

A THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION BETWEEN ELDER JOHN R. DAILY OF THE OLD BAPTIST CHURCH AND ELDER W. P. THROGMORTON OF THE MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH Held at the Missionary Baptist College in Ewing, Ill., August 13, 14, 15, 16, 1912. MODERATORS Eld. C. W. Radcliff; Eld. G. W. Danbury REPORTED BY Miss Carrie 13. Parish, Harrisburg, Ill. Indianapolis, Ind. DAILY & SONS 1912.

SECOND PROPOSITION—THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT GOD EMPLOYS THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL AS A MEANS IN THE REGENERATION OF SINNERS ELD. THROGMORTON'S FIRST SPEECH Gentlemen, Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen I want to set this chart here for a little bit so you can all see the proposition. (Sets chart containing proposition in place.) I want you to see it as well as hear it: "The Scriptures teach that God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners." It is my province to affirm that proposition. Brother Daily's to deny it. I wish incidentally to call attention to a mistake in the reading of our rules. In the quotation from "Hedges' Rules of Controversy," the word "Argument" is used where the word "Proof" should be used. I hope this will be remembered if the rules are printed in the book. It gives me great pleasure to affirm this proposition in discussion with my worthy friend once more. A year ago we had a delightful discussion of it. So far, we have had a pleasant discussion here. As has been said before, we met here at the beginning as friends, and I am sure we are now better friends still. The fact is, I esteem my opponent as a man very highly. I have been entertained in his home. I ate salt with him, besides other good things, and had a fine social time. He has a good wife and a nice family—a family that he ought to be proud of, and I have no doubt is; but in questions of this sort matters of friendship, of course, should cut no figure; neither should differences of this sort decrease the friendship that should exist between good men. I will begin this morning by defining, briefly, the terms of the proposition. "The Scriptures teach." By the Scriptures, I mean the Old and New Testaments, what we actually accept as the Bible, we Baptists, and Protestants generally. The term "teach" occurs. The proposition says "The Scriptures teach." That means they make known, and so what I mean is this: The Scriptures fairly interpreted teach, make known, what my proposition affirms. The first word in the proposition proper is "God" (not the first word in the writing but in the affirmation) God, the Supreme one, the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit; that is what I mean by the term God; and we will have no difference on that. We have heard Brother Daily on the God-head and he is orthodox. The Scriptures teach that "God employs." That word "employs" means that God makes use of, or uses the Gospel in the regeneration of sinners, and in doing that work he uses the preaching of the Gospel. That is my affirmative. The Gospel means the story of Christ crucified, buried and risen, and the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in him. If you will excuse me I will be a little more deliberate in my speech this morning. I shall also, on account of my ill health, have to be a little quiet in my delivery. In 1Co 15:1-4 we find Paul saying: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand, by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory that which I have preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." That is Paul's definition of the Gospel, the term in my proposition. He also gives it a further definition in Ro 1:16: "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." The next item in the proposition is the preaching of this Gospel. The preaching of this Gospel is employed by the Godhead in the regeneration

of sinners. Preaching means proclamation in a way to make known; it means to proclaim so as to teach. That other term “Means.” Means as defined in the Standard Dictionary, is the medium through which anything is done; the process in order to obtain an end; the subservient or secondary agency, instrumentality.” This from the Standard is as good a definition I think as I could make. God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. That word, “regeneration,” means the work of God in imparting to the human soul the divine nature and the divine life and making the children of Adam the children ‘of Jehovah. That is what I mean by regeneration. The last term to define: “Sinners.” This means persons who have transgressed God’s law. “Sin is the transgression of the law.” I have now a little preliminary statement which I wish to make before I begin my arguments: In producing any being—vegetable or animal—the germ or seed is necessary. The implantation of the germ or seed is the means employed in order to the production of the new being. The most beautiful flower-pot filled with the most fertile soil will not produce a flower without seed. The means in order to the production of the flower is the implantation of the seed. The Gospel or word of God, is the seed of the Kingdom of God. In planting or sowing this seed God employs preaching. See Lu 8:4-8, the parable of the sower, and Lu 8:11-15, the explanation. I want to read you: “And when much people were gathered together, and were come to him out of every city, he spake in parable; A sower went out to sow his seed, and as he sowed, some fell by the wayside, and it was trodden down, and the fowls of the air devoured it. And some fell upon a rock, and as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it lacked moisture. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprang up with it, and choked it. And others fell on good ground, and sprang up, and bare fruit an hundredfold. And when he had said these things, he cried, He that hath ears to hear let him hear.” There is the parable. Now here is the explanation: “Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God. Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved. They on the rock are they, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away. And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection. But that on the good ground are they, which, in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience.” We see from this that the heart of a man is the soil; the seed is the word of God, the gospel; the sowing is preaching the word or explaining the word. In our correspondence, more than a year ago, before we had the former discussion, Brother Daily refused to deny that God employs, the truth of the gospel—put the emphasis on the truth—in the regeneration of sinners. He does, however, deny that God uses or employs that truth when preached! That is his denial. God, he says, doesn’t use that truth this way when it is preached. So, according to Brother Daily, preaching the truth is a bad thing for the truth. It puts it where God will not employ it. Surely this robs God of his sovereignty. It limits him to what is entirely outside the word. It cuts him off from employing his truth if it be in preaching. For instance, to illustrate: We employ water to quench thirst. When the water is in a drinking cup or glass we employ the glass or cup as a medium to get that water to our thirst. If Brother Daily’s logic be worth anything, the employment of a cup or glass would hinder the water from quenching thirst. Brother Daily has it that God employs the truth in the regeneration of sinners, but holds that if that truth be in words spoken, God will not employ it. I think I am stating that fairly. More as to this later perhaps. You know it is of great importance that the question be understood. So I am giving a good deal of time to the defining of the question. The question before

us is not a question as to what God's power is. It is a question as to what God's method is. God could make the giant oak of the first without an acorn. But that is not the method he employs. He employs the acorn. And he as truly makes the oak when he employs the acorn as he made the first oak that was without an acorn. So our question is not whether God regenerates sinners! That is in my affirmation; I say in it that God regenerates sinners; we both agree that he does. But my affirmative is that, in doing it, he uses the preaching of the gospel. That is not ruling God out. God is in, and God does the work! And we are both agreed to this. The one question is: Does God, in regenerating sinners, employ the preaching of the Gospel as a means? Is that God's method? As to the mere question of power God could regenerate sinners with means or without means; he could employ the preaching of the gospel in regenerating sinners or he could regenerate them without employing the preaching. I affirm that his method is—that the Scriptures teach that his method is to employ the preaching of the gospel. That is what I have to prove and that is what I am going to prove. Another preliminary remark I desire to give you. This remark is that in denying my proposition Brother Daily is out of harmony with the "Old Baptist Faith." Do you get that? In denying my proposition Brother Daily is out of harmony with the Old Baptist Faith! He sets himself squarely against the Old Baptist Confession of Faith. If he shows that I am wrong in this discussion, he will show that the Old Confession of the Seven Churches in London, of 1644, was wrong. He will show that the "Somerset Confession" (of churches in West England), 1656, was wrong. He will show that the "Old London Confession" of 1689, of which his people have boasted so much, is wrong. He will show that the Philadelphia Confession is wrong. If he shows that my proposition is wrong, good bye to the doctrine of the old Baptists. I am here to defend the 'Old Baptist Faith, as to what is involved in this proposition. Brother Daily is here to oppose it, and to over throw it, if he can! Will you "Old School" Baptists follow him in this? Now for the facts: I will quo first, from the Confession of 1644, issued by Seven Churches in London. Speaking concerning faith it says: "That faith is ordinarily begot by the preaching of the Gospel, or Word of Christ," etc. Art. 24. See McClothlin's "Baptist Confessions of Faith," page 181. Proof text given, Ro 10:17. "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" also 1Co 1:21. The Somerset Confession in West England, 1656: "We believe that the Spirit is administered (that means 'given,' in that old way of expressing it) by or through the word of faith preached." (Ga 3:2.) "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith; that the Spirit is administered by or through the word of faith preached, which word was first declared by the Lord himself and was confirmed by them that heard him." Baptist Confessions of Faith, page 201. "That this Spirit of Christ, being administered by the word of faith, worketh in us faith in Christ," etc. Same work, page 207. These works show us plainly what those Baptists believed. What is in my proposition? The same idea: that faith comes by hearing. Inasmuch as regeneration comes by faith, then regeneration comes by the preaching of the Gospel. I come to the "Old London Confession," 1677. "Those whom God has predestinated unto life, he is pleased in his appointed and accepted time effectually to call (How?) By his word and Spirit out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ." How? By the Spirit alone? No, sir. By his Word and Spirit. That is the Old Baptists Faith. Chapter 10 of the Old London Confession. Mr. Daily: What section is that? Section 1 I believe it is. There is another point I wanted to give in the way of a preliminary. This question before us is not as to election or predestination or effectual calling or limited atonement. And all the time that my opponent may waste in discussing any one or more of those questions, is waste indeed. Our question is not whether salvation is conditional or unconditional; our question is just one thing: whether God

employs preaching in the regeneration of sinners! I hope this will be remembered by my worthy opponent and by the audience as well. Let me now go on with this testimony. "The grace of faith (this is from the old London Confession) whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word." That is by the preaching of the Gospel, don't you see? This is the Old London Confession, chapter 14, paragraph 1. This same point is found in the Old Philadelphia Confession. In denying my proposition, I want to say further, that Brother Daily not only sets himself against the "Old Baptist Confessions," but also against noted worthies whom he and his people have honored as leaders. All who were in the assembly of 1689, who approved and sent out the London Confession; those in the old Philadelphia Association when it adopted its confession, the one known by its name; Dr. John Gill, Dr. R. W. Fain, Dr. John M. Watson, Morgan Edwards, John Gano. I just want to call your attention to this list of names. These all endorsed these words which I have read from the Confessions and which Brother Daily denies in denying this proposition. But by the way, before I give you these quotations from these men, I have a few questions to present which he can answer at his leisure, or he can answer them in his next speech if he desires. Do you accept the statement in the Confession of 1644 that faith is ordinarily begot by the preaching of the Word?" (This is going on record.) Do you accept the statement in the Somerset Confession of 1656 that "the Spirit is administered by or through the word of faith preached?" Do you accept the statement on page 10 of the London Confession of 1689 that it pleases God effectually to call the elect by his Word and Spirit out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ?" "Do you agree with page 14 of the London Confession that faith is ordinarily wrought in the elect by the preaching of the Word?" That is on record. I don't ask Brother Daily to answer these in his next speech unless he wants to. Mr. Daily: I will. All right; we shall be glad to hear you. Will you old people who have so long boasted of your leaders and the London Confession—will you follow him in his issue with that Confession? (Someone in the audience nodded yes.) One brother says he will. All right. Some people follow their leader no matter where they go. I want to show you about Dr. John Gill. I want to show what Dr. Gill affirms in his comment on Jas 1:18: "But he begets us of his, own free grace, and favor, and of his rich and abundant mercy, and of his sovereign will and pleasure, according to his counsels and purposes of old" Well, what next? "And the means—that word "means over there in the proposition on the chart—"he makes use of—"that signifies employs, or with which he does it—is the word of truth; not Christ, who is the Word and truth itself, but the Gospel which is the word of truth, and truth itself, and contains nothing but truth; and by this souls are begotten and born again." That is Dr. Gill, Brother Daily. He refers to Eph 1:13. Yes, sir; Brother Daily knows it, but is setting himself against him. 1Pe 1:23. Dr. Gill also refers to, and this is what he says: "And hence ministers of it"—that is, ministers of the Gospel—"are accounted spiritual fathers." Now I will quote from R. W. Fain, page 15 of the Old Baptist Test. This is in the preface to Dr. Watson's great book: "Upon this principle the Gospel is preached to all, repentance and an interest in a Saviour's blood is offered to all." What was that we heard about offering salvation yesterday? That is neither here nor there of course! Brother Fain continues: "The charitable invitation, whosoever will, goes out to all, inviting them to take the water of life freely." Dr. John M. Watson: "To show that the will of God is in his word; 'of his own free will,' says James, "begat he us with the word of truth." "Old Baptist Test," page 421. David Jones' Circular Letter in the Old Philadelphia Association minutes, 1788, endorsed by that association: "The precious gift of faith is a free and sovereign gift of God, conveyed through the power of the Holy

Ghost, and the instrumentality of the Word.” This is what I want you to hear: “is co-existent with regeneration if not an essential part of it.” Isn’t that my proposition? Brother Jones says “faith is coexistent with regeneration”—History of the Philadelphia Association, page 240. Morgan Edwards (supposedly—it is not sure, but it is understood that he wrote it) approved by the Philadelphia Association, 1766: “Oh! Pray for your ministers, that the Lord will make them successful instruments in his hands for the comfort of saints (that is true isn’t it? But it doesn’t stop there) and the conversion of sinners.” Now from Elder John Gano, endorsed by the Old Philadelphia Association. Those “Old Baptists” you know. Philadelphia Association minutes, 1784. He is talking about effectual calling, as per tenth chapter of the Confession, first paragraph: “This is an act of sovereign grace, which flows from the everlasting love of Cod, and is such an irresistible impression made by the Holy Spirit upon the human soul, as to effect a blessed change.” I haven’t got to the issue yet. “This impression or call is sometimes immediate”— there are exceptional cases—”as in the instance of Paul and others—though more ordinarily through the instrumentality of the Word and providence of God.” So, Brother Daily, in denying my proposition, is off the old Baptist track and you are going to follow him, are you? He is out of line with the Old Baptist Confession! and will you follow him? He is out of line with the American Baptist Fathers before the great division of 1832, and is at cross purposes with some of the best of the “Old School” Baptists since the division. For instance, Watson and Fain. I am coming now to argue the proposition. I think we understand the issue clearly and where we are. Argument Number One: My first argument I base on the fact that John in his gospel teaches that God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a means in bringing men to faith in Jesus Christ and to life; or in other words, uses the preaching of the Gospel in producing faith and in communicating life which is regeneration. Joh 1:6-8: “There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.” (That was John the Baptist.) “The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light (that is to preach. What for? Why did John come?) “that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light.” The purpose was that all through him might believe. God employed this preaching of John to make believers. God sent him that men through him might believe”. He preached as in Joh 3:36: “that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” To make this point more clear let us read Joh 20:30-31: “And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not, written in this book. But these are written” (What for?) “that ye might believe ‘that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and” (what else?) “and that believing ye might have life through his name.” Having life through his name is regeneration, Brother Daily. Now the purpose of the written words (which are the same as the spoken words when you preach,) is, first: That men “may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,” and, in addition to that, that by believing they might have life through his name. You see both the faith and the life come through these written words and these spoken words as in the case of preaching the Gospel. God employs the written or spoken word in producing faith and in giving life. And, Brother Daily, the communication of life is regeneration. Argument Number Two: Jesus while here in the flesh taught that God employs the preaching of the Gospel in producing faith and in giving life. Joh 17:20: “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.” How do men believe? “Through their word!” Through the preaching of the Apostles. Jesus knew that men would believe, and he prays for them that believe through their word. Here faith was to be produced through the word; the word as a means. Jesus declares elsewhere that whoever thus believes has eternal life. Joh 5:24: “Verily,

verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." And the believing is in order to the life. "That believing ye might have life," John says. Believing and coming to Christ are the same. Joh 6:35: "And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." And the coming is in order to life. Note that the coming is not because you already have life. It is in order to life. Listen to the word, Joh 5:40: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me that ye might have life." What is it to come to Christ? To believe on him. How do we believe on him? Through the Apostle's word. What are we to get by coming to Christ? Life. What is the communication of life? Regeneration. So then, the proposition is true that "God employs the preaching of the Gospel in the regeneration of sinners"—in giving life to sinners. The Word is preached that men may hear; they hear that they may believe or come: they believe or come that they may have life. The hearing, the believing and the life are all of God, and in giving them, he uses the Word as a means. Don't let us misunderstand. God uses the Word as a means. The communication of life is regeneration. It is not given to unbelievers, but to believers through hearing the Word. Argument Number Three: I come next to argument three. Salvation, which involves regeneration, is wrought of God through the preaching of the Gospel. 1Co 1:18: "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." 1Co 1:21: "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God; it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Now the preaching of the Gospel is the power of God to the saved. So reads that eighteenth verse there. It is that by which, as a means, they are saved. God does the saving. He saves those that believe, and it pleases him, in saving them, to employ the preaching of the Gospel, isn't that plain? Just as plain as my hand. In this I am supported by Dr. John Gill on 1Co 1:21, that passage I have just quoted. Listen to him: "So the wise men of the world, with all their wisdom are left ignorant of God, and perish in their sins, whilst the Gospel which they despise is the power of God unto salvation, to all that believe in Christ; this, through efficacious grace, becomes the means of regenerating and quickening men, showing them their need of salvation, and where it is, and of working faith in them to look to Christ for it." But perhaps I had better show you how the Old Baptists far back regarded Dr. Gill. You have all heard of the Old Philadelphia Association. In 1807 that body adopted this: "This Association resolves to support the Publishing of the work to the utmost." That was Dr. Gill's Commentary which I have been quoting. To support the work to the utmost; they also recommended "to each church to subscribe for a COPY of this incomparable work for the use of their minister." And yet Dr. Gill's incomparable work conforms to my proposition. Hassell's Church History, a work, I am informed, which is held in high esteem by "Old School" Baptists, says on page 655: "John Gill of London was the soundest, the most learned and most able Baptist theologian since the death of the Apostle John—the author of a complete critical commentary of the old and new Testaments, and of a complete body of divinity—the only man that ever hunted and drove out Arminianism from the explanation of every verse in the Bible, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelations." These "Old School" preachers here were glad that Arminianism was put out and John Gill, in running Arminianism out completely from the Bible, is complimented by them. Argument Number Four: Now I have argument four to give you. Peter informs us that when God regenerated the first Gentile converts mentioned in the New Testament, he did it through the preaching of the Gospel as a means. You remember how Peter was sent to Cornelius' house and about his sermon

