause of their regeneration that he claimed Onesimus and Timothy and Titus as sons. The Corinthian brethren might, in Paul's supposition, have had ten thousand instructors in Christ Jesus, yet they had but one *father* as an *instructor* in this figurative sense, and that *one father was Paul*. He did not claim that he was a *means* in begetting them in the sense of regenerating them, or that God had employed his preaching as a means to effect their regeneration, for that would not have made them his children or him *their father*. He would not have done the BEGETTING or the *regenerating* in that case, and the *one who had done* it, and *not Paul, would have been their father*. He was their *father* as their *chief instructor*. Whatever Paul did, it was of his will, who had been blessed to bring them or beget them to a knowledge of the truth and conformity to the gospel. In this sense he writes to the Galatians, "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you," ([Ga 4:19](#).) In this he calls the Galatians little children, his little children, and says he *travails* in birth *again* in their behalf. For what purpose? That he might regenerate them *again*? Not by any means. It was that Christ might be formed in them. They had been

regenerated, but had departed from the gospel practice, and Paul stood in much doubt of them. He desires that they might be renewed in the spirit of their minds, and put on the new man *practically*. Here was a travail in a kind of birth, but no one understands Paul to mean regeneration. So he had begotten the Corinthians through the gospel, and in that sense it was possible for him to *beget* them *again* and *again*.

I desire to attend to my Ninth Argument, as this is the only speech in which I can introduce new argument. My Ninth Argument is that as Christ is an unrivalled, peerless preacher of his gospel, the power that attended its proclamation was the greatest possible when he preached it. Never man spake as he did. ([Joh 7:46](#).) If God had intended the preaching of the gospel to be a means in the regeneration of sinners, the preaching of the gospel by Christ would have been pre-eminently successful in the accomplishment of that result. But, instead, his preaching was very unsuccessful as to its favorable reception on the part of the people who heard its sound. One of the most important and impressive discourses preached by him is recorded in [Joh 6](#). It was delivered to the multitude who sought him for the loaves and fishes, but instead of being regenerated by it and receiving it with glad hearts, they were highly displeased with it. The cause of this ascribed by our Saviour to *unbelief* and *inability* to come to him. These are his words: "But I said unto you that ye have also seen me and believed not. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me." "Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." "There are some of you that believe not." "Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come to me except it were given him of my Father." This shows that, though Jesus preached to them the truth in its purity and greatest power, they were not regenerated by it. The reason assigned is that the Father did not *give* them to him, and did not *draw* them. This proves that the drawing by the Father in regeneration was not accomplished by means of the preaching of the gospel, even when it was preached by Christ. It is conclusive proof that regeneration is not effected by means of the preaching of the gospel, but, is accomplished by a power entirely separate and apart from it.

At Nazareth, Jesus preached from the prophecy of Isaiah. The people wondered at the gracious words that came from his lips, but what were the effects of that sermon? Was a sinner regenerated by it? Not one. They reproached him on account of his humble origin. "Is not this Joseph's son?" they said. In accounting for this, Jesus preached the doctrine of discriminating grace, illustrating that doctrine by alluding to the one widow of Sarepta and the one Syrian leper, at which the people were so angered that they thrust out the Divine preacher and would have cast him headlong over the cliff had he not passed through their midst and gone his way, withdrawing from them in a miraculous manner. The gospel when preached by the greatest and best of all preachers was not heard by the unregenerated populace with hearing ears and understanding hearts. I insist that if it had been God's plan to make it a means in regeneration, it would have proved to have been such when Jesus preached it. The failure of his preaching to effect that end is plain, positive and irrefutable proof that preaching is not so employed. If God had intended that the preaching of the gospel should be a means, so powerful would have been the preaching of Jesus Christ that every sinner would have been regenerated. I have shown that they were angered with the preacher. There had to be something apart from it; there was something apart from it to accomplish the great work of regeneration.

But I come to my next argument. My Tenth Argument is that the proposition we are discussing is contradicted by the following well-authenticated fact: The same measure of power, under the same circumstances, must produce similar effects. If Christ died for all sinners, and the preaching of the gospel were a means used by the Spirit in the regeneration of sinners, and all unregenerated sinners are in like condition, dead in sins, deaf to the sweetness of the gospel, and blind to its heavenly beauties, in love with the darkness of error rather than with the light of gospel truth, and in a condemned state, there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. ([Ro 3:22-23](#).) If, then, Christ died for them all, God's intention is that all should be benefited by his death; and if he uses the preaching of the gospel as a means in their regeneration, he will use it with the same measure of power. As the same measure of power, under similar circumstances, must produce similar results, it follows that all to whom the gospel is preached will be regenerated if this proposition is true. But all to whom the gospel is preached are not regenerated. Therefore this

