

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 *'ilasmov* (*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 shall 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 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 made 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, and hath 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 for 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 *bereth* of the Old Testament, and the Greek word *diathka* (*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 sanctifeth 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 mc 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 mc 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. Burn 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 to 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 he 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 in 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 Mosaic 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 sinners 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 unfeigned 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 tile 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 acceptation, 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 giving 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.. God 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 time, a warm time, and Both 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 is concerning 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 acceptation, 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 as 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 preserve 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; neither 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 he 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 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 choosest and causest 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 suntelesqhnaı 'amartian (Tou suntelesthenai hamartian). The Greek infinitive in this phrase suntelesqhnaı 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 'amartian (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 adikias (Tou exilasasthai adikias); the infinitive ecilasasqai (exilasasthai), 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 adikias (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 hear 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 choosest and causest 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 suntelesqhnaı 'amartian (Tou suntelesthenai hamartian). The Greek infinitive in this phrase suntelesqhnaı 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 hear 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 then, 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 5th 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 antitype 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 lied, 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 specially 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 de sires 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.)