when he got there. Read Ac 10:11 for the whole story. Also read Ac 15:7. Here is what he says. It was at the Council at Jerusalem when they were discussing whether the Gentiles would submit to the law and be circumcised after the manner of Moses to be saved. Ac 15:7— “And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe!” But I am not through yet. “And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the holy Ghost, even as he did unto us”—I am not through—“and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts”—How?—“By faith.” Were their hearts pure before Peter went down there? Was it before Peter went down there, and before they believed? No, sir! “Purifying their hearts by faith.” Who purified their hearts? God. How did he do it? By faith. How did he work faith in them? Read the seventh verse again: “God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe,” and by that believing which was through the word preached to them, God purified the hearts. God did it. God purified their hearts by faith. Not without faith. Not before faith. But by it. And faith was worked in them by Peter’s preaching. That is God’s word. Using preaching as the instrumentality, as the old Baptist authorities say, the Holy Spirit worked faith in them. Here we have all the terms of my proposition. It is a rule of controversy that the proofs must contain the terms to be proven or their equivalent. I have found the equivalent where I have not found the term itself. Here we have God; we have God employing the preaching of the Gospel, we have regeneration; we have purification of the heart—God “purifying their hearts.” I think that means regeneration. God purifies their hearts and in doing so he employed the preaching of the Gospel. Now I appeal to you! Doesn’t all this prove my proposition? As Brother Daily said yesterday, let us lay aside prejudice. Let us take the word of our God, no matter where it leads us. By the preaching of the Gospel they believed. This believing was faith and by this faith God purified their hearts. Their hearts were not purified, as I said a moment ago before faith, but by faith, and God did it. Don’t forget that. He purified their hearts and in purifying their hearts he used Peter’s preaching, to work the faith in them and he purified them by the faith. Argument Five: I will give you Argument Five. I am pretty well stocked up, but I want to ask you again to pardon me for being slow this morning. Paul states it as the Gospel rule that God employs the preaching of the Gospel in producing faith. Ro 10:8-17, “But what saith it? ‘What says the word of faith? That is the meaning. The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith, which we preach; That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation. For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. “How then shall they call in whom they have not believed and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher (the preacher of the Gospel)? And how shall they preach except they be sent as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace and bring glad tidings of good things. “But they have not all obeyed the Gospel For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? (17th verse) So then faith—I have read all this to reach this conclusion—“So then faith cometh by hearing.” How? By hearing. “And hearing by the word.” Isn’t that plain enough for you? Looks plain to me. Nothing could be plainer. The word of faith is preached. Men hear, men believe and are saved. God

employs the word of God in producing faith. By this faith men are saved, have life, are purified, are regenerated. Eph 2:8, "By grace are you saved through faith." Not before faith. Not without faith, but by faith. And how does faith come? "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God." That this salvation involves regeneration, see verses 4 and 5: Eph 2:4-5, "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved). "The quickening and the salvation are the same. The quickening is by faith. Yes, sir; it is by faith. It is not before faith, it is by it. And it is the salvation—the regeneration. I desire to give you what Dr. John Gill says commenting on Ro 10:17. Possibly some of you may have made eyes at my interpretation of this passage. "So then, faith cometh by hearing—that is, by preaching; for the word hearing is used in the same sense as in the preceding verse; and designs the report of the Gospel, or the preaching of the word, which is the means God makes use of to convey faith into the hearts of his people; for preachers are ministers, or instruments, by whom others believe." Dr. Gill's commentary on Ro 10:17. Argument Six: I want to give Brother Daily a chance to see these arguments. I don't want to save them up to the last. Paul clearly teaches that faith comes by hearing and after hearing. Eph 1:13, "in whom ye also trusted after that ye heard, that is you trusted in Christ." (When?) "whom also ye trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise." With the faith and through the faith, as a means, comes life, the communication of which means regeneration. God employs the preaching of the word of truth, which is the Gospel, in regenerating sinners. I will not elaborate here very extensively just now, but will pass, if you please, to Argument Seven: We are specifically taught that uses the word as a means in what is called quickening. Ps 119:50. David says: "Thy word hath quickened me." Doubtless he quickened the Ephesians just as he did David. See Eph 2:1, "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and in sins." Notice who did the quickening. God. That is what my proposition says: "God employs the preaching of the Gospel." He does the quickening, and in doing it, he employs the preaching of the Gospel. Joh 20:30-31, "But these are written that ye might I that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." Not life before believing. Not life without believing, but life by believing. Argument Eight: Now I will give you Argument Eight, if I have time, Brother Daily. 1Co 3:5-7 shows that God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a mean in the regeneration of sinners: "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos, watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase." Here again we have all the terms of my proposition or their equivalent. Paul preached the Gospel and thus planted the good seed in their hearts. The result was, believers—children of God—God is in the proposition; he caused the seed to grow. Planting the seed was a means which God employed in the regeneration of the Corinthian sinners. In fact, when there is no seed there can be no growth. But the planter and the planting of the seed count. It is God's ordinary way of producing new beings. He used Paul and Apollos simply as a means. They were ministers by whom the Corinthians were made believers. God gave the increase, but he gave it through the preaching of Paul; through the preaching of the Gospel. The increase was the regenerated sinners. That was the way God gave it. Argument Nine: In another place the Corinthians are declared to be the epistles of Christ. That is Christ had written in their hearts. They were thus made what they were not before. They were regenerated; before they were not regenerated. Here are the words: 2Co 3:3, "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of

Christ ministered by us, written not with ink; but with the Spirit of the living God, not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." The Corinthians' hearts were the paper; the Holy Spirit was the ink; Paul was the pen; Christ was the writer. God had employed Paul's preaching as a means; through that means the Holy Spirit reached their hearts and there imprinted and emplaced his own nature, which means regeneration. Now I appeal to you, my friends, if in these two passages from the letters to the Corinthians, are not all the terms of the proposition which I have affirmed. God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. Could anything be plainer? And so we have it that Paul teaches, and Peter teaches, and John teaches, and Jesus teaches—God himself teaches—that in the regeneration of sinners God employs the preaching of the Gospel. My friends, I want you to take these arguments and think about them and construe them; I trust my opponent will take up the proofs—what care I for the argument, if he shows there is nothing in the proofs? I want him to examine the proofs and show, if he can, that what I have said is in them is not in them. If he does that, he meets my arguments. (Time expired.) ELD. DAILY'S FIRST REPLY Gentlemen, Moderators, Worthy Opponent. Ladies and Gentlemen: It gives me great pleasure this morning to appear before you, and thus approach what I feel to be my privilege as well as my duty to respond to the speech to which you have just patiently listened. I appreciate more than I can express the compliments of my Brother opponent of myself and my family. I was glad to have him at my home. We would have treated him better than we did if we could, and if I ever have the pleasure again of having his company there I will try to do as well or even better than I did then. Mr. Throgmorton: "Don't think you can do it." I esteem him as a high-toned. Christian gentleman and we entertain no ill feelings toward each other. We differ, but differ honestly. We differ in friendship. I want to say to those who may infer from me in this discussion, that I hold no malice in my heart toward any. Both the propositions we agreed to discuss at this time were worded by my opponent, he would not consent to have it word "atone" in the first proposition, or the word "necessarily" in this. In our correspondence he insisted that no Missionary Baptist, no representative Missionary Baptist, had ever taken the position that the preaching of the Gospel is really necessary in the regeneration of sinners, and so would not have the word necessary in the proposition. He spoke of my objection to affirm that God makes use of the truth of the Gospel. I objected to that term because it was somewhat ambiguous and would allow the affirmant to make a play upon it. Now it is important that the people understand this to begin with: that either he regards the Gospel really necessary to the regeneration of sinners, or that he does not. If he does not regard the preaching of the Gospel as really necessary there is not so much between us as there would be if he did regard the preaching as really necessary: so that to show these people and get before you clearly just how much there is between us and what is the exact issue. I desire to get this matter settled in the beginning of this question. I hold in my hand a printed pamphlet containing the report of an oral debate held about fifty years ago between Elder G. M. Thompson of the Primitive Baptist Church and Elder Selvidge, of the Missionary Church at Calhoun, Ga. In this, on page 8, Mr. Selvidge says: "The Gospel is the means God has appointed for the conversion of the world. It must therefore be preached or the world must remain in unbelief. The Bible must be printed in the different languages and sent to the different nations before they can be redeemed from heathenism and idolatry. The mind and judgment have to be informed and convinced of the truth of the Gospel before we can believe or have faith, and preaching is the means God has appointed for this, purpose." On pages 42 and 43, he says: "The Gospel is the means of grace, and without it none can be saved; for none can believe on him of whom they have not heard, and none

can hear without a preacher. The Gospel must be preached before sinners can be converted. The day of miracles is past, and we now live in the day of means, and it is only in the use of those means that the world is to be converted to God. We must plant our seed and cultivate our ground if we expect to gather a crop. Mr. Thompson's corn will not grow if he does not cultivate it; and we cannot expect sinners to be converted unless we use the means. Faith comes by hearing, and is the fruit of testimony; without testimony we cannot believe anything. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. Faith is the condition of salvation, and if we believe not we shall be damned; and this faith we can never have without a preached Gospel." One more quotation from this book. On page 26, Mr. Selvidge says: "God speaks to man through human language, and human language alone. I would like to know what words the Holy Ghost ever said to Mr. Thompson. There is a great deal of talk about the Holy Ghost that is vain and foolish, the people are taught to look for some miraculous light, some supernatural invitation, but this is all superstition. The Gospel is to be preached, and the world is to be evangelized through human efforts, and by language, and language alone, does God speak to men. We know nothing but what we learn; and it is by use of human language that we learn all we know, either as men or as Christians. This is the age of means, and it is by the use of means and human language that men are taught religion." Now Mr. Selvidge was a representative Missionary Baptist preacher, chosen by his people to represent them in this discussion with Mr. Thompson. But it may be that Brother Throgmorton has never seen this work, and when he wrote that no representative Missionary Baptist ever did take the position that the preaching of the Gospel is a necessary means in the regeneration of sinners, he had not read this work and did not know that Mr. Selvidge said this. I will, therefore, give him something a little more modern than that. I have a debate between Eller Cayce and Elder Penick. It will not be disputed I am sure that he is a representative Missionary Baptist. I heard him two days. He has had fifty-three discussions he informed me, and I regard him as an able man. In this work, page 237. Mr. Penick says: "Never have I admitted that any man was saved before hearing the Gospel." On page 333 he says, speaking of his opponent, "So you see the point that he makes is that there are regenerate people who are not believers, and these regenerate people who are not believers in heathen lands must he made believers by the preachers. He thinks these will be saved. Is there somebody who is not a believer that will be saved, Brother Cayce? That never heard the Gospel, don't have to hear it? "Again, on page 259, he says, "I have you any evidence that any one is saved who has never heard or believed the Gospel? I don't find the case. I should be glad to find it." From these plain, statements, and many others made by Elder Penick it is certain that he as a representative Missionary Baptist preacher taught that the preaching of the Gospel is absolutely necessary to the work of regeneration. It may be possible that my worthy opponent is so busy with his editorial and preaching work and other duties that he has not been able to read this work very carefully and has not noticed that Elder Penick said that in that debate. And not having just noticed that, he made the assertion that no representative Missionary Baptist had ever said the preaching was a necessary means in the regeneration of sinners. To refresh my opponent's memory a little, I shall now give a few quotations from the Potter-Throgmorton debate. I give these statements from Brother Throgmorton himself, to refresh his mind, for surely he had forgotten he said these things when he wrote me that no representative Missionary Baptist had ever taken the position that the preaching of the gospel is really necessary in the work of regeneration. On page 211, Throgmorton-Potter debate: "We plant the incorruptible seed. The church through her ministers is to go forth unto the uttermost parts of the earth

and plant this seed. We do not make it grow, Brother Potter. God giveth the increase. But he does not give it without the seed. We sow the seed, don't you forget that. If you think you can show that he does give increase without seed, try it. Show a single instance where he ever brought anybody to Christ without the word. Do not misunderstand me. I do not say the word atone, not that. The word alone will not bring a man to Christ. 'We are workers together with him.' He prepareth the soil, and maketh the seed to grow; but not where the seed is not. He does not sow the seed by means of his angels or do anything of that sort. Well, how is it? Thus: 'For after that in the wisdom of the world the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God,' 'Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight,' 'It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe,'" Hear Brother Throgmorton again in the same debate. Page 213: "I do not say that salvation is in the preaching; not that. I do not say that the seed alone produces the children of the kingdom; not that. But I do say that it has pleased God to make these things inseparable in the conversion of sinners in all lands, countries and nationalities since the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Now, Brother Throgmorton wrote to me in type capitals that no representative Missionary Baptist had ever taken the position that the preaching was absolutely necessary in the regeneration of sinners. Either he did not regard himself as a representative, or he had forgotten he said it himself. I could give much more of the same kind from this book, but this is sufficient. I have a little work here that was published by Harry Todd when Harry was with the Primitive Baptists, and in this little work on "Church Identity," just to prove without a question of a doubt that the Missionary Baptists had departed from the original faith, Harry gives their Seventh Article, as follows: "That the influence of the Spirit is co-extensive with the proclamation of the Gospel." This must be correct, for Harry knew. That is according to my representation on this black board. (see page 58). The Spirit of God cannot operate beyond the territory in the world's history where preachers preach. Looks like some limitation there. Now this Article of Faith must be correct because Harry knew. He had been a Missionary before he came to us. Then it is a plank of the creed of the Missionary Baptist Church that the preaching of the Gospel is necessary to the regeneration of sinners. In fact, Brother Throgmorton has taken that position in this speech he has just made. But I have agreed to debate with Brother Throgmorton, in a friendly way, with all good feeling, the proposition as worded by him and accepted by me, which has been read in your hearing. My brother handed me some questions to which I believe I will now attend: "Do you agree with Chapter 14 of the London Confession of Faith, that faith is ordinarily wrought in the hearts of the elect by the ministry of the word?" The 14th Chapter, Article One, of the Chapter in the Confession of Faith, says that the grace of faith is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word. There is a distinction, which I desire you to hold in mind throughout the discussion of this proposition, between the life that produces the faith, or out of which the faith comes, and the graces. The faith is a fruit of the Spirit and the Spirit's work in giving life, in producing that fruit, and so I accept this article of the London Confession with the understanding that there is a distinction and difference between the trace and the fruits, and the thing itself which produces them. Very well. "Do you accept the statement in Chapter 10 of the London Confession of 1689, That it pleased God effectually to call (the elect) by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation?" Yes, sir; I accept that with the explanation given in the next paragraph, Section 2, of Chapter Ten—"This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen of man (faith or anything else), nor from any power or agency in the creature co-working with his special grace; the creature being wholly passive therein, is dead in sins and trespasses, until, being

quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace there and conveyed in it, and that by no less power than that which raised up Christ from the dead." Yes, sir; I accept the London Confession of Faith. Brethren, just follow me as long as I keep to the faith. I dare him to show he accepts the wording just as it is in that Second Chapter. Let him say he will. "Do you accept the statement in the Somerset Confession of 1656. That the Spirit is administered by or through the word of faith preached?" I do not accept that statement. I will object to any error that has ever crept into the church from the days of the Apostles down to the present. In the church of Jesus Christ there have crept many errors, even in Confessions and circular letters. When I find any of them erroneous I am going to object. When I find anything taught in these that is not taught, in the word of God, I am going to stand up against them. The next question: "Do you accept the statement in the Confession of 1644, "That faith is ordinarily begot by the preaching of the Word?" I have no objection to that statement. Faith may be, in the sense of belief or accepting a fact as published or taught. In that sense faith is wrought that way. Of course I have no objection to that whatever. In his definitions Brother Throgmorton spoke of God as the Supreme One. Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and said we agreed in reference to that. It may develop, in fact I am not sure but it has already developed, that we are not agreed in regard to the actual supremacy of God; that we are not fully agreed. Passing over his definitions and accepting them except where he places some misconstruction upon the Scriptures—he says in producing any being the germ or seed is necessary, implanting is the means, and the Gospel or word of God is the seed. My contention will be during the discussion of this proposition that the Gospel or word of God is simply the truth, spiritual truth, and the preaching is the proclamation of what is true, the truth. I shall make a distinction between truth and life. I shall show that truth is not life, that life is distinct from truth in the sense of facts existing and published. He calls attention to the parable of the sower, not in any regular argument, but in the line of his definitions and proceeds to make an argument upon that parable to which I shall now give attention. I want you to mark that the Word of God is called the "Word," Mr 4:14; "the Word of God," in Lu 18:1, and that the heart that is said to be represented by the good ground in the parable in Lu 8:15, is called the honest and the good heart, Now that seed, he says, is the truth that the preacher preaches. Well, we accept that. But is that the life? That is the question. Is that the life? I know that seed sown by sowers is living seed, but in this parable what does that seed represent? If it represents eternal life, then my friend is right, but it devolves up to him to prove that it means eternal life—not what the seed is in itself, but what the seed represents. I deny that the seed represents the life. I deny that by my preaching or through my preaching I can speak to dead sinners, dead in trespasses and sins, and give life to them by my speaking this word or preaching it. His position is that the preacher or preaching the truth gives life to dead sinners by his preaching, just as the sower puts life in the ground by sowing. That God depends upon the preacher for the transmission of life to the sinner dead in trespasses and sins. There was no change produced in the ground, the good ground even, by sowing the seed. It is the same ground it was before. There was no change wrought in the stony ground by sowing the seed. There was no change produced in the wayside ground by sowing seed upon it. There was no change in the ground that brought forth thorns, briars, etc., by sowing seeds among those thorns. The sowing produced no change. The ground represents the hearts. The preaching then produces no change in the hearts of people. None whatever. The seed sown cannot be eternal life; because where it fell on the wayside it was taken up the fowls and carried away. If it represents eternal life fowls get eternal life by swallowing the seed they will get salvation, and if it represents eternal life