proposition is not true. If a number of unregenerated sinners are under the sound of the preaching of the gospel, and some are regenerated while others are not, and if God employs the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of those regenerated, why does not the same means regenerate the others? How can we account for three thousand being favorably affected by Peter's preaching at Pentecost, while under Stephen's preaching of the same blessed gospel not one heard with a hearing ear and an understanding heart? Under the one the lambs cry out, and under the other the lions rage. How can we account for the difference? Can we do it by saying that God uses the preaching as a means? The Ninevites, under one sermon by a prophet, melted into repentance, while the inhabitants of Capernaum, under the admonitions and teaching of a far greater than all prophets, seconded by the performance of wonderful miracles, are not persuaded. Many of the Jews who had heard the doctrine of Christ, had seen the purity of his life, and witnessed his great miracles, cried out for his life and consented to the crucifixion of his person, while the thief on the cross, who perhaps had never seen a miracle or heard a single sermon, of the precious Saviour, turns his dying eyes to him, and dies a regenerate man, going into Paradise with the Son of God, The only way to account for all this difference is to accept the truth that regeneration is solely the work of God, independent of all means and instrumentality, The change wrought in the soul in regeneration has the same Author as the fashioning of the dust of the ground into a human body. God needs no help in regeneration, and if he did he could not find it. As Christ is the sole worker in redemption, so is God by his Spirit the sole worker in regeneration, who creates us in Christ unto good works. Therefore God does not employ the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners.

I insist that God would not set on foot a plan that makes a failure. The plan represented by my friend here makes a failure. God being all-wise and knowing all things, having all power, would not devise a system that would be inadequate to reach the people and those that never heard it. I say he would not.

I want to read some things here that seem rather startling. I read from the Cumberland *Lutheran*, that denomination standing exactly as this denomination stands relative to the proposition we are discussing today. There is given in one of the copies of the Cumberland *Lutheran*, a monthly journal published at Cumberland, Md., a table of statistics under the title, "Do Missions Pay?" in which it is shown that the cost of saving a soul in India is \$18, while the cost in this country is \$72. Under this table is given the following statement: "It costs nearly three times as much to maintain our churches here as in India. It takes seven members to win one from heathenism but ten to win one here with Christian surroundings. Measured in dollars, it costs four times as much to save a soul here as there, and who will put God's estimate of the value of a soul when heaven rejoices over one sinner that repents?"

Now with reference to civilized lands, Rev. Dr. Talmage said: "I simply state a fact when I state that in many places the church is surrendering and the world is conquering. When there is one man brought into the kingdom of God through Christian instrumentality, there are ten men dragged down by dissipation. Within the last twenty-five years the churches of God in this country have averaged less than two conversions a year each. There have been an average of four or five deaths in the churches. How soon, at that rate, will this world be brought to God? We gain two; we lose four. Eternal God! what will this come to?" How about it in heathen lands? How about it in this country? We call this a Christian country today, and only a little over one-third of the inhabitants make any profession at all right here where our schools are and our churches, but crime is on the increase. I want to read now from a statement made by Rev. James Johnson, published in 1886, where he says: "The heathen population is more by 200,000,000 than it was a hundred years ago; while the converts and their families do not amount to more than 3,000,000. The numbers now generally accepted as accurate, and quoted by missionary and other societies, are 173,000,000 of Mohammedans and 874,000,000 of heathen, 1,047,000,000 in all. We mourn over the sad fact that the increase of heathens is numerically seventy times greater than that of converts."

(Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON'S SEVENTH SPEECH

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I come before you now with my last speech on this proposition and in this discussion. We have had a pleasant time, and of course we are going to close out pleasantly.

Brother Daily seemed to think he fooled away his time in answering those questions. I think myself you did, brother, the way you answered them. If you had put something into the answers, then perhaps you wouldn't have been fooling away your time altogether. I want to show you where he gives away his whole theory. He doesn't think so, but you can see.

Does God want everybody to do right all the time? He says, "Yes."

Does the devil want everybody to do wrong all the time? He says, "Yes."

If God has more power than the devil and wants everybody to do right all the time, do they do right all the time? Brother Daily said, "No."

According to his theory that he has been preaching all the way through, if God absolutely determines to do his pleasure in every sense, the devil has more power than God. "It is not a question of what we do," he says. Nearly every purpose of God has to do with what somebody else does, brother. He didn't pay any more attention to [Isa 46:9](#).

Then he begins to talk about the drawing. He says, "Is the sinner drawn because he comes?" Why do you ask that question? I made it as plain as that nose on his face that God draws the sinner first. You all remember that. In the face of that he asks: "Is he drawn because he comes?" No; but his coming is in consequence of the drawing. He contends that every one that God draws comes. "If I be lifted up I will draw all men to me." (See [Joh 12:32](#).) They will all come then, according to Brother Daily's theory.