then eternal life perishes. If it represents eternal life, then eternal life is choked. I deny that it represents eternal life, and call upon him to prove it, which he will never do. He accuses me of having God limited, and speaks of our quenching thirst by the use of a cup. Of course we could employ a gourd to drink our water, but in his system the preached Gospel is the only means. Will you deny it? Your illustrations are rather unfortunate for your cause, to say the least of it. But he says it is not a question of God's power, but a question as to method. But he said yesterday that God could not save a sinner until the sinner came to Christ. So it was a question of power yesterday. It is not a question of power today. Do you say he can save them now? Do you say he has the power to do it? I dare you to get up and say. He says I am out of harmony with the Old Baptist faith, London, Somerset, etc., and I have already answered that by calling your attention to the London Confession. But he calls up John Gill. Now I have John Gill's works. I couldn't bring my library, it is too big. I have a great many Commentaries. Indeed I do not know how many. I will not take the time to count, and I prize all those Commentaries for what they are worth, but they are only worth what is true in them, and I accept what is true. How about John Gill in his Commentary? It did seem that John Gill favored the heresy that I am now opposing and that I expect to successfully oppose in this debate. But John Gill has contradicted himself very much, and if a witness comes into court and testifies concerning a case, and then in addition testifies contradictory to that testimony, his testimony as a witness is set aside. So I shall set John Gill aside. Page 180, Cause of God and Truth—"There is want of spiritual consideration and attention in every man, until God opens his heart, by his powerful grace, as he did Lydia's, to attend to the things which are spoken, or which regard his spiritual welfare. The parable of the seed sown, instanced it, shows that the hearts of unregenerated men are unfit and unprepared to receive the word, and therefore it becomes unfruitful to them." Bless my life, he is against my brother on the parable of the sower! I am discovering something! "And that it is only fruitful where it is received in an honest and good heart, made so by the Spirit and grace of God in regeneration." You see? Well, I just declare! "whence it follows, that regeneration is rather a preparation for the right hearing of the word than the hearing of the word is a preparation for regeneration." Dr. John Gill, page 180. Cause of Regeneration, pages 114 and 115, Body of Divinity, Volume 2: "The instrumental cause of regeneration, if it may be so called, are the word of God and the ministers of it; hence regenerate persons are said to be born again by the word of God. 1 Peter 1:23, and again: Of his own will begat he us by the word of truth, Jas 1:18, unless by the word in these passages should be meant the eternal logos, or essential word of God, Jesus Christ, since logos is used in both places. Though ministers of the Gospel are not only represented as ministers and instruments by whom others believe, but as spiritual fathers." Seems like John Gill put his studying cap on here. Seems like he wanted to get it right. Though you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, says the Apostle to the Corinthians, yet have ye not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the Gospel. So he speaks of his Son Onesimus, whom he had begotten in his bonds. Phm 1:10. Yet this instrumentality of the word in regeneration seems not so agreeable to the principle of grace implanted in the soul in regeneration and to be understood in respect to that, since it is done by immediate infusion and is represented as a creation; and now as God made no use of any instrument in the first and old creation, so neither does it seem so agreeable that he should use any in the new creation; wherefore, this is rather to be understood of the exterior of the principle of grace as the drawing it forth into act and exercise, which is excited and encouraged by the ministry of the word by which it appears that a man is born again. So the three thousand first converts and the jailor were first regenerated, or had the

principle of grace wrought in their souls by the Spirit of God, and then were directed and encouraged by the ministry of the Apostles to repent and believe in Christ; where by it becomes manifest that they were born again." Mr. Throgmorton: What work is that you quote from? Body of Divinity, page 535. "The new man is created in righteousness and. true holiness; the principle of holiness is then formed, from whence holy actions spring. The grace of repentance then appears. The stony, hard, impenitent heart being taken away, and a heart of flesh susceptible of Divine impressions being given; on which to follow a sense of sin, sorrow for it of a godly sort, and repentance unto life and salvation, which is not to be repented of; faith in Christ, which is not of a man's self, but the gift of God, and the operation of the Spirit of God, is now brought into exercise, which being an effect, is an evidence of regeneration." Page 537: "Regeneration is a passive work, or rather, men are passive in it; as they must needs be, in the first infusion and implantation of grace, and the quickening of them; even as passive as the first matter created was, out of which all things were made; and as a dead man when raised from the dead is." So much for John Gill. How about this work from which I am quoting? Was it written when he was a boy and didn't know? By no means. In the Memoirs of John Gill, found in his "Body of Divinity," it is said: "This was his last work, and contains the substance of what he delivered to his people in the space of five or six years." So much for Dr. John Gill. Yes, I stand where Dr. John Gill did in his mature age, when he had thought the matter over studiously. So, as I follow Brother John Gill, my brethren can follow me along. Rather, you follow me as I follow Christ. That is the proper rule. He then calls our attention in his first Argument, to Joh 1 :6-8 and Joh 3:36 and Joh 20:30-31, arguing from this that it was John's teaching that God employs; the preaching of the Gospel in producing faith and consequent life. I believe I will confine my notice of this argument to the notice of Joh 20:30-31, as that seems to be the strongest claim by him made in support of his proposition. Now this verse reads as follows: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." Dead, unregenerate sinners are not meant or addressed in this passage, sinners whose hearts are enmity toward God, who are not subject to his will and cannot be. They are merely natural, having been born of the flesh only. They receive not the things published in the Gospel, because they are foolishness to them, and they cannot know those things because they are spiritually discerned. To say an inducement is offered to them to believe what they do not believe and what they cannot believe while their hearts are unchanged, is absurd. An offer to change their hearts by the gift of eternal life if they will only believe, made to them while they were in a state of enmity, while their hearts are unchanged and unprepared to bring forth the good fruit of faith, is too absurd to be entertained for a moment by any intelligent mind. As they will not receive the spiritual things published in the Gospel and cannot know them, they must be made spiritual by being born of God before they can know them, just as John Gill says. Elder Throgmorton's theory requires them to do what they will not do and cannot do in order to receive the change produced by the gift of eternal life to them. Again, if these things had to be written and believed in order that eternal life might be given and received, then no one had eternal life till they were written and believed. The rebuke of the Jews by the Saviour is in place here, and could be given to all who advocate Elder Throgmorton's false theory: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me." Joh 5:39. How blind they were to think that life was in the mere testimony! They might be excused, but people now ought to know better. In this day of enlightenment, people should not display such blindness as that. In Christ is the life. It is not in

the Bible or the preaching. These are mere testimonies of the life. John was sent to bear witness of that light, and he made no higher claim. No one has a right to claim more. In his second argument he says God employs Gospel preaching in the regeneration of sinners and quotes from Joh 17:20, where it is said that there were those who believed on him through the word of the Apostles. Now we are not discussing as to whether people can believe the truth by hearing it preached. That is not the question. We are discussing whether or not God employs the preaching as a means, a necessary means, at that, in the regeneration of sinners. Of course he has everlasting life, or he cannot believe. Why, to be sure nobody believes but those that have everlasting life. People don't believe without the Spirit. Faith is a fruit of the Spirit. Why, to be sure they have everlasting life, and by their faith they know that. It is the evidence, and so faith is a fruit, the evidence of eternal life there, by that Spirit. So, my friends, it is an evidence of eternal life, and every one that believes has it. In his third argument, he said salvation which involves regeneration is said to be through preaching. There is another little issue between my brother and myself. I hope we will be nearer together when this closes: that is, I hope he will be nearer to me, and that if he should be right, I will be nearer to him. That is fair. Salvation does not always involve regeneration. But notice in 1Co 1:18 it is said that preaching is the power of God to save the believers. Brother Throgmorton said it was the power of God to the saved. We are agreed. If it is the power of God to the saved, it is not the power of God that saves them and regenerates them. It is the power of God to salvation unto every one that believes. It devolves upon him to show that it is the power of God to the unbeliever, to the one who is dead in sins. If he finds a text that says it is the power of God to regenerate the unbeliever, who in his heart despises the truth, then he will succeed in sustaining his position. But on account of his inability to do it, the proposition will never stand. It is said that it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. It is to save the believer from what? From erroneous teaching, false points in doctrine and practice. Salvation in order to bring to him the sweet evidence that God has already regenerated his heart, in which he is made to rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. In his fourth argument, he calls attention to the first Gentile converts and asks if Cornelius was regenerated, quoting Ac 1:7-9. It is said in that passage that their hearts were purified by faith. We want to know what the nature of that purification is; whether it is a purification from a state of death in sins or a purification from error. God had cleansed Cornelius and his household, before Peter preached to them, by the work of regeneration, is my position. To convince Peter that he had a people among the Gentiles that he should preach to, the Lord let down a vessel unto him as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, wherein were all manner of four footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts and creeping things and fowls of the air. "And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call thou not common." God had already cleansed the Gentiles before sending Peter down there. This is proof that Cornelius was cleansed by regeneration before Peter ever saw him. He was said to be a "devout man." A devout man is one devoted to religion and piety. He "feared God." The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. Pr 1:7. "It shall be well with them that fear God." Ec 8:12. He prayed to God and was heard and answered. He was a worker of righteousness. "He that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Ac 10:35. He was born of God, therefore, for 1Jo 2:29, says: "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him." Now Cornelius was doing righteousness and therefore born of God. He loved God and was born of God before Peter ever

appeared and preached a sermon to him, and he that loveth is born, of God. Therefore, Cornelius was born of God before Peter preached to him, so the purifying of hearts by faith did not mean the purification in regeneration, but meant the purification from error by instructing them, and that is all the Gospel is ever intended to do, instruct the people. That is the truth, and I will stand on it these two days. In regard to Paul's Gospel rule, as given in Ro 10:17. I desire our attention a little to some things that I have which I regard as very pertinent here. It is said in that lesson: Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Now the terms belief and unbelief, believer and unbeliever, apply only to a special class of the human family. Those terms do not apply to people who have not heard the Gospel preached. If I have a fact in my mind, and you do not know what it is, you do not know whether you are a believer or not. I do not know whether you are a believer of that fact or not. But when I tell that to you, I may be able to discover whether you are a believer or unbeliever. So those that never hear the Gospel preached have not rejected it, because they have never heard it. They cannot be said to be believers in the sense of believing the Gospel. One cannot be said to believe a proposition until the proposition is presented to his mind. So believing and calling on the name of the Lord, and not believing, in the sense of this passage, are applicable to those only who hear the Gospel and give evidence of their condition by either believing or not believing. The terms belief and unbelief, believer and unbeliever, are not at all applicable to infants, the insane or the idiotic. Neither are they applicable to those who have not heard the Gospel preached. An unbeliever is one that, having heard, does not believe, and a believer is one who, having heard the Gospel receives it with a good and honest heart, believes in the Christ it publishes, loving him and the truth as it is in him. Here is the distinction. In his sixth argument he referred to Eph 1:16. Why to be sure, Cornelius, after he heard the word, trusting in the Lord, rejoiced. Whenever you hear a Gospel sermon, you children of God, some of you that are growing aged, that Gospel sermon calls forth anew and fresh, and bright, the faith wrought in your hearts, and your love is revived and you trust anew in the Gospel of the Lord thus preached and heard. That is your experience. We believe all that, but that does not prove that through this means, the hearts are prepared to receive the truth. His seventh argument was based on Ps 119:50. The word of God quickens God's children. There is a difference between quickening people who are dead, and quickening people who are living. One may quicken a dead horse if he is able to give him life; he, may quicken a living horse with a spur or a switch or a slap of the bridle reins, but no person can quicken a dead horse without he has ability to give him life. So no preacher can quicken a dead sinner with preaching unless he has ability to give life. Argument Eight: "Who is Paul and who is Appolos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?" My brother has been contending that "every man" meant the whole human family. Did God give to every man this faith in the territory where the Gospel is never preached? Does God give faith to every man, does he give faith to every man that hears the gospel? If he does, man will never believe until God gives him the faith. He may listen but he will never believe until God gives him the faith. It doesn't mean the whole human family. It doesn't mean all men in that text. It is restricted. But he quotes from 2Co 3:3 to prove this argument. We will notice that briefly now and perhaps more fully later on. He says that in that passage, Christ is the writer, the pen is the preacher, the ink is the Holy Spirit, and the paper is the heart of the ungodly unregenerated sinner, the act of writing being the work of regeneration. If I take my pen to write on paper, the pen must move as I move it, it cannot resist or refuse, and the paper just has to receive whatever is written on it. It cannot help it. The ink just has to flow through the pen. It cannot help it. The pen has to move as the writer moves. But in writing on the

paper the pen isn't changed a particle. It is the same paper and this writing was not on tables of stone, it was not on stony hearts, but on the fleshy tables of the heart. Allusion is made in this passage of Ezekiel, when God declares by him: "I will take away the stony heart and give you a heart of flesh." Then when God, in regeneration, gives the heart of flesh, there will be writing on fleshy hearts. It will be on a stony heart until God gives a heart of flesh. The writing won't change the heart, just as the sowing of the seed didn't change the ground. I now have some questions for Brother Throgmorton 1. Does God want everybody to be saved? 2. Does the devil want everybody to be lost? 3. If God is more powerful than the devil wants to save everybody, will he not save them? 4. Are not those born of God who love him? Joh 4:5. 5. If those who love God are born of God, does the alien sinner love God? 6. If the alien sinner does not love God or does not love Christ, then must he accept Christ in order to be born of God? 7. If the alien does accept Christ when he does not love him, does he not accept what he does not want? 8. Does an alien sinner have to become willing in order to be regenerated? 9. Is the alien sinner regenerated according to his own will or according to God's will? 10. If the alien sinner is regenerated according to his own will, is it not of the will of the flesh or of the will of man? 11. If you say it is of the will of man reconcile this idea with Joh 1:12-13. 12. Do the heathen without the Gospel have an equal chance with those who have the Gospel? I will give you an hour, two hours at noon, to answer. I come to my first negative argument now: My first negative argument is that there is of necessity in regeneration, a direct contact or, impact of the Holy Spirit. It matters not, so far as this argument is concerned how the Spirit reaches the sinner's heart. My opponent in our correspondence said the spoken and written words were vehicles. Suppose for the sake of argument that this is true. It is not the vehicle that does the work nor does the vehicle stand between the power that does it and the work done. "It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing." Joh 6:63. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh: and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." Joh 3:6. That spirit is God for "God is a spirit." Joh 4:24. "Now the Lord is that spirit, for where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." It is comparable to the blowing wind. The wind blows directly upon whatever it touches and move and not through a medium. It is like leaven which a woman took and his three measures of meal. Mt 13:31 and Lu 13:21. The leaven comes in direct contact with the meal, so the spirit comes in contact with the heart. Elder Penick said in his debate with Elder Cayce, page 227: "I take it that every Missionary Baptist believes that in the process of salvation there is an immediate touch or contact with the Holy Spirit." Again, on page 285, he said: "Let me say again, to get it clearly before you to-wit, that every passage of Scripture that intimates or implies, or says in almost direct words, that God's Spirit does come in immediate direct contact with the heart, I believe it, my brethren believe it. Every single, solitary one of them. Does the Spirit quicken? Yes. Does the Spirit enlighten? Yes." Elder Throgmorton himself admitted this in his former debate with me, and so I suppose he will admit it now. Since, then, the Holy Spirit comes in direct, immediate contact with the heart in regeneration, no medium is between the spirit and the heart in that work, and so no means are used. This is simply unanswerable. Means is from the Latin word medianus, which means middle, that which comes in between. The proposition goes down before this argument, and Elder Throgmorton will never be able to lift it up with the weight of this argument upon it. Now with this stick and with this fan I touch this blackboard. This stick representing the preaching of the Gospel and the fan the Holy Spirit, both touching the blackboard, the board representing the sinner's heart. If it is the Spirit that regenerates, the Spirit does the work by immediate touch. So no means are used through which the power is conveyed. My contention is that the Spirit of God, whether it comes in contact the

very moment the word preached reaches the heart, or whether it does not, that it is the Spirit that does the quickening. The Spirit of God does the regenerating, and as the Spirit does the regenerating, no means are used in the work of regeneration. No means are used for it is by immediate touch. If I were to throw a lasso out there and draw an interested brother up here to this rostrum, I would lasso him by means of the rope, the lasso would be between me and the thing operated upon. But if with the rope in my hand I go down to the brother and touch him with the rope and at the same time take hold of him myself and bring him up here, it cannot be said I used the rope as a means. I do it direct. How is it done? It is done by direct touch. Cannot be done by means when the Spirit of God does the work and does it by direct contact. It is certainly self-evident. My second negative argument is that in regeneration sinners are quickened or raised from a state of death and so it is represented as a resurrection from death. Resurrection from death is accomplished by the direct impartation of life to the dead in which no medium is used. Eph 2:1, "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." Verse 5 "But God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we dead in sins hath quickened us together with Christ." The context shows that the Ephesian saints have been going away from God until the very moment they were quickened. In the three instances of Jesus raising the dead, no medium came between the power that raised the dead and the dead that were raised. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." In the resurrection of the body no medium or means is employed, for the same Spirit that resurrects the soul will resurrect the body in the same way. Ro 8:11, "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." The word "also" in this passage shows that the same will be done for the bodies in their resurrection that is done for the souls in their regeneration, and in the same manner. As the resurrection of the bodies will be without any means whatever, so is the resurrection of the dead. It is not with words and arguments and through a process of teaching, but by an immediate exertion of almighty power to raise the dead; that he can reach those that are out of the reach of all other powers; that he can do what the devil cannot do; that he conquers the devil and takes from him poor, hell deserving sinners, change the hearts by the touch of his Omnipotence, and makes them by the Spirit into what they had not been before, causing them to love God and desire to glorify his precious name. As the resurrection of the body shall be without any means whatever, so is the resurrection of the soul. God gives them life. "The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of God and they that hear shall live." Joh 5:25. It is the voice of the Son of God the dead hear, and not the voice of the preachers. It is not simply the words of the Son of God spoken by preachers, but it is the voice of the Son of God himself that must cause the dead to live. If I write a letter, that letter is not my voice. There is a difference between what is contained in that letter and my voice. If I tell you something to tell somebody in your town, my brother, and you tell that one, he doesn't hear my voice, he hears your voice. Your voice is not mine. My written words are not my voice. There is a difference between one person telling what another person tells him to tell, and the voice that tells him to tell it. All hear to whom the voice speaks. They all hear and live. They hear because life is given by the power of the voice that speaks to them. Christ further says in the continuation of this passage, "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son of God to have life in himself, and hath given him power to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." So the life is not in the preacher to be given to the sinner, or in his preaching to be imparted by proxy, but in the Son of God to be given to sinners directly by the touch of his omnipotent power. So John says.

“He that hath the Son of God hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” (Time expired.) ELD. THROGMORTON'S SECOND SPEECH Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen I am glad to see the continued and increasing interest in this discussion in which is manifested by the presence of so many of you when so many of you are uncomfortably situated on account of the heat. I shall spend my time during this half hour in noticing the very remarkable speech made by my worthy friend. It was remarkable chiefly because of its great distance from the issue before us. Of course, you may not put that estimate on it. I am just giving my estimate. He began by telling you what I would not affirm, and seems to be dissatisfied with this proposition. I beg leave, however, to say that this is the proposition under discussion, and his discussion of what he thought the proposition ought to be, was entirely out of place. I don't mean his telling about that but his discussion of that. He began by telling you that I would not affirm that preaching was a necessary means in the regeneration of sinners; that I said no Missionary Baptist, no accredited Missionary Baptist, so taught. There is a little unintentional misrepresentation in that statement! Notice the proposition. Notice the wording of the proposition that he asked me to affirm or wanted me to affirm: “The Scriptures teach that God employs the preaching of the Gospel as a necessary means in the regeneration of sinners. That is, he wanted me to affirm that it was necessary on God's part. For me to have done that would have been to say that God was so tied that he could not regenerate a man without the preaching of the Gospel. This would have been to limit the power of God. I could not and do not take such a position. I explained that in my opening speech. Then he proceeds to quote some of our authors. Of course I could not take the full statement quoted, but I tried to note them the best I could; that is those that have anything to do with the proposition. However, many of them have nothing to do with the issue, nor does my duty as to the proposition require me to notice them. Yet I want my brother to have rope, because he has got to have something with which to take up his time. He cannot meet my proposition. He cannot meet my arguments on my proposition. He can never weaken for a moment, a phalanx of scriptures that I have brought forward in support of my proposition. So he must fail. He quoted Selvidge to show something about my proposition and to show up a statement which I made about another proposition. Not at all in point. Yet I want to humor you, Brother Daily, and be good to you. Well, he quotes Selvidge of fifty years ago, and had to go back to Georgia to a debate Brother Selvidge had with Elder Thompson. In that discussion Brother Selvidge, he tells us, said that God “had adopted the word as the means.” This is all right: That “this is the age of means.” That is all right. That the world is to be evangelized by means.” That is all right. I don't think Brother Selvidge was undertaking to tie God to this means because he would not have desired to limit the power of God. You see my brother is wanting to argue another proposition. He also quotes Brother Penick as saying that there was no evidence that there are any regenerated without the preaching of the gospel. If you know of any will you please tell us, Brother Daily? If you know of a single man regenerated in this age without the gospel, tell this audience about it. Brother Penick said he saw no evidence. That is not saying God couldn't do it. Not at all. Nor that with God it was a necessary means. What he quotes from me in the Potter-Throgmorton debate is to the same effect. I am abundantly satisfied with that debate. That discussion was held in July, 1887, and if I was to begin to try to count the “Old School” Baptist brethren who have come to us since then—and many of them who say that they came in consequence of the reading of that book—I wouldn't be able to name them all. I am mighty well satisfied with that debate, and I am expecting fruit like that from this one. Yes, sir; lots of it. I wouldn't wonder if Brother Daily were to come to us yet. Don't you know what Brother Todd did in 1896

at Eldorado? He debated with Brother Edmunds as one of you, now he is with us. He has the pastor ate of the Missionary Baptist church at Greenville. Where is A. M. Kirkland? He was once with you. Now he is pastor of the Missionary Baptist church at Eldorado. Where is H. E Pettus? He was one of your bright young men. Yew he is pastor of the Missionary Baptist church at Westfield. Others have come; are here on this platform. Why should I mention more? Time would fail me. Come along. Brother Daily. You are a fine man and I would be glad to have you. But remember, in any case, my brother in quoting these men is begging the question. If Brother Daily is not pleased with the question as we have it, why did he accept it? Was you so anxious for a debate with me Brother Daily that you agreed to deny a proposition that you believe? I think not. Then discuss this proposition and don't try to change it to something else. That is the thing for you to do. You made a mighty speech on another and different proposition but not on this proposition. Yes! He quoted Brother Todd, by the way, after he got through with Selvidge and Throgmorton and Penick. What was Harry Todd when you quoted him? One of your own witnesses. Where is he now? With us. How did he happen to come? He got his eyes open. Brother Daily says Todd first went to them from us. He said yesterday that Brother Todd went to them from us after he was of age. If think this is a mistake, but anyway he went to them in his youth. When he reached mature years he came back home. Brother Daily says I made an argument on the parable of the sower. It wasn't exactly an argument that I made there; at least it wasn't one of my stated arguments; it was a part of the preliminary definitions that I was laying down. I am very glad he ventured to try an answer to what I said on that parable, and here is the main thing I want you to notice. He agrees with me that the seed is the word, the preached word, but he says it is not the life. Who said it was the life? He went right on and argued as if I had said that the seed was the life! I didn't say it. I say in my proposition that God communicates life through the seed. Brother Daily is trying to put still another proposition in my mouth. What you want to debate? Why don't you debate the Proposition we have? He then proceeds to say I cannot give life by preaching! And then says that is my argument! He looks you people in the face and says that! I didn't say I could give life by preaching. I didn't say Brother Daily could. I said God gives life through preaching as a means. Now, Brother, come up to the trough, if you will allow that expression, and "lick salt right." It is not the preacher that gives the life. It is God. And he gives it by means of preaching and thus regeneration. The giving of life is regeneration. Here was a mighty smart thing: He said those fowls that picked up the seed that was sown would get salvation because they had swallowed the seed which was eternal life! Wasn't that bright? Won't that look fine in the published book? "Bad off" for something to say wasn't he? He says that Brother Throgmorton makes the seed eternal life. Not a word like that, did I say Brother Daily. What I say is that God gives eternal life through the word as a means. Can't you understand that? Well he says that I told you it is not a question of God's power! He said yesterday that it was a question of God's power. But he had another question yesterday. Do you want to go back and argue that question? Are you not satisfied? This is not a question of power. It is a question of how an all-powerful God does a thing. That is the thing. Not a question of power, but a question of method. Now those questions. He was very kind to answer. He just came right up. Let's see: "Do you accept the statement in the Confession of 1644 that faith is ordinarily begot by the preaching of the word?" He reads from the London confession, Fourteenth Chapter, and says he accepts that. That wasn't what I asked you. I asked about the Confession of 1644-that by the Seven Churches. Then he tries to tell us there is a distinction between that out of which faith comes and the fruits of it. Certainly, there is. We will pass that until later. "Do you accept the statement in the Somerset Confession that the Spirit,

is administered by or through the word of faith preached?" "No," he says. He says he will stand against what is not taught in the word of God, no matter where it is. That is right. I do not say that these Confessions ought to be blindly followed. Here is what I quoted them for: To show you that John R. Daily is at variance with those old Confessions, and that he doesn't teach what they taught. If you want to go back on them, all right; but I am sorry to see you going the wrong way. Now the next: "Do you accept the statement in Chapter 10 of the London Confession that it pleased God effectually to call (the elect) by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation?" "Yes, sir," he says, "as explained by the next paragraph." The next paragraph doesn't explain it at all. It goes on and explains something else. He ought not to say that. The next one neither contradicts nor explains the paragraph under discussion. Here is what this says: "That it pleases God effectually to call the elect by his word and spirit out of that state of sin and death." It is not after they are out of it! "Out of that state of sin and death to grace and salvation." Yes, Brother Daily accepts that as explained by the next paragraph! He dares me to accept the second section. Suppose I don't. I am not tied up by the London Confession. It contains much mighty good doctrine; but you folks make your boast of the London Confession. Just a few years ago you published an edition of it, which is the one I have here. Now, Brother John R. Daily, the one upon whom the mantle fell, when that great man Lemuel Potter died—he comes up and takes issue with that old London Confession in plain words. That is the thing to do if he thinks it is wrong. But he ought not to try to cover it up. That is not saying he does of course. "Do you agree with Chapter 14 of the London Confession "that faith is ordinarily wrought in the hearts of the elect by the ministry of the Word." "No objection whatever," says Brother Daily, "faith is wrought that way." Well give me your hand on that. Certainly! (They shake hands). Faith, John R. Daily says, is wrought in the hearts of the elect ordinarily by the ministry of the word! Is anybody regenerated without faith? No, sir. What does Paul say? "Ye are all the children (regenerated) by faith." Not without faith. Not before it. So, if faith is wrought ordinarily in the hearts of the elect by the ministry of the Word, that faith thus wrought is that through which God regenerates and so the elect are regenerated by the ministry of the word. That is, God regenerates them through the ministry of the word. So much for those questions. I have some more for you after awhile. This debate is going to be quite a "query box" affair. Now, as to Dr. John Gill. Those of you who are at all informed know how the "Old School Baptists regard Dr. John Gill. Brother Daily says Gill's Commentary is only worth what it is worth for what truth is in it. That is right. I show, however, that my opponent is out of line with Gill's Commentary and I show that the old Baptists away back endorsed that Commentary. Of course we might not to follow anybody who is out of line with truth. I would rather be right than to be a Baptist—if there is any difference between them. Sure. But my friend tries to show that Dr. Gill, contradicts himself not in the Commentary, but in a later work, "The Body of Divinity." In this later work Dr. Gill has it that the sinner is passive in regeneration. That is right. Yes, sir, the sinner is passive in regeneration—as passive as the patient on the operating table when the surgeon uses the knife! This faith! Placing oneself passive into the hands of God. Then God regenerates! But he doesn't go to a fellow and thy hands, wretched helpless and undone; perfectly passive. I am saved thou must save me! Then God regenerates! But he doesn't go to a fellow and regenerate him in a saloon when he is not thinking of God and salvation; he is not passive then; he is in opposition. I tell you this doctrine that Brother Daily preaches destroys human responsibility. I intend to read something further from the Old London Confession before this is through, on that point. He says that Dr. Gill wrote that "Body of Divinity" in his old age. Maybe he had gotten into

his dotage That great Commentary is what makes John Gill a giant among the Baptists of that age and that giant in that great Commentary: written in the prime of his manhood, and not when in his dotage agrees with my Proposition, Brother Daily; but when he came to write a doctrinal book, as I understand in his old age, so to speak. He said some things somewhat at variance possibly with his Commentary. Brother Daily said when a witness contradicts himself that forces him out of Court. You ought not to quote Brother Todd then. You know Brother Todd had come over to us and contradicted himself. What did you bring him up for? It seems that my friend will say almost anything in order to make it appear that my arguments are not what they ought to be; and then he finds fault with me for quoting such a man as Dr. John Gill. He comes to Joh 20:30-31. He says we are not discussing whether men can believe when truth is preached. But he says they cannot. He says God doesn't help anybody but the elect; so that others cannot believe. That has nothing to do with this question. I wish I could get Brother Daily to see the real issue in this debate and come up and face it. He affirms that life is before faith, just as the peach tree is before the peaches. We all know that it doesn't follow that the life that Christ gives is before faith in him for he says in that same passage—my brother doesn't examine it, but just says that life is before faith because a dead sinner cannot believe because he is dead like a dead horse! But God says, "These are written that ye might believe. Of course that is all right. "And that believing ye might have life through his name." What kind of life? The life that is in Christ. What kind? In him we have eternal life. Why don't you teach that, brother? But my opponent says this was written that Christians might believe. The idea that a man that is a Christian does not believe that Jesus is the Son of God! Why every Christian believes that Jesus is the Son of God. He cannot be a Christian without believing that. He that believeth not is condemned, the wrath of God is upon him and he shall die in his sins." "Ye believe not because you are not of my sheep," said Jesus. The sheep believe in him. The mark of the sheep is that they believe on him. Here is a man who says, "I am a sheep; but says: Oh, no; I don't believe on Jesus. You believe not because you are not a sheep. See Joh 10:26. My phalanx of Scripture proofs has never been touched. He says salvation doesn't always involve regeneration. I grant sometimes the word is used when it does not; but there are plenty, of passages where it does, for instance, 1Co 1:21, according to Dr. Gill, who Brother Daily says is not a good witness. The gospel is God's power to save believers, and by the preaching of it God makes believers. Brother Daily says that just as I do. Yes, God through preaching works faith. Get through preaching works faith and immediately the believer is saved. "He that believeth hath everlasting life." God saves men as I quoted, by the foolishness of preaching. He saves them from what they were before they believed; before they believed God's wrath is upon them. See Joh 3:36. A man cannot be saved with God's wrath on him. Brother Daily says the purification in Ac 15:9 was purification from error! That those Gentiles were already God's children! They were not believers. Can a man be God's child and yet not be a believer? "He that believeth not is condemned already." Brother Daily would by the vision of unclean beast that Cornelius and his company were already God's children. That is rather far fetched. They were not believers; they were not pure. They had to be made believers; they had to be purified. How do men become children of God .1 want to tell you it is by faith. To the Galatian Christians Paul said: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Ga 3:26. My friend has those Gentiles the children of God without faith and. before faith. Don't you know that won't do? I have a parallel on one of the charts which I will show you. These Gentiles were not of God's children; that had not faith. It was by Peter's mouth that God made them believers. Brother Daily says the terms believer and unbeliever refer only to certain classes who have heard the testimony

and has no reference to regeneration! In this he is away off. A believer is one that has heard the gospel and been led by God to accept it. What about an unbeliever? Where is he? Just tell me. Jesus tells where he is in the plainest terms, "He that believeth not is condemned." Here is another admission Brother Daily makes. Coming to Ro 10:1; 7 he agrees that faith does come by hearing. And we have shaken hands in that. It is settled in this debate, that the faith which is the gift of God comes by hearing the preaching of the gospel. Remember we have shaken hands on that: John R. Daily and I have. This settles the question about regeneration. Regeneration is by faith and we are agreed as to how faith is produced. God works it by the preaching of the word. Are you "Old School" Baptists going to follow my opponent on this? Yes, follow him on this, for in this he is right. But this is not the way his people generally preach it. He says however, that they get faith by hearing. And Paul says, Ga 3:26, "Ye are all children by faith;" not before it. (Time expired). ELD. DAILY'S SECOND REPLY Gentlemen Moderators, My Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen. If you can just succeed in keeping cool, I promise you that Brother Throgmorton and I will do our best along that line. (It was an exceeding warm day). He accuses me of getting a great distance from the issue in my speech which I made in reply to his; that is the proposition that we have agreed to discuss. Now part of the time, I was a great distance from that proposition, but I was following Brother Throgmorton, and if he runs a hundred miles from the proposition, I will follow him. So if he wants me to stick to the proposition, let him stick to it. He is in the affirmative now. I am going after him this day and tomorrow. He has agreed to affirm that the Scriptures teach that God employs the preaching of the gospel in the regeneration of sinners, but in his very first speech he tried to prove by Dr. Gill that that was the truth. So I went after him, and left the proposition far enough to turn Gill against him in what is recorded in the Memoirs in the "Body of Divinity" as he crowning work of Gill's life. He went into the London Confession of Faith. I went into that to follow him, and called him to state if he really believes the statement in the 2d Sec. of the 10th Chapter, and he didn't say in his last speech whether he did or not. Yes, I got some distance from the proposition that the Scriptures teach the doctrine he is advocating. He claims that I have misrepresented him. Of course he meant you to understand that I had unintentionally misrepresented him; at least, I hope that was his aim. (Mr. Throgmorton: I said that Brother Daily). If I do misrepresent Brother Throgmorton it is not my intention. In regard to the preaching of the Gospel being necessary or not necessary. I said in the beginning of my speech you remember that that was an important matter in the discussion of this Question. If he says now that the preaching of the Gospel is not really necessary, why of course I will leave that matter out and say no more about it. If he will get up in his next speech and say to us that the preaching of the Gospel is not necessary, that God, without preachers, can get clown here in the heathen lands and save them everlastingly from sin and that preaching is not necessary, then I will just leave that out. He said it was not a matter as to whether God could or could not, but he has said that God cannot save sinners any more than God can lie without the sinner first believing and coming to Christ for that salvation. Now if he is willing to take that back, we will accept his acknowledgment of error and welcome him as being that much closer to us than what he was. He said that I had referred to a statement made by him long ago about another proposition. It doesn't matter if it was about another proposition. The statement that he made was: "Understand, Brother Potter, God cannot give the increase where the seed is not planted." That is what he said. If that was the truth then it is the truth now. If it wasn't true then, if he thinks it wasn't the truth then, let him take it back and we will welcome him as nearer to us. He said Selvidge did not aim to limit God. How can we tell what a man means