The trouble is that Jesus Christ died for just a few, according to his position, and the rest are not drawn; they are the children of wrath, *born* that way, and must be eternally that way, and must go to hell forever. And he says, in harmony with that doctrine, that *if* God draws the sinner *comes*, and wants to know if I can tell the difference between cause and effect. My friend thinks that God draws the sinner just like the yoke of oxen draws the log. The truth is *God* reproves the sinner; *God* opens his heart; *God* makes him feel his great need, and then the *sinner* comes. He is *commanded* to come, and must therefore do the coming. My friend says God has nothing to do with what the sinner does. If this is right the sinner may come or not, and God's will not be interfered with!

Then he comes to the charts and notices *one* thing - well, maybe *two* things. He said that he showed that Gill was against Gill, and that was enough. We will have this on record, that Brother Daily, the leader of the "Old School" Baptists, has set it down in debate, and it has gone into print, that the famous John Gill is not a good witness to quote in a debate of this sort, because he *contradicts* himself. When Dr. Gill is quoted it amounts to nothing, because in his old age, in an essay, when he was talking rather as a denominationalist than a scholar, he said something different from what he had said before in his commentary!

My opponent proceeds to affirm that regeneration is before faith because faith is a fruit. But he assumes the point he ought to prove. Faith is that by which, under God, regeneration is effected. "Ye are all the children of God *by* faith." You can't get me away from that, Brother Daily. He says opening Lydia's heart was giving her *love*, or something to that effect. David said, "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold that wonderful thing out of the law." According to Brother Daily, whether he obeyed God or not, when he did understand, had nothing to do with God's will. *David* might obey or not. *God's* will was not concerned in it. Well, after his resurrection, Jesus opened the understanding of his disciples that *they might understand*. That is what he did for Lydia; and thus understanding she fell in and attended to the things that she understood. She wasn't dragged in; she was *drawn* and *came* in.

But he says that my construction of [Ro 10](#) in connection with the parable of the sower makes it impossible for any sinner to be regenerated except according to the *method* laid down in the proposition. I suppose that is his opinion, but it is not true.

And here he lays down something that upsets his whole theory. "*Whatever is God's will for God to do he will do.*" I say so too. We are agreed on that. Let's shake hands on it. (They shake hands.)

(Mr. Daily: I am glad you are converted. Come along. Bless your soul. I love you better than ever.)

Whatever the *sinner* does and whatever any man does has no reference to God's will. That is what my friend says. He doesn't agree with me on that exactly.

(Mr. Daily: I am glad I have got you that far. If you can't see it, everybody else does.)

(Mr. Throgmorton: They look like it out there in the audience.)

He says I am talking about the *word* of God itself all the time, and the proposition is *preaching* of the word. It is the *preaching* of the word of truth. So it is the preaching of the word of truth that God cannot employ! Is not the word *preached*, or is it not the same word of truth that it is elsewhere? That was a quibble; that was an evasion.

To show you further how Brother Daily misapprehends, I quote this from him: "Whoever heard of anybody accepting being born?" Nobody said anything about accepting or not accepting being born. Not a word of it. I was talking about accepting *Christ*. God comes and *offers* us *Christ*, and we accept him as *God's free gift to us*, and *when we accept* him, we *have* him. That was the point. And when we have *him* we have *regeneration*, because *that* and every other blessing *is in him*. Brother Daily said, "Who ever heard of anybody accepting being born?" and said it was preposterous. Well, I think it would be. Then he proceeds to that when we are born we may believe, and *not before*.

Whenever a man is born of the Spirit of God he may believe on Jesus Christ, and not before, says Brother Daily. How a man can persist in taking issue with the word of God, and reiterate it time and again, is past my comprehension. The word says that regeneration is *by* believing. Those are not the exact words, but here are the exact words: "Ye are all the children of God *by* faith." But my friend persists in saying they are born of God before they believe, and that a man who has mental life and moral life and is moved upon by the Spirit of God *can't* believe until *after* he is born again. That is where the preposterous part comes in, Brother Daily. Then he says I thought it preposterous that he thought that I considered that if corn was planted it would result in the children of God, but instead of putting it that way this time he puts it the corn representing the children of God. Just what he wanted with that it is hard to understand.

I pass to another thought. He says I didn't explain who the children of God were in the parable of the sower. Let me say this: The soil is the heart of the sinner, the heart of the unregenerated. The preparation of the heart is what God's Spirit does when he draws the sinner. The heart that refuses the drawing is not a good and honest heart. But this preparation, which is the drawing or opening, put these hearts into this category, good and honest. Then the seed or word, falling into these, through it life is produced and the sinner is regenerated. But he says that which the apostles preached was Christ, and *that* was what did the work, and not the preaching. Didn't *he* rather, *whom* the apostles preached, do the work *through the preaching*? That is the point in my proposition.