except by what he says? Selvidge said: By human language alone sinners are reached and made to experience the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. He said if I know any who were regenerated without the gospel tell him. Cornelius was one. Cornelius was said to be a devout man, which is from eusebhv (eusebes) which means Godly, pious. Cornelius was a Godly man as eusebhv signifies. If he was a godly man, he was regenerated. There is one regenerated without the gospel. He was a Godly man before Peter got to him. I know another. That was Saul of Tarsus. I know what plea he will make on that, and I will let him make it first, then I will answer him. I know of a great class that are regenerated without the gospel. Little infants that die in infancy. There are idiots that are regenerated without the gospel. There are deaf and dumb that never hear preaching in all their lives; they are regenerated without the preaching of the gospel. There are insane, there are heathen regenerated without the preaching of the gospel. In his last speech he didn't get through answering me, and so I will now lead, although he is in the affirmative. I don't think he will get through answering me at 4 o'clock tomorrow evening. I don't expect him to. Where is Kirkland, where is Brother Willis and some others? Gone off into heresy. They went into heresy before they left us, and we were glad they left us after they went into heresy and if there are any others among the Primitive Baptists preaching the Missionary Doctrine we want them to leave us and go to the Missionary Baptists. I am willing to measure arms with him. I wouldn't be afraid to say I have baptized more missionaries than he ever baptized into the Missionary Baptists from us. I tell you, I have no idea how many I have baptized and if I can get these missionaries here to believe the truth before this debate ends and to come to us. I am ready to baptize them. And if I Bother Throgmorton will come to us, I can baptize him as big as he is. He said I quoted Harry Todd. I quoted what he said about your article of faith, which says the operation of the Spirit is co-extensive with the proclamation of the gospel. In regard to the parable of the sower, the seed and the word, he said he didn't say the seed was eternal life. He said it was the incorruptible seed. That is what he said in his debate with Elder Potter. God giveth the increase, he said, but not where the seed is not. If incorruptible seed is not eternal life tell us what it is! Is it life that will go out directly? Is it life that will die after awhile? Is it a life like our mortal life, that will waste away? If it is not eternal and everlasting life, tell us what it is! You say it is the word of God. You say it is the incorruptible seed. I don't object to you saying it is the word of God, but I do object to you saying it is incorruptible seed. You prove it is the incorruptible seed and tell us what it is. If it is not something eternal tell us what it is. If fowls pick up incorruptible seed and swallow it, do they not pick up that which is incorruptible? Will it not be the incorruptible seed inside of them? And if they won't go to heaven, Why not? You said yesterday it was a question of power. Did you not say God could not though he would? Answer. He said I made a distinction between what is produced and the thing that produces it. Do you say there is not a difference? What is it produces faith in the heart? It is the Spirit. Can faith be there before the Spirit is there to produce it? He says the second paragraph of Chapter Ten of the London Confession of Faith refers to something else besides what is in the first section. The first and second are connected, and regeneration is embraced in both, and the second fully the position of those that framed the London Confession of Faith. Relative to the London Confession of Faith, he said he is not tied up to the Confession? I am not either. So there we are even. In regard to the children of God being the children of God by faith, he quotes from Ga 3:26, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." So the children of God are said to be his children by obedience, but it is not their obedience that makes them his children. 1 Cor 17, "Wherefore come out from, among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and

touch not the unclean thing; and. I will receive you. And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." How are they to be sons and daughters? By obedience. God's children are his children by obedience. It is not their faith that makes them his children but faith proves them to be his children. So faith is proof of the fact. He says I am out of line with Gill's Commentary. He is out of line with Gill's Body of Divinity. In answer to his question. I quoted Todd and the article of Faith: That the operation of the Spirit is coextensive with the proclamation of the gospel. Cannot go where the gospel does not go. Not at all. And it can only reach a very few where the gospel is proclaimed. So that the preaching of the gospel is necessary in the regeneration of sinners. Life is before faith. He says it is not; that it is not like peach trees before peaches. He asks if it is not unreasonable to say that a child of God is brought to believe. I want to read you 1Jo 5:13, "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." That is written to persons who believe, not that they might have eternal life, but that they might know they have eternal life, and that they might believe on the Son of God; written to children who had eternal life, that they might know. Every time you hear a good sermon it starts up anew your faith, and you go out from the house of God having your faith revived just as the grass that seems to be dead is alive and is revived by the soft summer shower. Living children of God receive a new life of joy and peace whenever they are refreshed by the gospel and enabled to believe confidently in the blessed Son of God. Often they feel cold and barren and lifeless. Like the withered grass they seem to have no life. Then as the refreshing showers of sweet gospel truth drop into their hearts they are revived, being enabled again to realize that Jesus is their Saviour and again to rest in his glorious promises. Many regenerated persons have not known what their experience meant, have not understood the things they have felt, till they have heard the pure gospel. As the gospel presents the evidences of a change of heart and holds up the glorious Saviour of sinners, they believe in him because they have eternal life in their hearts enabling them to believe. They are revived by the warmth of the sunlight of divine truth, and live in a sweet happiness that no unregenerated one can ever know. And so the passage in Joh 20:30-31 is explained by John in 1Jo 5:13. He admits that salvation does not always involve regeneration, and then says, "Mr. Daily says that the gospel saves believers." It does because the Bible says so. Having noticed all that is relevant of my brother's speech, I now continue my negative arguments against his proposition. When I took my seat at the close of my last speech I was on the argument that regeneration is represented as a resurrection from death, and as that resurrection is without means so regeneration is without means., 'I was quoting a passage from the language of John which says, "He that hath the Son of God hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Continuing still, the Lord says: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth." A life-giving power must be self-existent, uncreated and divine. The same invincible power that caused the beasts of the earth and the fowls of the air to become docile and move into Noah's ark must cause the lion and the lamb to lie down together. That same power that stopped the lions mouths and warded off the unwonted heat of the fiery furnace; that woke a dead Lazarus and healed all manner of diseases, that rebuked the elements at his pleasure and caused the very devils to tremble: that invincible power which did all these things, and many more wonderful things without any instrument or means, that same almighty power must regenerate the soul. The voice of the preacher will never be heard by the dead in sins, in a spiritual sense. The voice of Jesus by the Divine Spirit must give life before such can hear the preaching of the

gospel. Even the voice of Jesus himself, in preaching his gospel, was not heard by those who were dead. Jesus said to this class, "Why do ye not understand my speech; even because ye cannot hear my words. 8:43. It was necessary that he speak to them in regeneration in order that they might be able to hear his voice in preaching. Why? It is not in the regeneration of sinners that the gospel is employed as a means. I argue from all these unanswerable facts that God does not employ the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. I come now to the Third Negative Argument: My Third Negative Argument is that regeneration is represented in the scriptures as a creation, and creation is the direct work of the Creator without the use of any medium agent. 1Co 5:13, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature. Ga 6:15, "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, not uncircumcision, but a new creature." It takes a new creation to constitute one a new creature. But not only is it implied in these passages that regeneration is a creation, but it is expressly stated in Eph 2:10, "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Bara in the Heb. ktisiv (ktisis) in the Greek, and create or creation in the English are the strongest terms that could be selected to express the idea of the sovereign work of God done independent of any medium whatever. We must take these words in their undiminished meaning, as they are used in the inspired writers without any qualification. We are, then, obliged to understand by this language a special divine operation distinct and apart from the preaching of the gospel. No creature assisted in his own creation or the creation of another. Regeneration is a creation. God does not employ anything as means in creation. Therefore God does not employ the preaching of the Gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. Argument Four: My fourth argument against this proposition is based upon the relation of two kinds of light to two kinds of darkness; the relation of the light of instruction to the darkness of ignorance, and the relation of the light of life to the darkness of death. The light of instruction is the opposite of the darkness of ignorance, and the light of life is the opposite of the darkness of death. There is great difference between the light of life, which is life itself, and the light of instruction, and a correspondingly great difference bet the darkness of death, which is death itself, and the darkness of ignorance. The light of instruction will never deliver from the darkness of death. The light of life only will do that. John says of Jesus, "In him was life; and the life was the light of men."—Joh 1:4. Again Joh 5:26, "As the Father hath life in him so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." 1Jo 5:11—12, "this is the record that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." The giving of this life to the sinner in the darkness of death delivers from the darkness of that death. "I give unto them eternal life." So Jesus says of his sheep. (Joh 10:28). And in his prayer he declares, "As thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." (Joh 17:2). Nothing but the light of life will ever make the dead live. The light of instruction will deliver from the darkness of ignorance, but it will never penetrate where the light of life is not. Paul was sent to turn the Gentiles from the darkness of ignorance to the light of instruction, and not from the darkness of death to light of life. This is very evident, because he declares that the natural man, or the unregenerated man, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1Co 2:14 The preaching of the gospel is presenting the things of the Spirit by the light of instruction. Since none can receive such things without, being made spiritual by the light of life, it follows that the preaching of the gospel is not employed as a means in the regeneration of sinners. Argument Five: My fifth argument is based upon the teaching of the parable of

the sower, as recorded in Mt 13, Mark 4 and Luke 8. In that parable Christ represents the "honest and good heart" as "good ground into which the seed fell and brought forth fruit." I see I will not have time to finish this argument, so I want to call attention to the position my friend occupies: that the ground represents the hearts of sinners; that the preacher is represented by the one sowing the seed, and that there can be no children of God except the preacher so that seed. That in territory where the seed has never been sown there cannot be found children of God. People living in such a country until they come to death, go down to endless hell because the seed has never been sown in their territory, because they have never had the opportunity to hear the gospel preached. The incorruptible seed has never been sown in their hearts. They are not children of God, and therefore when they come down to death they are punished forever. On this map we have a representation of the part of the earth where the gospel has never been preached. We have a representation here where the gospel has been preached. We have a representation here where the gospel has been preached. Only a small portion of those who have an opportunity to hear the gospel are regenerated, a large majority are not and all that live in the territory where the gospel has never been proclaimed had no opportunity, and therefore they are not regenerated. (Time Expired.) CHART Page 280 ELD THROGMORTON'S THIRD SPEECH Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first thing I want to do in this speech is to give a little dissertation on the phrase "dead in sins," on what it means to be dead in sins. I think this is a good stage of the discussion for this thought to be brought up. According to Brother Daily, a dead sinner is dead just like a dead horse; that is, the sinner dead in sins is like a dead horse, like a block of wood, like a piece of stone: just as insensible, just as inanimate to righteousness. Let us consider. Dead in sins does not mean that the man thus dead has no life in any sense. It means this: It means that he is condemned; that he has no Divine life; that he is separated from Christ and from real righteousness. That is what it means. He is dead to righteousness exactly as a Christ is dead to sin. Here is the Christian dead to sin; here is the sinner dead to righteousness; both dead just alike, only in opposite directions. Isn't that right? A saint can be tempted to sin though he is dead to Sin. Can't he? So a sinner can be so drawn by the Spirit as to desire a life of righteousness while dead to righteousness if that is not true how can you make the other side true? The Colossians, dead to sin, were told to mortify their members upon the earth (See Col. 3 5) Saints are to resist temptation. So a man can be commanded to repent when dead to righteous ness. He may be drawn from sin, just as a Christian may be drawn from sin, and we have all been that. Christians may actually commit sin. Haven't you? I have. Christians may thus do and still he dead to sin. Isn't that right? I want you to pay attention to that. Isn't that right? So a man dead in sin, dead to righteousness, may he so drawn by the Holy Spirit and taught by the truth that he may desire life and seek life while still dead to righteousness, if that is not true how is the other point true? You never can answer that while the sun shines, nor after it is dark. Try your hand at it, and your brain, and your good spirit. Now let us see what the Bible says: Joh 5:40, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." You can see how that is: Drawn by the Spirit, taught by the truth, a man dead to this Divine life may be led to desire it, and may come where it is and get it! But these people that Jesus talked to, would not do that! He said to them, "Ye will not come." Brother Daily told us awhile ago that eternal life is in Christ. Yes and here were persons that would not come and get it. Of course they were dead. Joh 6:53, "Then Jesus said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." How do we partake? By accepting his flesh and blood by faith. And how s faith produced? According to Brother Daily "by the ministry of the word." Unless a man partakes of the virtue

of Christ's flesh by faith then there is no life in him. You can put John R. Daily down as agreed to that in open court. Where is he now? Joh 6:57, "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." Before he eats, he is dead, when he eats, he is alive. 1Jo 5:12, quoted by my brother, I believe, "he that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." There is the line between the living and the dead; on the one side a man is dead to sin on the other side a man is dead to righteousness, and in the one case he is just as dead as in the other except as to directions. Now something else. Isa 55:1-3, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters!" (Here is a dead sinner desiring something better. He is still dead). "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come, ye, to the waters, and he that hath no money; come, ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently, unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let' your soul delight itself in fatness. Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David." "Hear and your soul shall live" There is hearing in order to living, hearing before life. It doesn't mean life from a death like the death of a dead horse; not that, of course; but that the one to seek life has a life as to spiritual things, just like the life of the Christian as to carnal things. Try that Brother Daily. I will give you all the rest of the time on that. I think you will need it; and then you cannot touch it. I have some more here from Isa 55:6-7. Speaking to these same parties who are dead, yet desiring life, a thirst for life, the prophet says, "seek ye the Lord while he may he found, call upon him while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way and let the unrighteous man his thoughts and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him: and to our God for he will abundantly pardon." Now this is the way the Bible teaches about death in trespasses and sins. It is no such a conglomerate mess that it cannot be understood. It does not mean that you folks that are not born again are just like a block of wood, that you don't even know what we are talking about, that you are just as inanimate (according to his doctrine you are just as inanimate to the Bible and this discussion) as the body of a dead horse is to the life of the live horse. You know that is not so. Your own consciousness tells you so. I am talking to the people out there, Brother Daily. Not to you. Brother Daily complains that I am not making any progress. I have gone as far as I want to go at present. I am going further when I get to the place; I know where the place is. Don't you bother about that. I have a fence built. I have a rampart in place. There has not a rail been taken off. He says that in Eph 1:1-13, they trusted after they heard, and that they were regenerated before they heard. He quotes from the book of Suppositions. The idea of a man that doesn't trust in Jesus Christ being regenerated, when Jesus Christ says such a man is condemned and under the wrath of God. Children of God are not under the wrath of God, they are justified. Well he says that to quicken—I am referring now to some things he said this morning. He says to quicken means to enliven, as well as to give life. I grant that is sometimes so. Your dead horse illustration is correct as to that. You can quicken a live horse with a spur. And there is where your fallacy is. The sinner according to your position is as dead as a dead horse; he is like a stone and a block of wood. What would you think of Brother Daily preaching to a lot of tomb stones? If that gets a congregation where there is no elect that would be his crowd. They couldn't understand a thing and the Holy Spirit could not reach them; they are dead, not simply dead as in sins, but dead as a dead horse that is rotting in the field and the buzzards feeding upon him. Such a doctrine utterly repudiates human responsibility. He said no preacher could give life to a dead sinner. Who said he could? I said God gives life. God gives life. God employs the preaching of the gospel

as a means in giving life. That is what I am arguing. He is setting up a straw man and amusing himself by throwing at him. I am here; throw at me. In 1Co 3:5-7 my opponent wants to know whom every man means. Every one to whom there is reference. He didn't touch the argument. God made them believers through Paul's preaching. That is my point. Paul planted; God gave the increase through Paul's planting. He preached, God gave the increase. That is the point. God used the preaching. You see that is my proposition. You can see that. Remember Brother Daily agrees that faith is produced that way. Don't forget, either, that faith is produced by the ministry of the word, and that God does it. The "Old School" brethren argue that faith is the direct gift of God. Yet Brother Daily has been arguing that if the Spirit acts directly he cannot use the word, and yet he has the Spirit giving the faith a God's direct gift. And this is going into the book. How will that look in the book? Yes sir; it will be read that John R. Daily who teaches that faith is God's direct gift says, and shakes hands with me on it, that faith comes by the preaching of the gospel and yet in the same day he said that because the Spirit operates directly or immediately if regeneration, he cannot use the word in regeneration! Mighty bad for you, Brother Daily, but you did it yourself. He comes to 2Co 3:3 where the Corinthians were the paper, Paul the pen, the Holy Spirit the ink and Jesus Christ the writer; and he said. "That is can't help-it-ism." Suppose it was. It proves my proposition, whether it is "can't help-it-ism" or not Here we have Christ using the preacher and using the Holy Spirit to imprint himself in the hearts of these Corinthians. Brother Daily says the ink doesn't change the paper. I think it makes a great difference in it. Here is a check signed by John D. Rockefeller. Just over here is a blank piece of paper. Which would you pick up? Yet he says the ink makes no difference! Could you have any crop on any soil—would there be any results? Would it be a fruitful field without seed? Never. But my friend is going to elaborate the parable of the sower. By the way I have some more questions, and I want to get back to the query box. I am going to open it again. Let us look at some of my brother's questions. "Does God want everybody to be saved?" What has that got to do with our proposition? I am answering in the sense of desire. He does. "God will have," in the sense of desire, "all men to be saved." God has not determined it. God desires you to live a holy life every day, but you don't do it. No, sir, God's desire is not accomplished even in your case. Of course, God could take you and work you like a machine, but he doesn't do it. "Does the devil want everybody to be lost?" I think "If God has more power than the devil and wants and desires to save everybody, will he not save them?" he does. Not necessarily. The devil wants you to do wrong every day. God desires that you do right every day. But you do wrong every day. Does that prove that God has less power than the devil has? You answer that. If this means anything, I want you to have the full benefit of it. I have certainly answered you. "Are not those born of God who love him?" 1Jo 4:7. Yes, sir. "If those who love God are born of God, does the alien sinner love God?" In a general sense, no; the alien sinner does not love God. "If the alien sinner does not love God must he accept Christ in order to be born of God?" Yes, sir. In accepting Christ he is born of God, receives God's love. "If the alien sinner does accept Christ when he does not love him docs he not accept what he does not want?" That might be or not be. I have taken things many things I didn't exactly want, that is in the sense of desire. That question is a little ambiguous. "Does the alien sinner have to become willing in order to be regenerated?" Don't you think so? I thought you all believed that. So often have I heard your preachers quote, "My people shall be a willing people in the day of power." (In giving this quotation, Mr. Throgmorton intones the words.) I have heard that away back when I was a little boy. Yes, the sinner has to become willing. "Is the alien sinner regenerated according to his own will or according to God's will?" According to God's will. As to