Then he comes again to the question of sinners having the Spirit before faith. It is true the Spirit works on them as I said. The Spirit reproves them and opens their heart, but they do not *possess* the Spirit.

Coming to [1Co 4:15](#), he reads quite a discussion into it. "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you." He asks, Did Paul mean God had regenerated those people? Yes, and I showed you by Dr. Gill's exposition of the passage that Paul's preaching was the means *through which God regenerated them*. Of course Paul doesn't mean that he himself literally begat them.

My friend proceeds on the theory that Paul was talking of himself as an instructor, but he speaks of himself as more than that. "For though ye have ten thousand instructors, yet have ye not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus have I begotten yon through the gospel." The other instructors had not begotten them. Paul was *the* one whom *Jesus Christ* used as the means. Christ did it through Paul's preaching. Now look at that and examine it, and you have something like an answer. He told how Paul travailed suffering in birth for certain saints. Quite a difference in that, however, from [1Co 4:15](#).

Brother Daily appears to think that *God* is another name for Necessity. He seems to hold to the doctrine of Fatalism. Here is what he says, alluding to power through preaching: "Power through preaching should have been the greatest when Jesus preached." Isn't it owing to whether Jesus purposed to make it so? Now we didn't say that *Jesus' preaching* nor that *Peter's preaching* nor anybody's *preaching* regenerates anybody without *God*, but what we say is, that when God would regenerate a sinner he *employs* the preaching of the gospel or word of truth, written or spoken. That is *God's method*. And the fact that God does not regenerate at one time is not proof that he doesn't use the means at another time. He employs the means when he does regenerate. "Of his own will begets he us with the word of truth."

My friend gave us what he called "Argument Ten." and he says, "The same measure of power under similar circumstances must produce the same effect." If God uses the means, he uses it always in the same way and measure. He makes God the same as he turns himself on, as the water is when you turn it on a mill wheel, or as the electric fluid is when it is turned on to make the light. How wise! He leaves God without choice, but the word says: "He quickeneth whom he will." God is sovereign. But my opponent proceeds: "God would not set on foot a plan that would fail or that would be inadequate to the end desired." I don't think God has done such a thing. God has set on foot a plan that has not failed and will not fail. God has set on foot a plan that is entirely adequate to the end desired-in the long run. And in this plan are his means for the regeneration of sinners.

My brother had to talk about the cost of converts. He gave us one of those little sermons which he has preached some time along that line. I tell you, he soars. I have something I want to give you on that subject.

He talks about our paying so much per convert, and finds literature in which there is talk about that, because so much money is spent in mission work. The Old London Confession made Christians responsible for failing to instruct those for whom they were under obligations, and held them responsible for the loss of souls. It takes time to go after those souls. It costs money to get literature with which to teach them. Time is money. So we might figure up how the Old London Confession Baptists made souls saved cost so much per head. There is nothing to such an argument. But remember this: Instruction and literature and expenses connected therewith are second causes, and *decrees* even do not take away the contingency of them, but rather establish the same, as teaches the Old London Confession.

I promised to read something from Dr. John M. Watson. It is on page 520 of his Old Baptist Test. I begin at the bottom of page 519. "But our preaching does in one sense, when we preach to all unregenerated persons alike, for with us there are no evidences of distinction; we do so in faith, believing that the Lord knoweth them that are his; hence, our commission includes 'every creature,' but the calling of the Lord, the chosen few. Shall we presumptuously close this part of our ministry against the 'other sheep' which Christ said he must also bring? We know them not, but our commission embraces them, as fully as though we did, provided we address 'every creature,' all men are everywhere alike in a state of unregeneracy. Assuredly our preaching to them is in holy accordance with the purpose, which included both the preaching and the blessing. [1Co 1:21](#). Their connection with each other involves, in the plainest manner, the duty of preaching to every creature repentance toward God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord has ordained this way; our violation of it in the 19th century will not cause it to fail; others will do the work; it needs must be done; and this may be the cause why so few are coming into our churches." (That is what is the matter with you, Brother Daily.) Dr. Watson continues: "We have violated our commission." (That is what you and your people have done.)

Preach the gospel to every creature and let God *use* it as he wills. He doesn't turn it on like a miller turns the water on the wheel. If he has an elect the use of his word is his method of calling them, as you have agreed when you endorsed the London Confession. There is something else along this same line, I want to give you, but I don't want to spend too much time with it. However, speaking of the preachers, Dr. Watson says "their payment would supply the needs of many pastors that are toiling without it and many hearts that are now burdened almost past endurance would be comforted; or words to that effect.

And so this great and good man, Dr. Watson, goes on to show the errors of his people and how to remedy them on pages 283 and 284; and one of the remedies he says, is by making weekly contributions; another, the reviving the deaconry, as he calls it. Brother Daily has the book if these quotations are disputed.