how God brings men to be willing, that is another question. Of course, he uses the word. My friend has already agreed that God uses the word in producing faith. "If the alien sinner is regenerated according to his own will is it not the will of the flesh or of the will of men?" He is not regenerated according to his own will. Nothing of the sort. God brings him to be willing, but the process is of God. "If you say it is of the will of the flesh or of the will of man, reconcile this idea with Joh 1:12-13." I don't have to, because that is not what I say. "Do the heathen without the gospel have an equal chance with those who have the gospel?" They have not. That is, those that have not heard the gospel I mean. There are men in this country who do not have equal opportunities with others. God lets one boy grow up in a community where there is but little culture; lets another boy be born where everything tends to refinement and culture. Do they have similar opportunities? No. But they each have enough, in his Place, to make him responsible. I have more of that. Well, I have already answered this argument about the impact. You had better give up that stuff and take a doctrine that is consistent? He says he is after me and that I have left the proposition. No. I defined the proposition and in laying down the definitions I indicated that he in denying it, was out of line with the old Confession. I was approaching the issue in this. He backed off instead of approaching it. He says he followed me into Gill and into the London Confession and he tells you I wouldn't say whether I believed a certain thing or not. I didn't have to. I made before the debate, a close study of the Old Confession. I haven't taken the opportunity to look closely at the point he asked me since he asked me about it. I am sure of one thing: It does not affect the issue. The Confession is a fine old document, but I am like my friend. He is not tied to it he says. The Old London Confession was signed by the fathers. He says that to say whether preaching is necessary does not concern us. To say whether preaching is necessary does concern us, I say preaching is necessary, but it is not necessary to enable God to do this or that. God has all power. My opponent says this: "If Brother Throgmorton will say that God can save heathen and others without the word I will leave off." I have said that a dozen times already that God can do it. Of course God can do it. He has the power to do it. But that is not the question. It is the method that is in question. God has the power to save through the preaching of the gospel and that is his method. He may save some the other way; I don't say he doesn't. Brother Daily mentioned some he thought were. I think he made a little mistake on some of them. He tells you I say God cannot give the increase where the seed is not planted. God can plant the seed himself if he needs it. He says that now. He says Selvidge made sport of the work of the Spirit. I have heard a good many things imputed to the Spirit that I don't think the Spirit had anything to do with. You know there are extremes in all denominations as to the work of the Spirit, and people do and say unreasonable things under impulse and say they are led by the Spirit. My friend says Cornelius was regenerated without the Gospel. I want to read from Ac 10. Here is what Peter said. We will see whether Cornelius was regenerated without the Gospel. Ac 10:36: "The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all). That word I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which Jesus preached." So if they were regenerated at the time Brother Daily says, it was not without the Gospel because they knew about it. He says Saul was another case of regeneration without the preaching of the gospel. Saul had the word direct through the mouth of Christ himself, and threw up the white flag of surrender at once, saying, "What wilt thou have me to do?" Christ used the word even from the sky. Brother Daily says the deaf and dumb are regenerated without the preaching of the gospel. I am not talking about the deaf and dumb, and we are not speaking of the after world. And the heathen. I don't know what he would say

about them, whether God regenerates them after death or when. But he says he is in the lead! Yes, I have seen a calf in the lead, loose, and somebody after it, before today. He says Kirkland and others went off into heresy and a year ago he said he was glad they went. He didn't say that this time. He is glad they went after they got to be heretics. He says he has baptized more missionaries than I have of his people. I can't just now count up. I have baptized several of them, and I tell you this, judging by the way the two denominations grow, I wouldn't infer that he got very many of us. Old School Baptists don't have many converts. Their children go to our Baptist churches and to Methodist churches and under the preaching of the gospel, are converted. Then they go back and join; go back and tell what the Lord has done for them. I have known scores of cases of that kind. Converts among them in their meetings are few. I believe so far that more than fifty per cent whom I have known to join them went from meetings of other denominations where they were converted. Of course they told their story and were taken in and baptized; they were pronounced elect and all right, and it was believed that preaching had no more to do with saving them than had the saloon. I have heard just that kind of talk. If they are dead, as dead blocks of wood, why may not regeneration as well occur in a saloon as a church? The sinner according to my friend's view has no responsibility at all and spiritually is as well off in a saloon as under the preaching of the word. My opponent says he baptizes any that comes to him with the proper experience. Yes; they get that experience at this meeting or that and they come and tell you and you baptize them. You might have been converted at one of these kinds of meetings yourself. He tells you that the word of God is the incorruptible seed. So do I. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." "Wherefore laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as new born babes desire the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby." 2Pe 1:21 and 2Pe 2:1-2). The same word all the way through. (Time expired). ELD. DAILY'S THIRD REPLY Brethren Moderators, My Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am delighted to know that we are all of us feeling very pleasant, and that we are all enjoying this discussion. That is what I anticipated. This is what I anticipate shall continue. In the opening of his speech he undertook to explain what it means to be dead in sins, and said that it does not mean the man has no life in any sense. Agreed. He says that the man that is dead has no Divine life. Agreed again. He says he is dead just as a Christian, making the argument that as a Christian is dead to sin so is the unregenerated sinner dead in sins, and that as the Christian is dead to sin, sins, nevertheless, so the unregenerated sinner who is dead in sins may, I suppose, be righteous; may do righteously. What about the Christian that is dead to sin? Is it the body of the Christian, or the soul of the Christian which is made to be partaker of the Divine nature? I turn to 1Jo 3:9, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God?" Now to the question. The one who is born of God cannot sin because he is born of God. Paul, in explaining how it came that he did that which he would not, said "It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." There was that in Paul that did not sin, there is that in every child of God that cannot sin, because that is born of God. So that the Christian, so far as he is born of God, is completely dead to sin. "How shall we," Paul asks in the beginning of Ro 6, "who are dead to sin live any longer therein?" To be dead in sins then we agree is to be altogether destitute of Divine life. Now natural life is one thing which we all in Adam possess. Divine life or Spiritual life is another thing which we possess only in Christ. To perform physical acts or natural acts we must possess physical life. So to perform Spiritual acts we must possess Spiritual or Divine life. Life is first in both

cases. One cannot act in the natural capacity without natural life, neither can one act in the Spiritual capacity without Spiritual life. Spiritual life is given to those dead in sins by the quickening work of God, and they remain dead in sins until the moment that God quickens them. While dead in sins their course is wrong. They walk according to the course of this world until they are quickened. The very moment they are quickened they are alive, then they act in a Spiritual way and not until then. My dear brother seemed to me to be making sport of us preachers because we dwell so much upon the power of God, using a single tone. If he is inclined to make sport of us preachers he may continue to make sport of us, but I will not make sport of him and his class. He limited the power of God. I shall pity them and not make sport of them. They are to be pitied, rather than blamed. I am in good company, my friends, for when my opponent represents me as preaching that the dead sinner cannot hear, I remember what Christ said: "Why do ye not understand my speech, even because you cannot hear my words." He can make sport of me if he wants to for contending that sinners are so dead that there is absolutely no spiritual life in them; that they are absolutely enmity against God, not subject to his will and cannot be; that they are in the flesh and cannot please God and cannot hear my preaching in a Spiritual sense; but while he is making sport of me he is making sport as well of my precious Saviour, and I am in good company. Our Saviour knew that people would make sport of him, and so encouraged his faithful disciples to preach the truth. I will not mimic his manner of preaching. I presume the tone of my voice will compare very favorably with his. I will make no sport of my brother in any sense or of his associate, and he can make all the sport of us he wants to. It will go down in the book. He says that a sinner dead in trespasses and in sins may desire eternal life and seek life, that is, eternal life, while he is dead in sins. Now the good ground, saying nothing of the other kinds of ground, according to your illustration, according to your explanation of the parable of the sower is not changed by the seed he sows into it. Your interpretation of the parable is wrong. You call the seed sown incorruptible seed referred to by the apostle. If that is not eternal life I want to know what it is. I want to know what it is, if not eternal life, and you haven't said. He said a sinner may desire life. I deny that. They take light for darkness and darkness for light. That means they take truth for error, and error for truth. They take good for bad, and bad for good. Can a person prefer the real light when he takes darkness to be that light? Certainly not. There must be a change in the person. I deny that the sinner dead in sins can desire eternal life with a pure desire of the heart. I deny that he can seek eternal life. I deny that he has any Spiritual power to do it. God is pleased with nothing they do. The apostle says that they that are in the flesh cannot please God. You say they can by desiring life and seeking it. He calls your attention to Isa 55, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come to the waters." The dead do not thirst. We do not drink water to get life, originally. We must have life before we can want water. Having life, originally, we may thirst for water, and we may drink water to live, just as a person may desire food if he has life. We don't feed the dead to get them to live. We feed the living. The dead cannot hunger, only the living man can hunger. We do not eat food to get life originally, we do it because we have life, and we desire that life to be sustained. But he says, quoting from Isaiah, "Hear, and your souls shall live." True enough. There is a life enjoyed in hearing the blessed gospel preached. There is a life enjoyed in obeying the commands of the Word. I believe that at the age of sixteen years I heard the commandment which was impressed upon my young heart to walk in the paths of righteousness, and in walking that way I enjoy that which I should have missed. The Word is food for the living to enjoy. He comes to 1Co 3:3, and I desire your attention to more things that I have for you on that. I am already very far in the lead, but I don't have to be in any

very great hurry. I don't think that he meant that I was a calf, when he said he had heard about calves being in the lead and somebody after them. Of course I don't think he meant me. I am sure not. I think a dog might be after a calf, but I don't think he is a dog. No, I don't think he is a dog. But I want to tell you this, my intelligent audience, if I am a calf and he is the dog, he is a long ways behind. He will never catch up. Now, if I take my pen, and I have one here, and write on paper, the paper must receive whatever I write on it. I can write on one sheet of paper just as well as another, if I have the sheet of paper and the pen. If I were able to do it, and desired to do it, I could write on every sheet of paper in the world-one sheet just as well as another. If Christ is the writer, and the pen is the preacher, and the ink is the Spirit, and the paper represents the heart of the sinner, I ask him why every sinner under the sound of the voice of the preacher is not converted. He says they can hear, and makes fun of us for saying they can't. If they were like paper they would have to hear. His interpretation of that is wrong. I know it is wrong. Christ having died to save all, why does he not use preachers to write on the hearts of all, and thus regenerate all of them? I said the paper was not changed. I say it again. He tried to make an illustration of a check and a piece of paper that was a blank. I say so far as the paper is concerned that paper that the check is written on is just the same as the blank so far as the paper in concerned. He has the paper representing the heart of the sinner, and according to his theory there is no change in the heart of the sinner, and he can't get out of that either. As to what that does mean I shall have ample time to tell you. I have shown that he is wrong. Not while his name is W. P. Throgmorton will he ever catch up with the calf. But I want to turn to Ac 10:36 and read also verse 34: "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons." Who were there? Cornelius and his household. Anybody else? The company that went with him. Who were they? Some brothers of the church, God's children. They were in the congregation. He says, "But in every nation he that feareth him. and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Peter knew that the Jews would object because they were Gentiles, and the Jews couldn't understand, so the Apostle took some Jewish Christians with him. And here he is trying to explain in their hearing that those are God's children; that here Cornelius is, he is working righteousness, and by that I know he is accepted. He is devout and, as eusebhv signifies, he is godly, or good. He is one whom God hears. His prayers go up and God hears them, though he is a heathen man. And now he is a child of God. For that reason here the apostle is instructing his Jewish brethren concerning him, to show the consistency of his preaching to him. If Jesus Christ is only heard through the preaching of the gospel, as held by Missionary Baptists, he is only heard by the part of the world where the gospel is preached. The devil operates where the gospel is not preached, and also over the territory where the gospel is preached. Peter was addressing his Jewish brethren who had heard the word and knew it, and not the Gentiles, when he said, "That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Gallilee, after the baptism which John preached." The gospel had not been preached up to that time among the Gentiles throughout all Judea. Peter taught those Jews who were with him that it was proper to consider these Gentiles children of God, though the gospel had not been preached to them. Jesus said, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold." He meant the Jews and Gentiles, though the gospel had never been preached among the Gentiles. When the Apostle first went to Corinth, and God appeared to him and said, "Stay here and preach, I have much people in this city," the gospel had never been preached there before. It was a Gentile city. The truth is, God is not bound, not roped up in preachers. He is heard by all his people. I intend to defend him and champion his cause. Talking about the two denominations growing. I would rather grow slow and grow right, than to

grow fast and grow wrong. We are growing a great deal faster than a great many people think. I am not given to boasting. He says there are conversions among the Missionary Baptists. I thank God that, although they do not preach the gospel, God can regenerate his people among them, and does do it. I am glad he does work where the gospel is not preached. I am glad that these Missionaries, all of them that are born of God, are children of God. They never hear the gospel unless some old Baptist happens to go into their churches and preach it. As I am still in the lead, I have plenty of time. I was in the lead day before yesterday and yesterday. I have been in the lead today. I expect to be in the lead tomorrow. I will lead tip until four o'clock tomorrow evening, and he can follow on after me if he wants to. I was on my Fifth argument when I took my seat, which argument is based upon the parable of the sower. The good' ground is said to be the good and honest heart. How does a heart come to be good and honest? By having the seed sown? That cannot be. This ground was represented as good ground before the seed was sown. Isn't that so? Then the good and honest heart doesn't become good and honest by having seed sown into it, because the ground was good and honest before. The ground, the heart, must have been made good in the work of regeneration. I know of no other way to state it, for the unregenerated have an evil heart. Mt 12:35, "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things." Now, if there are any among the Missionary Baptists that are not born of God, you may get the grammar of it, you are not dead in the sense of not having natural sense, but you are dead spiritually. You Missionaries that are born spiritually, if you listen to the truth, which is this, The evil man out of the evil treasure never brings forth anything but evil; that good cannot come out of the evil treasure of heart; that an unregenerated man cannot bring both good, you will receive spiritual instruction. Faith is a good thing. Just as the grass is made to grow under rain, we are refreshed by preaching. That is what I gave my hand to my brother on. It is not the dead grass that is made to live by rain, it is the living grass, like faith comes out where the life has been planted. That is it. Now the evil heart, represented by the ground that is not good, doesn't produce anything that is good. But the good heart, represented by the good ground, produces that which is good. The change from an evil heart to a good heart effected in the work of regeneration, when the Lord takes away the stony heart out of the flesh and gives a heart of flesh. Eze 36:26. The seed sown said to be "The word." Mr 4:14; "The word of the kingdom," Mt 13:19; "The word of God," Lu 8:11. It is the truth proclaimed when the pure gospel is preached. Seed, then, is a figure used to represent truth. Truth taught is not life. Life is a mysterious something which we define as vitality, while truth is a statement of what is true. The difference between life and truth is so clear that anyone can see it, even Brother Throgmorton. The seed does not mean eternal life. Some seeds fell by the wayside, and the fowls of the air, satan represented by fowls, came and devoured them up, Eternal life cannot be devoured up. Some fell upon stony ground, and were scorched and withered away. Eternal life cannot be scorched and withered away. Some fell among thorns and were choked, Eternal life cannot be choked. He said it was not eternal life. But it looks to me like he is going to have hard work to explain this matter as being anything else than eternal life, according to his position. As the truth sown has a favorable effect on those hearts only that are honest and good, made good by regeneration; it follows that the preaching of the gospel is not employed as a means in the regeneration of sinners. I come to the Sixth argument in refutation of this proposition, which is that in order to hear or receive the preaching of the gospel in a spiritual sense, the sinner must first be of God; or, in other words, must be born of God. Jesus said to the unregenerated Jews, "Why do ye not understand my speech?" He answered immediately himself: "Even because ye cannot hear my words." If the preaching of the gospel

could ever have been the means of regenerating sinners, it surely would have regenerated those who had the advantage of the preaching of Jesus. If the word when preached by him was not a means in the hand of God to cause the deaf to hear, surely it is the height of presumption for any now to claim for their preaching what this proposition lays claim to, that God employs the preaching of such preachers as a means in the regeneration of sinners, means so necessary that sinners cannot be regenerated without it. The fact that they could not hear the preaching of Jesus Christ as he preached, asserts more than a mere lack of will or disposition to hear, it asserts positive lack of ability or power. Continuing in this discourse, Jesus says, "He that is of God, heareth God's words;" that is, he that is born of God, heareth God's words. "Ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." If two persons were under the sound of gospel preaching and one hears with spiritual hearing while the other does not, how is the difference to be accounted for? The one that hears is of God, is born of God, and the other hears not because he is not born of God. As one must be born of God in order to hear the word preached with spiritual hearing, the ability to hear cannot come by means of the preaching. To say that ability to hear comes by means of hearing is an absurdity. In further proof of this argument I read: 1Jo 4:5-6, "They are of the world; therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error." That preaching which unregenerated sinners can hear with an understanding is not gospel preaching, for the world of unregenerated sinners does not hear the true gospel of Christ, cannot hear it. This fact accounts for the large numbers which are merely of the world joining the Missionary Baptist church, whose doctrine is of the world. Their preaching is of the world. (Time expired.) ELD.