Chapter Three, London Confession. I wanted to get that: "Nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, not yet is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." So there we see the harmony between decrees and means.

Now what have we done in this debate? I think we have established that proposition on the chart beyond doubt and by the plainest possible passages of scripture. I want to give you a review of some of them.

I began with the gospel by John, first chapter, 6-8 ([Joh 1:6-8](#)): "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." ([Joh 1:6-8](#)) That is God sent him to preach. What was the purpose? "That all men through Him might believe." Then the purpose of preaching is that believers may be made. Not that the *preaching makes* them. *God* makes them through the preaching. My friend didn't notice that passage. He said he would, but he never got back to it.

Then that other passage: [Joh 20:30-31](#), "And many other signs truly did Jesus, which are not written in this book, but these are written." What for? "That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ." Men come then to believe that Jesus is the Christ through these things that are written when they are read. *God through them makes believers*. Is that all? "And that believing ye might have life through his name." You have surely never been able to touch that, Brother Daily. I don't blame you. You cannot help it.

I called attention to [Joh 17:20](#), where believers are made through the apostles' word. *Through* their word! Believers made through preaching the word; and through believing in Jesus Christ comes regeneration.

From [Joh 6:35](#), believing on Christ and coming to Christ are seen to be the same. From another passage I showed you that by receiving Jesus Christ, partaking of him, we receive life: "I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."

By [1Co 1:21](#) I showed you that it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save sinners. My opponent has contended that I think the preacher or preaching by itself, or by themselves, produces believers. Not so. *God employs* the preacher and the preaching to produce believers, and "it pleased God by the simplicity of preaching to save them that believe." I showed you that Dr. John Gill agrees with me that this salvation involves *regeneration*. My opponent touched that passage very lightly. Nor has he been able to show about the quickening. His effort was to show that Dr. Gill was not a worthy witness. Yet I read you of the great confidence that our fathers had in that (Gill's) commentary when they wrote to each church to subscribe for a copy of "this incomparable work for the use of their ministers." But Brother Daily makes it a work unworthy of trust!

I also called your attention to [Ac 15:7-9](#). What was accomplished as stated there? Peter went and preached to the Gentiles that by his mouth they might believe: "Ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." They were made believers. My brother cannot dispute that. Who can dispute that? Nobody! Surely, my friend has agreed to it. But he says that regeneration

didn't come that way. I showed you what God did through this faith: "God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witnesses, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between them and us *purifying their heart by faith.*" Purifying the heart is regenerating it, when God does it; and he does it not *without faith, nor before it, but by it.*

In his last speech my opponent referred again to [Ro 10:17](#). I understand he agreed with me on that passage. We shook hands on it - that faith comes by hearing. Yes, you gave me your hand on it, Brother Daily. I got him in on this question yesterday, but he is like the woman that said "scissors." He agreed with me yesterday that God, the Holy Spirit, ordinarily produces faith in the hearts of the elect by the ministry of the word. That is all I got out of [Ro 10:17](#). Let us read. "So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Don't go back on it. It is on record against you. You have agreed that this is so, and later you have said it again. Again you have said that by faith we are manifestly the children of God. Paul doesn't put it that way. He says, Ye are all the children of God *by faith.*" Not without it. Not before it. That is enough for me so far as this controversy is concerned, because this faith is wrought by the ministry of the word, and that is my proposition.

I also showed how Dr. John Gill agrees with me in this. I shall not burden the recapitulation with re quoting him, however.

Yes, here is another passage I called your attention to and that I want in this review: [1Co 3:5-7](#). Who is Paul and who is Apollos, but "ministers by whom ye believed." That is plain enough. "Even as the *Lord* gave to every man." Through Paul's preaching *God* gave believers. He wrought faith in their hearts. Then Paul goes on: "I have planted, but God gave the increase." God gave the converts. "Neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but *God* that giveth the increase." How did he give it? *Through the preaching.* That is my proposition, and all my friend's long arguments (?) count as nothing against this solid phalanx of passages from the word of God.

[2Co 3:3](#), concerning which so much was said, I think you remember, also. Likewise the others. (Time expired.)

And now, as my time has expired, can I have a half minute?

(The request was granted.)

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies, and Gentlemen, Brethren and Sisters and Friends – and Brother Daily:

We have had a good time. This has been my last speech, and completes my part of the second discussion I have had with my worthy brother, and I believe we will close it at the last as we said in the beginning-better friends than before. I like this man. It is true we have differed. We have gone after each other. We have said what some of you may have considered sharp things, but it has been done in Christian spirit and good feeling on my part, and I believe on his. To that you will all testify. A great many said concerning the debate we held a year ago at Marion: "If we could always have discussions conducted like that one, we would be glad to have more of them." I heard one of our prominent preachers in that city say that he had been prejudiced against public debates, but said he: "I have changed my mind. You men conducted that discussion on a high plane. You have caused the people to study the Bible more and to have more respect for it." I trust the result will be the same with this. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your kind attention to everything I have had to say. I pray God's blessing on you. I thank these moderators for the impartiality with which they have ruled. They have worked together before. They are friends as we are, and they part friends. And as to my opponent my prayer is this: That whether he is right or whether he is wrong, or whether we are both wrong, we may both at last in the light of that better country enjoy God and know and be what is right and enjoy what is right forever. I want to thank our reporter. She gave me a demonstration of what she could do in the way of reporting before this debate began, and I have the utmost confidence in her ability. God bless her. And now, Brother Daily, let me give you my hand in brotherly love.

(Disputants shake hands.)

ELD. DAILY'S SEVENTH REPLY

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

You have been so very patient. This has been a warm time. But you have, under the oppression of heat, sat and listened patiently to our speeches up to this good moment, and I come before you for the purpose of closing this debate by making the last address. I shall expect the same exercise of patience on your part and undivided attention that has thus far been given us.

My first duty is to attend to the things which I consider relevant that have been said by my brother opponent in his closing speech.

He said that he made it as plain as the nose on a man's face that God draws first, and that the sinner comes because God draws him. So far we are agreed. What is the issue regarding God's drawing? The issue between Brother Throgmorton and myself relative to that point is this: I believe that every sinner *comes* to Christ that God *draws* to Christ. It seems to be his position that God tries to draw a great many sinners to Christ, or at least some sinners to Christ, that he *fails* to draw to Christ. God does the drawing. The sinner comes because he is drawn. The effect is produced by the cause. In all this we are agreed. I claim that the *cause* is sufficient to produce the *effect*, where the *cause operates*. He has contended that the *cause* is *not* sufficient to produce the effect in all cases where the cause operates. That God *tries* to draw some sinners to Christ that *do not come*. As to this drawing, the word is elkush (helkuse).

(Mr. Throgmorton: You have had opportunity before to define it.)

(Mr. Daily: If it is new matter I don't mean to introduce anything new.)

The primitive meaning of this word is *drag*. I just drop that as a thought

(Mr. Throgmorton: Read the other part of the definition.)

(Mr. Daily: I am willing to strike it out. I don't want to introduce anything new.)

(Mr. Throgmorton: I know you want to be fair.)

(Moderator: Go on with your argument.)

What it is God's will for God to do God will do, he said. Notice what he said: What it is *God's will* for God to do *God will do*. Now we repeat that *God regenerates the sinner*; that God *draws* the sinner. It is God's will to regenerate, to draw every sinner that he wills to regenerate and draw. As *God will do* what it is *God's will* to do, he will draw every sinner that it is his *will* to *draw*. It is impossible to reconcile that position with another position taken by him that God draws at some sinners and tries to draw some sinners who are not drawn. There is a contradiction that will go down in the book. He says: Accepting Christ is the work of the unregenerated sinner when Christ is offered to him, and when the unregenerated sinner accepts Christ he has Christ, and when he has Christ he has regeneration. He has said that the sinner in an unregenerated state does not love Christ. Then it follows that he accepts Christ when he does not love Christ! The sinner, in a state of unregeneration, when he does not love Christ, must accept what he does not love in order to have Christ, and he must accept him in order to be regenerated! He must accept what he does not love in order to be regenerated! My contention is that it is *impossible for anyone to accept what he does not love*. He may *get* what he doesn't love, but there is a difference between *getting* and *accepting* what one does not love.

On the parable of the sower he says again that the soil is the heart of the sinner. Then it was the heart of the sinner before the seed was sown into it, and it was a good and honest heart before. In our other discussion he said that a good and honest heart was simply one that was morally better than the others. He has been a little more careful this time, and has not said that in this discussion; in fact, he has hardly said what it does represent. I take the position that the good and honest heart is one that is regenerated, because the heart of an unregenerated person is evil. It must be regenerated to be good. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good, and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil. The preaching of the word is simply the preaching of the truth, and when the regenerated heart receives the truth as preached he simply receives it as truth, and not as life, because there is a difference between truth and life. Just as we can tell where good ground is when we sow our wheat upon the ground, so we can tell where good and honest hearts are. The effect of our preaching tells us. If some are moved by our preaching to shed tears of joy, while there is another who listens and despises the preacher because of what he preaches, we know that to the one the word has come in power. Hearts which have been prepared to receive the truth in good and honest hearts, receive it as good soil receives the seed sown into it.