THROGMORTON'S FOURTH SPEECH. Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have come to the last day of the discussion, and it again gives me pleasure to come before you still affirming that the Scriptures teach that God employs the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. It is not necessary to enter further upon any definitions, I guess, however, it would be well to introduce the query box again the first thing; so I have some questions I want to give Brother Daily: Do you deny that faith comes by hearing the preaching of the gospel? Do you deny that until a sinner believes in Jesus that he is condemned and in a state of death? Do you deny that the failure of Christians to instruct others may be the occasion of the blindness and wickedness of those others? Do you deny that the blood of those who die in their sins may be required at the hands of those who failed to warn them? Do you think there will be any people in hell at last, who might have repented, in their life time on earth, had greater opportunities have been given them? Do you hold that God in justifying a sinner employs no instrument on the sinner's part? Do you believe that men in heathendom can attain to saving grace or repentance without the gospel? (He has really answered this already.) When an elect sinner is brought by the Holy Spirit to feel that he is condemned and lost, is the impression true or false? Just when, in personal experience, does God forgive a person's sins? Can a child of God be tempted and drawn to sin? Does a Christian ever actually sin, and does he suffer on account of it? Is the Christian dead to sin? If a Christian who is dead to sin may be drawn to sin and may actually sin and may suffer therefor, and still be dead to sin, why may not a sinner who is dead to righteousness be drawn to righteousness and take some steps in the direction of righteousness and suffer even to weeping and trembling, and still be dead to righteousness. Does God want everybody to do right all the time? (I want you to listen to this closely: Does God want everybody to do right all the time?) Does the devil want everybody to do wrong all the time? If God has more power than the devil and wants everybody to do

right all the time, do they do right all the time? Do not those born of God love God? If those born of God love God, does every elect man as soon as regenerated love God? If there is any unregenerated man that does not love God, is he lost or saved? If there is any regenerated man who has not both faith in and love for God. Have you not a man saved without either faith or love? Is it according to the will of God that one of his elect should live on and do wickedly for years and years before he is regenerated? If not, whose will prevents his regeneration? Reconcile the idea that the wickedness of an elect man delays his regeneration, and show why it is that during that delay his will (as you put it) is stronger than God's will? I think that will be enough for you. (Mr. Daily: If you have any more, go ahead.) (Mr. Throgmorton: I guess you would like to have all the time to fool away in trying to answer questions.)

Now to other business. I desire to give you an exposition of the parable of the sower and at the same time answer Brother Daily's argument on the parable. The sower was the Lord. It seems we are agreed on that. The seed is the word. We are agreed on that. The production of the new being from the seed and the soil is regeneration. That is what he denies. He holds that the soil was regenerated before the seed ever touched it, and so got a new being without any germ! Several kinds of hearts or hearers we have: Careless; stony ground (shallow minded); impulsive; full of worldly care; those that have open, good and honest hearts. "The preparation of the heart in man and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord;" Pr 16:1. But this preparation is not regeneration. "Drawing." See Joh 6:44, "No man can come to Christ except the Father draw him." But this drawing is not regeneration. God must open the heart that a man may attend to the word. See Ac 16:14. But this opening is not regeneration. "Giving," 1Co 3:5-7, and "reproving," Joh 16:7-9, are not regeneration. Neither drawing, nor, opening, nor giving, nor preparing, nor reproving is regeneration, Not one of them, nor all of them together. They are before regeneration. They are before faith and without faith. Drawing is before coming; before opening; before .attending; before reproving; before believing; not one of these first acts of the spirit is by faith, but before faith. Regeneration is by faith. Listen! This soil has no life in it before the seed was sown. Then the proper union between the seed and the good soil was perfected, then there was a new life and never before. And the new life is the regenerate life when you make the heart of man the soil. In nature the seed without the soil could not produce the new life. The prepared soil without the seed could not produce it. And both together could not produce it without moisture and sunshine! God gives the increase by means of all these. God does the work in the soil through the seed, the sowing of which seed, he says in the parable, represents the preaching of the word. Brother Daily says now that he gave me his hand on the idea that faith already implanted is called out by the word! You gave me your hand on the statement in the London Confession: "That grace of faith whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word." That is what you gave me your hand on. While he says he is not tied to the London Confession, yet chapter 10, paragraph 1, he accepts as explained by second paragraph. I say that God "is pleased effectually to call"- how?-"by his Word and Spirit out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ." Now Brother Daily says he accepts that as explained by the other. The other doesn't contradict it. I want to turn to page 54 of the Confession and read from it. "This effectual call"-how is that effectual call made? By the word and Spirit--this effectual call is by the word." Brother Daily, not from anything at all foreseen in man, nor from any power or agency in the creature (the word wasn't foreseen in man) co-working with his special grace; the creature being wholly passive therein, being dead in sins and trespasses, until, being

quicken and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it, and that by no less power than that which raised up Christ from the dead." This call which man thus answers is made by the Spirit and word. Now he says he accepts that. S2 he is tied to it. So you are tied to my proposition; glad to have you, Brother Daily. God bless you! (Shakes hands with Mr. Daily.) Brother Daily argues that a regenerated sinner may not believe on the Son of God. And quoted 1Jo 5:13 to prove it. The revised version renders the passage thus: "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, even unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God." You see they were already believers and I aim wanted them to know that they had eternal life. As to the one who believes not, "The wrath of God abideth on him." Joh 3:36. Brother Daily relies much on the idea that regeneration is called a resurrection. The dead sinner cannot spiritually hear the voice of the preacher. I agree that the dead sinner cannot hear, so as to understand; cannot come; cannot repent; cannot believe--unless the Father draws him! That is my doctrine. He cannot believe unless the Father gives him a power which by nature he has not, and this gift of power is the first thing that is done in bringing the sinner to Christ. Joh 6:44. But this drawing is not regeneration. If my brother says it is, it is his business to prove it. It is giving the sinner power to do that which without the drawing he cannot do. It is giving him the power to come where he can be regenerated. The truth is my opponent limits God's power. He holds that God cannot use the preaching of the gospel on a dead sinner. He thinks God cannot use it in the regeneration of sinners. We say he can and does. I have shown you what death in sin means. Paul explains something about it in Ro 7:9. Paul was from the day of his birth alive until the commandment came to him. During that time there was nothing against him either as to Adam's sin or as to his own actual transgression. That work which Jesus Christ did, brings to every man justification of life, and brought it to Paul, so that he says, "I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died." What does that mean? It means that when the commandment came he sinned and died, or came under condemnation. This was death to righteousness, exactly the opposite to the death of the saint to sin. My friend says there is something in a Christian which cannot sin. True, and the sinner cannot do righteousness of himself, but the saint can be led to sin notwithstanding, and the sinner can be empowered of God to hear and believe. Notwithstanding, God can do that. The sinner cannot do it of himself; but my argument is that God gives him power, and that when God so works faith in him (and remember we are both agreed that this faith is wrought by the ministry of the word)-when God so works faith in him, then he believes and then God regenerates him and in this there is direct impact and at the same time the use of the word. There is direct impact in producing faith and in regenerating. Brother Daily admits that in the production of faith God employs the word. So there is direct impact and the use of the word both at the same time, as held by both of us. Argument Nine. I want now to introduce Argument Nine. James explicitly makes the point that God employs the word of truth as a means in the regeneration of sinners. James the apostle does that. Let me read: Jas 1:18, "Of his own will begat he us"(of his own will regenerated he us)--"Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." Now let us read on and see if this is the word which is written and which is the gospel as preached. See 21st verse: "Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls. But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only"-a preached word-"and not hearers on~ deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass." So you see it is the written or preached word he is talking about. "Of his own will begat

he us." Isn't that my proposition? Eph 1:13, "The word of truth" Paul defines as "the gospel of your salvation." See Eph 1:13. The "engrafted word" (Jas 1:21) the Diaglott renders "implanted word." It is a word which we hear and a word which we do. So Jas 1:18 is another way of stating my proposition. God begat or regenerated these sinners, with the word of truth which they heard. This is, he employed the preaching in their regeneration. Couple this with Ga 3:26, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Not manifestly of God, but actually the children of God 'by faith, because of his own will begat he us with the word of truth which is preached in the gospel! God regenerated these by faith as a means. Not before faith; not without faith. And the faith came by hearing. Remember my opponent has admitted that as to faith. I must quote Dr. Gill on Jas 1:18: "But he begets of his own free will and favor, and of his rich and abundant mercy, and if his sovereign will and pleasure, according to his counsels and his purposes of old. And the means he makes use of, or with which he does it, is with the word of truth. Not Christ, who is the word, and truth itself-but the gospel which is the word of truth, and truth itself, and contains nothing but truth; and by this souls are begotten and born again; see Eph 1:13; 1Pe 1:23; and hence ministers of it are accounted spiritual fathers." Plainly according to Dr. Gill, and according to James, and according to my proposition, God begets sinners, God regenerates sinners with the word of truth, which word or truth is preached in the gospel. But let us return to the fact that Brother Daily tries to make much of the idea that regeneration is called a creation. That does not prove that God does not employ the word in it. My friend says: "No creature assists in its creation." True faith puts us passive into God's hands and God does the work; but he uses the word. This is fully explained in Eph 2:8-10. There is creation through faith. The creation in Christ and the salvation are the same. But how are they? Through faith; not before faith; not without faith. I don't want you ever to forget that; but by faith. So the creation is by faith. God does the creating through faith which is wrought in the hearts of the elect by the ministry of the word. Brother Daily has shaken hands with me on that. Therefore in regenerating sinners, God employs the preaching of the gospel. Brother Daily seems to feel hurt that I used the "old tune" in quoting, "My people shall be a willing people in the day of my power," and let on as if I had made fun of his voice and as if I claim to have a better one. I had no reference to your voice, Brother Daily. You have certainly as good a voice as I ha\`e. I wish God had given me a better one. I only used the "tune" as a little matter of pleasantry, and I have often said I would give a dollar to hear one of those old brethren preach again with the tune, as I used to hear them. Please don't cry; I didn't mean to hurt you or to make fun of you. Brother Daily says there must be life before there can be hunger and thirst. That is so in nature; but we are talking about spiritual things. There must be hunger for the divine life and thirst for the divine life before it can be had, and there must be the eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood that it may be had. Joh 6:53, "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of God ye have no life in you." Eating and drinking are in order to the life. Don't forget that. I mentioned a calf who was on the run. Brother Daily don't think I meant to call him a calf, but he takes it that the calf represents him. All right; take it that way. Then he insinuates that if he is the calf I am the dog after the calf. A pretty good turn, and I was amused; we all were; but this is good for my point. The business of a shepherd dog after a calf is to overtake him and bring him in if possible, and the calf has to run mighty fast if the dog does not get him. But Brother Daily says he is going to keep running till four o'clock this afternoon. Some years ago, when the Republican and Democratic platforms had been adopted, and nominations made, the Chicago Herald was not taking a very aggressive stand as to certain candidates who were before the people of Illinois for Governor. The editor was asked to explain, He said: "The

Democrats have nominated So-and-so for Governor of Illinois, and the Republicans have nominated So-and-so for Governor of Illinois. The Herald takes to the woods." Of course, if Brother Daily takes to the woods and doesn't try to bother my ramparts at all, I will just let him run. He says when paper is written on it is still paper. Sure, and when a man is regenerated, isn't he still a man? He has not changed in the animal sense at all. He is the same man, but a changed one. A check is written on paper; it is still paper, but mightly changed. I have shown him the difference. There is something in the paper and on the paper that wasn't there before. So when a man is regenerated there is something in him and on him that wasn't there before. But he is still a man. My friend says that God is not wrapped up in words nor in preaching. I have said all the time that God wasn't confined to preaching, but that he uses preachers and uses words: That is his method, as we have seen in James. Speaking of the growth of his people, Brother Daily says he would rather grow slowly and grow right. So with us. I would rather grow slowly and grow right, but we have been getting men from among their best. I mentioned some yesterday. They are Kirkland, Willis, Mitchell, and Pettus, and many more. Perhaps all I have just named are on the platform here. Preachers all of them. I count that pretty good growth. Vole will be glad to get Brother Daily and all these nice, goodlooking men here, when they get right, and I hope that some of you, after you have heard the debate and read the book and gotten the vision of what the preacher ought to be, will see something you haven't seen. But he says a sinner must be of God to hear. But he cannot be of God in the sense of regeneration till he believes. He says "every one that doeth righteousness is born of God." But men don't do righteousness till they believe. Believing is not working righteousness. Ro 4:5, "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Faith is the very opposite of working righteousness. But now hear this! Brother Daily says Missionary Baptist preaching is of the world, and that is why so many join us! You preachers understand. Yet isn't it strange that God chooses to regenerate so many for you people in our meetings? Why doesn't God pick out some other place? "Why doesn't he select a saloon or some other such place? God seems to make it a point to get to men right in the midst of the preaching which my friend says is of the world and there convert them. Ah, brother, it is under the preaching of the gospel. Has God changed his plan? I would almost guarantee that there have been "Hardshell" preachers attending this debate who were converted in our Missionary Baptist meetings. Some of them flew around mightily, too! I 'would guarantee it; and I guess I could prove it. This was because that in our meetings God's covenant was preached as taught by the Old London Confession. "It pleased the Lord to make a covenant of grace wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation, by Jesus Christ requiring of them (the sinners) faith in him that they might be saved." Old London Confession, chapter 7, paragraph 2. You are not tied to that, are you" Brother Daily? No; he is not tied to that, except as to my proposition. Although he is denying it, he has shaken hands with me on the statement that faith is wrought of God in the hearts of the elect by the preaching of the gospel, by the preaching of the word. Not only by the spirit, but by the word. But this last from the Confession, I suppose makes a little too large a dose for him. Let's see that again as to what this covenant of grace does: "It pleased the Lord to make a covenant of grace wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life." This offering of life is to that man that is as dead as "a dead horse." Brother Daily says there is no use of it, but the Old London Confession, which is the boast of Old School Baptists, says that God offers to sinners in this great covenant life and salvation by Jesus Christ and making requirements of them at the same time-requiring of them faith in him that they might be saved. And how does God work this faith in them? That paragraph goes on and tells that he guarantees to work

it. Chapter 7, paragraph 2. I want you to remember that point, that it is in the covenant of grace that God offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him that they might be saved. So this rampart which I have builded of these scripture texts-this fence which I have builded from passages contained in the word of God-remains intact in spite of the ingenuity, in spite of all the argument my friend has been able to bring. It still stands that, believing, we have "life through his name." (Time expired.) ELD. DAILY'S FOURTH REPLY Gentlemen Moderators, Worthy Opponent, Ladies and Gentlemen: As to the little pleasantry that my dear brother has raised relative to the calf, my retort is a matter of pleasantry too, that a dog might be after the calf. In referring to it again this morning, he speaks of himself as a shepherd dog after the calf. I deny that he is a shepherd dog; in this instance it is a long-legged calf and it is a bench-legged nest. And the benchlegged fiest and the long-legged calf have become so domesticated together that they are perfectly familiar, and the long-legged calf is just running from the bench-legged fiest through fun, because he can keep ahead without any trouble. Whenever he gets ready he just turns around and says ba-a to the bench-legged fiest. I had not intended to make any reference to this matter again, but as he has referred to it again this really reminds me of the boy that yoked himself up with a calf. It was on Sunday morning, and he told his pa he was going to yoke up with the calf. His pa was out to "latch the fun, and finally the boy and the calf were yoked up. The calf walked around for a while very docile, and finally began to run, and ran faster and faster, and there the boy was yoked up with the calf, and just in front was a stump all splintered up, and the boy began to call to his pa, "We are going to straddle that stump!" But instead of straddling the stump the calf struck the stump, and dragged him over, and went on with him. He has struck the stump, and he is just dragging along at his end of the yoke. I want to say, relative to the questions he propounded at the beginning of his speech, that I have some matter that I want to introduce in this speech, so I will not attend to these questions just now, but promise to attend to them later on. I have some important matter I wish to introduce. I wish first to notice, however, some of the answers he gave to the questions I asked in writing. "Does God want everybody to be saved?" He said, Yes, in the sense of desire. But he tried to make it appear that while it was God's pleasure, God's pleasure is not always performed, because we do not perform his pleasure. He is undertaking to make that appear because I have pressed him to know if God always does his pleasure. The question is not, do we always do God's pleasure. The question is, does God always do his pleasure. I may not do the pleasure of God, Brother Throgmorton, may not, but the question is not as to whether we do, but as to whether God does his own pleasure. If God desires the salvation of all sinners, if it is his pleasure -and God save's sinners-the question is not do they do his pleasure, but will he accomplish his own desire. He says: "I am God, and there is none else." "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." If God saves sinners, and it is his pleasure to save all sinners, will he not save them? If God has more power than the devil, and wants to save everybody, will he not save them? He said not necessarily. See how evasive that answer is. It will appear in the book. As to the seventh question: "If the alien sinner does not accept Christ when he does not love him, does he not accept what he does not want?" He says it might or might not be. The sinner might accept what he does not want. Is it not a fact that he accepts what he does not want if he accepts Christ when he does not love him. That answer is evasive. The New Hampshire Confession of Faith of 1853 is generally accepted by Missionary Baptists as their Confession of Faith. I notice that Mr. A. Malone, in his book entitled "The Issue," says: "We believe that, in order to be saved, sinners must be regenerated, or born again; that regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind; that it is effected in a