He says God quickeneth whom He will. To be sure. We are agreed to that. God quickeneth whom He will. Then as many as God wills to quicken will be quickened. We are agreed in relation to that. My contention is that not only in enlightened countries, but in heathen lands as well, God quickens whom He will. He is not limited or bound by a system that is not of the Bible. He says God has not set on foot a plan that will fail. I contend, my precious friends, that according to his system God *has* set on foot a plan that *does* fail. I claim that the devil exerts more extended power, according to my friend's system, than the Holy Trinity exerts, and that has been true in all ages of the world, all over the world. Satan has power where God cannot go. Is it not a failure when it is said that Christ dies for the whole race and that God and Christ and the Spirit cannot operate except where preachers carry the Spirit, and can operate nowhere in all the world except over territory where preachers preach? It seems to me like the plan fails. It seems to me it does if the saved are confined to a very small minority of the portion of mankind that hears the gospel proclaimed publicly, while those that never hear it cannot be saved! It seems to me the plan is a failure if God, who in the beginning was just as independent as the devil, because he had no book to confine him, has set on foot a plan that has finally developed into his being confined to a limited territory, while the devil continues to have universal sway over the whole human race. It seems to me, according to that, that God has set on foot a plan that fails!

As to Dr. Watson's Old Baptist Test, I have read that work. There are many things in that Old Baptist Test that I admire. Whatever in Dr. Watson's Old Baptist Test agrees with the teaching of God's word I am willing to accept. But I will not accept from Dr. Watson or any other man, even from Dr. Throgmorton, as well as I love him anything I don't understand the Bible to teach. The Baptists have been an independent people regarding this matter. We take the Scriptures as the only Divine rule of faith and practice, and for that article we contend. But Dr. Watson has said some things I think ought to be read and ought to go into the book in addition to what my friend has said. I want to read from page 61: "The true gospel would have utterly failed had it been presented to the world for its approval or rejection according to the natural understanding, judgment and reason of man; but a false gospel may and does prevail in that manner over the judgment and feelings of 'many;' while the true gospel in its hidden power and embraces only a 'few.' "

And further in connection I read on page 72: "Were Christ to descend personally from heaven to earth, and to declare the same truths, and reveal the same Gospel ordinances, natural men would, notwithstanding all this, continue to hate his truths and oppose his ways. Their *state* requires something beyond this-*the birth of the Spirit*-the very blessing which he has secured to them, given them in the election of the Father."

What I said in reference to the interpretation of the Tenth of Romans was, that his *present* interpretation of it showed that his position is that the preaching of the gospel is *absolutely necessary* in the regeneration of sinners, while he said a number of times during this debate that God may do it without the gospel! How are we to understand my brother, when with one breath he says that God cannot give the increase unless the preacher does his work, and in the next breath he

says that God *may* do it *without* the preacher? I think it is the result of my brother's confused mind, not that he *intended* to take that position, positively to contradict himself. It is not very safe for a man in a public discussion to bring a fair and square contradiction before the people. And when a disputant contradicts himself squarely by saying time and time again that God employs the preaching of the gospel just as the sower sows the seed, and that faith comes by hearing, and that is the *way regeneration is produced*, making a preacher *necessary*, and then says in the next breath that he *may do it without*, it is a contradiction he wouldn't make if he were not confused! That is the only way I know how to account for it.

Now I want to invite your patient attention to just a brief recapitulation of a few things that have been brought out in the discussion of this proposition.

You remember that I started out with the statement that where there was direct contact, where there was direct impact of the Holy Spirit with the human heart, no means was used, because there was no medium between the power that operates and the thing operated upon. My friend has admitted that the Spirit operates by direct contact. He has contended, however, that, notwithstanding that fact, means are used. Now the issue between us on that is, my contention is that means must come between the power that acts and the thing acted upon, through which the power acts, and that if the thing acting comes in direct contact with that upon which it acts, there is no means used because there is nothing between, coming to this conclusion by the definition of the word means, something that comes in between. Now our difference upon that is before the people and will go to the people for their study.

I contend in the second place that regeneration is represented in the word of God as a resurrection from death. I showed that in the resurrection of the body by the Spirit no means are employed. Since the resurrection of the soul is from death, then it follows in that work no means are employed. I showed that if the Spirit dwells in the child of God, having resurrected his soul from death in sins, that same Spirit will also quicken his mortal body and by the same almighty operation. As the *one* is without a means, so the *other* must be. He has contended that death in sins, however, does not signify a helpless state; that one dead in sins has power to do in a spiritual way. There is the issue between us in reference to that point. That has been already discussed. I have contended that as natural action must come from natural life, so spiritual action must come from spiritual life. That the life must be first.

In the third place I have contended that regeneration is represented in the Scriptures as a creation, and that in every case of creation, where a creation is effected or accomplished, the Spirit of God operates on the creature without means, without any medium or agency.

I have contended that in the parable of the sower the good ground represents the honest and good heart, that it is made good in the work of regeneration before the seed is sown, and that the sowing of the seed makes no difference in the nature of the ground, and so does not represent regeneration. I have contended, next, that the sinner must first be *of God*, or, in other words, *be born* of God, before he can spiritually hear God's word. I have proved that people that are of the world hear the world, while people of God hear the true gospel of Jesus Christ with a spiritual understanding and spiritual hearing. It has been my argument, further, that whatever is essential in regeneration in any case must be essential in all cases. Understand what I mean here. What is *essential*-I do not mean the way the thing may be done. I don't contend for that. I have argued that whatever is essential in *one* case must be essential in *all* cases. If sowing the seed in hearts by preaching to the hearts is essential to the regeneration of these hearts in *one* case, it is in *all* cases. If it can be done without that in one case, it can be done in all cases. That has been my contention. I have proved that position.

I will not take time further in recapitulating, as my time is now almost up. I will leave the matter before you as I have presented it. I want you to bear this one thing in mind, however: that I showed by the teaching of the Apostle in [Eph 2](#) that these Ephesians, before they were quickened or regenerated, had pursued an evil course, and had gone the wrong

way, and that the Apostle doesn't teach that they first turned about and sought the Lord, whom they did not love, and then the Lord quickened them because they sought Him, but that they were going the wrong way. That even when they were dead in sins God loved them so much that by His Holy Spirit He quickened them together with Christ. It signifies that just as Christ was raised from the dead, just as He was resurrected, so the Spirit of God raised the dead souls of the Ephesians; He quickened them. To quicken is to give life. He quickened them when they were going the wrong way. Saul was going a wrong course. God quickened him while he was on that course. It was not when Saul had turned himself about. God did it for him, and that brought him down. So my contention is that a person may sit under the sound of the true gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, his heart being unchanged, his mind being in enmity against God, not subject to His law and cannot be, and like a stone his heart will continue while the gospel is preached in his hearing. He will sit there and care nothing about it. Like the Jews that despised our Saviour, so people unregenerated will despise the gospel. They will have no love for the gospel until God, by His omnipotent Spirit, changes their hearts. A person may be sitting under the gospel; that sinner may make fun of the preacher. He may say in his mind, that is not my condition. At another time the same preacher may be preaching the same thing, when that sinner, under the sound of that preacher's voice, will melt down into weeping and say, "He is talking about me; he is describing my condition." What made the change? It was not the *preaching*, but the *Spirit of God*, that changed his heart. It was not the *sound* of the *preaching*. No sir. It was not the *sound* of the *preaching*, but it was the *Spirit* that did it. It was the Spirit that reached his heart, and as the Spirit changed his heart he melted down into weeping. He says, "Oh, I am a sinner, and I never saw it before. I never realized it before in my life."

But not only may that be the case, but persons may be away off, far from any preacher of the gospel, far away from any of God's faithful children. Yes, sir, he may be far away from relatives, far away from friends, and God's blessed Spirit finds his heart. I call to mind a precious young man whom I met in Southern Virginia a few years ago while conducting a discussion over there. The father was a preacher of our order. That young man had gone out in the navy. While he was down in the cabin of his vessel he was brought to feel he was lost, a hell-deserving sinner, far away from his precious father and his dear mother. But he was not far away from Jesus, not far away from the blessed Lord. God was there. I say to you, my friends, God is not dependent upon the vehicle of preaching to take Him anywhere. David said, "If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me."

(Time expired.)

Just a moment or two, now grant me. I want to thank you, my precious friends, for your patient attention, not only to the part that Brother Throgmorton has spoken, but also especially to that which I have said. I appreciate it. I feel to love you. If you do not agree with me, let our disagreement be in friendship. Let it be with good will. God knows I intend malice toward none. I have good will for all. I believe what I have contended for. I believe you will grant my sincerity in that. I do not believe you are disposed to doubt it.

I want to thank these brethren moderators. I appreciate your being with us and sitting and acting in this capacity, and I am glad in my heart, Brother Danbury and Brother Ratcliff, that Brother Throgmorton and I haven't given you any more trouble than we have. We have tried to demean ourselves as Christian gentlemen, and wherein I have failed I ask your pardon. It has been of the head and not of the heart.

Again I want to take the hand of Brother Throgmorton. You were at my home once. I invite you again. I will do my best for you; I will keep you a week or a month, and charge you nothing. That is the way the Old Baptists are.

I want to thank you, Miss Parish. You have labored hard. Sometimes I have spoken rapidly and made you hurry, but I believe you have succeeded. I have confidence in you.

As a last word, farewell to all, and if we meet no more in this world of sorrow and separation, my prayer is that we may meet in heaven, where there will be no tears, no sorrow, no separation. This comes from the depth of my poor heart.

Farewell.