manner above out comprehension, by the power of the Holy Spirit in connection with divine truth, so as to secure our voluntary obedience to the gospel." Of course he will say that he accepts that, and I have objections to that part of it, but the confession goes on to say, "And that its proper evidence (the evidence of regeneration) appears in the holy fruits of repentance and faith and newness of life." Now, while I object to the term "in connection with divine truth," in this statement, I call attention to the plain declaration in that statement that repentance and faith and newness of life are holy fruits of regeneration, and that they are proper evidence of regeneration. I now have some questions that I desire to submit to Brother Throgmorton: Question One: Are infants who die in infancy regenerated? If so, how? If not, how are they saved? Question Two: Is opportunity the measure of responsibility? Question Three: Are heathen who die without ever having heard the gospel saved or lost? If saved, how? If lost, why? Question Four: If the true light, which is life, lighteth every man that cometh into the world, in the sense of all the human race, why do you and your people teach that millions of heathens are going down to hell in gross darkness for the want of the gospel? I desire to give you some things now relative to the relation of faith in the work of the eternal salvation of sinners, as that matter was brought in, and as my brother is insisting upon faith being a necessary condition in order to the reception of eternal life. Faith is not a condition or cause of salvation in the sense of the quickening or regeneration of the soul. Having faith in a fact cannot be performed from the expectation of reward. One cannot make up his mind to believe what he does not believe for the desire of reward for believing it. From this plain and indisputable fact it is clear that faith cannot be a condition in any sense whatever. Belief in a fact comes from being convinced of the fact, and the believer is wholly involuntary, necessarily so. This is simply indisputable. Faith in a fact has nothing whatever to do with its being a fact, and the belief of a falsehood does not make it a fact. Salvation in regeneration faith has nothing to do with, because it is a resurrection from death, a new creation in Christ. After this resurrection or new creation, faith is produced as a fruit of the Spirit in the heart (Ga 5:22), for with the heart a man believeth unto righteousness (Ro 10:10), a heart made good so as to bring forth good things (Mt 12:35). By faith the mourner, whose heart has been tendered by the work of regeneration, who is really in a blessed state already (Mt 5:4), by faith the mourner is delivered from his trouble and made to rejoice. This faith is God's gift to him, and not a thing exercised by him. Phillipians 1:29. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Eph 2:8. Now with reference to that, he made an argument in his last speech that Eph 2:8 and Eph 2:10 were connected in such a way as to show that it is through faith that we are created anew. I deny that. The salvation that is mentioned through faith is that which delivers us from our troubles, doubts and fears. That comes through faith. But the creation here is the new creation in Christ, which cannot be through faith, because it is unreasonable to say that creation is performed because of the faith of the thing created. It is absurd. It ought not to be called creation. It is unreasonable. There is a salvation that is by quickening with which faith has nothing to do. Hence the Apostle says, in the verse preceding, of this chapter, "By grace are ye saved," without saying anything about faith. In the eighth verse of this chapter the Apostle has special reference to the enjoyment we receive from the faith, rather than the actual creation itself. He said: "Does God want everybody to do right all the time?" Of course taking the position that God does want everybody to do right all the time, but using that to show that God's desire is not always accomplished, To be sure God's pleasure is not always accomplished in what we do. Is God's desire always accomplished in what he does-not as to what we do, but as to what God does? Will he regenerate all whose pleasure it is his to

regenerate? If not, does God do all his pleasure? It is in regard to what God does, and not to what we do, that I am inquiring about. In regard to the parable of the sower, he says the production of regeneration is from seed and soil. He didn't prove that. We just have his word for that. Here is the soil. Here is the seed. It possesses life. The seed is put in the soil. He says the life of the seed and the soil together produces a regeneration. Now what is the thing regenerated? He has already said that the ground is the heart of the sinner. Is the ground changed by that generation of seed in the soil? Is it? Is the heart of the sinner changed? No. He denied that the life in the seed sown is eternal life, when I charged him with teaching that fowls swallow eternal life, and yet he says the seed has the life that produces the regeneration. It is life that produces the regeneration, and yet it is not eternal life. I think that was a dodge of his to escape the ridiculous conclusion, and he knew no other way to dodge than to take that dodge. I am inclined to think he meant eternal life was in the seed, for he afterwards talked about the seed being incorruptible seed, and said this is the same seed. That is not an illustration of regeneration at all. Not at all. Where the ground is good, where the heart is good, good and honest, made so by the grace of God in regeneration, we may sow the word of divine truth, and that word will be seen manifested in the life and character of those that hear it, good and honest hearts that can hear a growth, a development, a manifestation. That is what our Saviour teaches in the parable, and there is no absurdity connected with that idea of it, because that is the true idea. But he will never escape the absurdity of his position while he lives. There are different kinds of ground; only one ground is good. It represents the good and honest heart, and if that is not a regenerated heart, I ask what it is. If it is not a regenerated heart, what is it? Please say what it is. He says preparation of the heart is not regeneration; drawing is not regeneration; opening the heart is not regeneration; reproving is not regeneration; then it is hard for us to find out what his idea of regeneration is. I want to say I attended a debate when Elder Penick and Elder Tant debated. And Elder Penick took the position that opening of the heart was regeneration, and he undertook to prove by that that the Spirit of Gael in regeneration operates in a manner distinct from, as well as in addition to, the spoken or written word. Brother Throgmorton doesn't have to accept Brother Penick's position. I only stated that to show that Elder Penick was more consistent than Brother Throgmorton, who says all these are before regeneration. The preparation of the heart is before regeneration. Then regeneration doesn't prepare the heart. Doesn't make any change in the heart. The heart is prepared before it is regenerated. What does regeneration do for it? If the heart is prepared before, what does regeneration do for it? I want you to come up and answer that. You may have more of that later on. In regard to what I gave my hand on, as contained in the London Confession of Faith. The first section of chapter fourteen says: "The grace of faith whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their soul is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word." Mark you, "the grace of faith." Not regeneration, but the grace of faith. "The grace of faith is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word, by which also, and the administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper, prayer, and other means appointed of God, it is increased and strengthened." Now that article needs an explanation. He gives his explanation to it, but I gave him my hand on that article with the idea that I was to have my explanation of it. The explanation is clearly just what the article means, and is that faith is a grace; faith is a gift; faith a fruit of the Holy Spirit. It is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word, and I explained in the sense as of water and rain falling upon the grass that was seemingly dead, that grass is revived, refreshed, brought out, developed, so under the preaching of the gospel the faith which the Spirit produced there (it is a fruit) is

brought out and developed. That is what I gave my brother my hand on, not on his particular interpretation of that section of the article. Death in sins is not death like a dead horse in all respects. Why, no; a man dead in sins is not dead in every sense. I said that. I say it again. A man dead in sins is alive naturally, and may be naturally very intelligent, and may naturally do many things. But my position is he does not possess divine life, and my brother admits that. He is so dead that he is just dead; he is so dead he has no life; so dead he has no divine life; he is dead in trespasses and in sins. There are no degrees in death. On Jas 1:18, "Of his own will begat he us," I desire to give you something. Instead of honored instrumentalities, the whole power of begetting is here ascribed to God's own will alone, that is, to the sovereign, immutable will of Jehovah. In Re 19:13, we read, "And he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called the word of God." In Heb 1:2 we are informed that God made the worlds by Christ, and in Joh 1:3 we learn that this was accomplished by the eternal logos, the word that was with God and was God. This wonderful work of creation was performed of God's own will, without the help of means or instrumentalities of any kind. This divine word in essence, the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever, is to be distinguished from the word in mere description, as the preaching of the gospel is. When the omnipotent one speaks direct, there is a power which belongs to the word thus spoken which imparts life to the dead, as when Jesus spoke with a loud voice at the grave of Lazarus. When that voice said "let there be light," immediately light sprang forth. This is altogether different from the public proclamation of the gospel. What the word of God does as spoken by him is a creative work, a work never assigned to his ministers. I desire to come now to my Seventh Negative Argument: Whatever is essential to regeneration in any case is essential in all cases. There is but one method of regeneration. If the doctrine of this proposition is true, therefore, the heathen who never hear the gospel, and the infants, and insane who cannot hear it, are left out and never can see or enter into the kingdom of glory. If, as Brother Throgmorton argued in his debate with Elder' Potter, and as he still argues, God cannot give the increase without the incorruptible seed, and the seen is planted by preachers alone, then that is the only method of regeneration, and no sinner can be eternally saved without it. This method cannot reach the heathen who never hear the gospel preached, or infants and insane and the idiotic who cannot hear it intelligently. It is upon the theory that thousands of heathens are sinking down to endless death every day because the gospel does not reach them that the cry goes forth from Missionaries continually for more money to help send the incorruptible seed to them. God cannot save them, according to this theory, because the incorruptible seed is not carried there and planted by preachers, and preachers fail to get there with the incorruptible seed because the people fail to furnish the money to send it to them. According to his system there are millions of souls in the agonies of hell today who would be in heaven if enough money had been given to carry the Missionary work. To illustrate that, suppose that a baker in this town should have a great amount of bread on hand. Suppose a family five miles from this town are starving for bread. Suppose they do not know the bread is in this place. Suppose they cannot get here if they knew. Suppose someone took the bread from the baker and carried it to the starving family. Who deserves the greater honor? Who deserves the greater credit? The one who has the bread in the bakery, or the one who carries it to this starving family? If that represents the provision as having been made by God, Christ and the Holy Spirit, but no one can receive it unless the preacher carries it, why would not the preacher have greater honor and have greater credit for saving the lost, for carrying the gospel? Surely he would. The provision will amount to nothing. What God has done, what Christ has done, what the Holy Spirit has done, will amount to nothing in the case of

the sinner who has never heard the gospel preached. The preacher must carry it to him. The credit belongs to the preacher for carrying that which he could not have without he carried it to him. Let us take this home to ourselves and give it a personal test. How would you like to be one of those ignorant heathens, with no chance of salvation only through the preaching of the gospel, with no incorruptible seed in reach, and no one to sow it if there were, and be dependent upon a people who live in luxury, who believe your salvation depends upon them, who have to be begged at continually to give for this purpose, and who give but a few cents a year to get the incorruptible seed to you? Had you not rather risk your case with God who is found by them who seek him not, who is made manifest unto them who ask not after him? How can any Missionary who believes that doctrine rest for a moment? Look at the preacher who gets \$10,000 a year for preaching in this country, who could live well on \$1,000 and give \$9,000 to send the incorruptible seed to heathen lands. Look at the proud, finely dressed lady, who pays \$75 for a dress and \$25 for a hat, and who must have a change of apparel every time she appears in society. She lives up \$10,000 a year in gaudy dress, while it is her creed that thousands of heathen are going down to endless woe every day for lack of money to send the incorruptible seed to them. Look at the wealthy banker, who rides in his auto that cost \$5,000 and who pretends to believe that his money would help send the incorruptible seed to the heathen. Look at the missionary church edifice in the city, which cost \$100,000, with furniture to correspond, and a pipe organ that cost \$10,000, the whole amounting to \$150,000 or more. It was erected and equipped by a congregation who have been taught to believe that their money will help to get the incorruptible seed to perishing heathens and keep them from sinking into an endless hell. I assert again that whatever is essential to regeneration in one case is essential in all cases. Infant-s cannot be reached by the system I am opposing. On the plan of regeneration laid down by this proposition they cannot be born again. The incorruptible seed which my friend declares is sown by the preachers alone cannot reach them and enter their little hearts if the theory of my opponent be true. (Time expired.)

ELD. THROGMORTON'S FIFTH SPEECH

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish that the bankers and many other moneyed fellows could have been here to have heard Brother Daily's speech. It might have done some of them good. But what has that got to do with that proposition on the chart? Do you know? How my brother can debate when he goes off dear away from the question! That is one of his methods. "Does God employ the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners?" That is our issue. It is not, Can he regenerate an infant without the preaching of the gospel? nor is it, Can he regenerate an idiot without the preaching of the gospel? Nor is it, Can he regenerate the exceptional case? That is not the question. I admit those are great questions, but they are not now before us. Brother Daily, what is the matter with you? Why do you want to debate a question not at issue? But the calf has got to run, you know. Don't I look a good deal like a fiest dog? I think you are wool-gathered, Brother Daily. If you had said hound-dog-I thought maybe you would get off the hound-dog on me-you had a good opportunity to have made a good one on me, or on yourself. As to the boy that was yoked up with the calf, I don't see the application here, only to tell it and make us laugh. I thought that in that yarn it was an old man yoked up. The higher critics are finding new versions for everything. So I guess I will turn you over to the higher critics on that story. (Mr. Daily: I am a high critic.) He says, "I may not do the pleasure of God, but does God do his pleasure? God says he will. 'I will do all my pleasure.'" The -meaning is he will do all he has determined to do, but God doe~ not bring to pass everything he desires. Brother Daily admits that he may not do all the pleasure of God. Does God desire you to do right all the time? That is God's desire.

Brother Daily doesn't do right all the time. So God's desire is not brought to pass. Then why not the same in other cases? Well, he quotes the New Hampshire Confession, and, as I think; misconstrues it. That Confession says the evidences of regeneration are "manifest in the holy fruits of repentance, and faith and newness of life." That doesn't mean the regeneration is before repentance and faith, but that the fruits which grew out of repentance and faith and newness of life are the evidences of regeneration. So I accept the article just as it is. He doesn't dwell on that part of it which says that regeneration is "effected by the Holy Spirit operating in connection with divine truth." He doesn't agree with James, Jesus and John. He doesn't agree with the London Confession which affirms my proposition in nearly so many words. He says faith has nothing to do with regeneration. Don't that beat you? Faith, God's direct gift, has nothing to do with regeneration which is God's direct work. They have nothing to do with one another. Two different works! I thought you said, Brother Daily, that righteousness was a fruit. Doesn't fruit have anything to do with the tree? That is going in the book. Faith is God's gift? Certainly. Faith is God's direct gift, but that is not the issue. The issue is whether faith and regeneration are inseparably connected in God's method. My position is that faith is necessary to regeneration because "ye are all the children of God by faith." How are you going to be regenerated without faith, if it is by it? And if it is as he says that faith is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word, how are you going to get away from my proposition? My opponent proceeds to deny that salvation in Eph 2:8 means creation. The salvation in Eph 2:8 and the creation in Eph 2:10 I say are the same. He admits salvation is through faith, but he says this means deliverance from our troubles. What are our troubles? What is our trouble? Sin. We are under wrath. We are under the curse. We are dead in sins. And salvation delivers us from these. How? Through faith. How do we get life from the dead? By regeneration. Of course the creation and the salvation are the same. But he says that it is unreasonable that a creature should have anything to do in its own creation. That is his idea. "Create in me a clean heart, O God," says the 51st Psalm: the verse I cannot now give you exactly. Here David says, "Create in me a clean heart, O God." Didn't David have anything to do with that? If any are athirst, or hungry or seeking, - if he prays for God to create a new heart in him, it would be unreasonable, according to Brother Daily. The creature is absolutely unconscious in the matter of creation, according to him. He tells you that in explaining the parable of the sower I go far astray. It seems he can't understand me. I said that God, through the seed, and through the soil, and through His gifts of moisture and sunshine and heat, produced the life and brought the fruit. God produced the life in the new grain through the seed, using all the other things. So God employs the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. That is his means of giving life. Not that the preaching is life; not that the word is the life; not that the seed is the life. God gives the life through the seed. Brother Daily has said-I don't know how many times has said-that I hold that the incorruptible seed means eternal life. I did not say that. I think everybody else understands my position. If you want to keep bleating up that tree (I can't say barking, because I am the dog), I can't help it. I think the people understand. When he says he thinks I dodged here or there, I think he is mistaken. I don't believe I did. A difference of opinion. I have now Argument Ten, which I want to give you. It will be along the line of the argument on Jas 1:18. Peter specifically teaches that we are born again by the word which is preached. 1Pe 1:23-25: "Being born again (regenerated), not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." (God's word shall not pass away; it will live forever.) "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever." (It shall not

pass away; it shall stand forever.) "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." And by that word we are born again. To prove to you conclusively that the word here means the word we preach, let me read right on into the next chapter. You know in the original the Scriptures were not divided into chapters. "Wherefore, laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." You have been born again of this incorruptible seed, and you are to "desire the sincere milk of the word"-the same word-"that you may grow thereby." If this does not prove that the word here means the word that is preached, nothing can be proved by language. In the Greek it is *logos* (logos) in verse 23; *rhema* (rhema) in verse 25; *logos* (logos) in 2:1. *Logos* (Logos) rarely means Christ Himself. *Rhema* (rhema) never means Christ. *Logos* (Logos) sometimes does, but it does not so mean here. Peter says he is speaking of the word *rhema* which by the gospel is preached, and that by this word *logos* we are regenerated or born again. The scriptures teach that God employs the preaching of the gospel (this same word) as a means in the regeneration of sinners. Not that the word itself does it. Not that. Not that we do it. God does it, using the word as a means, just like Peter says. Brother Daily says that it is mighty hard for him to find out what I mean. I thought I made a fine lot of definitions at the start, brother, which you agreed to, as I remember. I said that regeneration was the communication of the divine nature. The impartation of the divine life to a human soul-that is regeneration. Of course, the regenerated man is the same, but he is a changed man, with a new life and a new nature. That is regeneration. The question before us is: How does God do it? What is God's method? Not what God can do, but what is his method? God could make an oak without an acorn. He did once; but now he uses the acorn. God could regenerate the Chinaman in the heart of China without anything in the way of means that we know; but whether he does it or not, I do not know. His method is that stated in my proposition, and in the London Confession, and in Jas 1:8. This is what I am here to prove. He says now that the London Confession, chapter 14, needs explanation. He ought not to have shaken hands with me till he made his explanation. He says he gave his hand on the explanation. That is a funny way-having a written contract and needing an explanation of it. A poor way to try to get out, Brother Daily. Then he says that faith is a grace. I grant it. It is a fruit of the Spirit. He says it is originally wrought by the ministry of the word. How does that get him out? It gets him in again. His explaining that it is a grace, a fruit of the Spirit, doesn't help him a bit. If that is true, this fruit is wrought by the word, and this fruit is necessary to regeneration. He has surrendered the question. "Ye are all the children of God." How? By faith," which my opponent says is wrought by the ministry of the word. Then he says that the London Confession article doesn't mean the working of faith in the sense of producing it, but that it is more like when the rain comes down and brings out the grass that is withered. That is not the point. The article which he has agreed to says "wrought." The rain doesn't work the grass; the grass is not wrought by the rain. This faith is wrought, produced by the ministry of the word. That is the language of the Confession. And this will go into the book in cold type. "Well," says Brother Daily, "the dead sinner is not in all respects like a dead horse, but he doesn't have divine life." We are agreed on that. The sinner doesn't have any divine life at all, but he has other phases of life. Mental life, moral life, animal life. Take a man that is as blind as a bat. You can talk to him about sight and the blue sky, and get him to understand there are such things. And possibly he may desire sight and to see the sky. And God does put it into the heart of sinners that are dead to divine life the desire for divine life, and when a man so wrought on cries to God for life, God gives him life. When he is led by the Spirit to repent of his sins that he may

know Christ and accepts Christ as his, then he has Christ and all that is in him. "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." He has not divine life. That is the idea. He has animal life, and moral life, and mental life, but not divine life. My brother comes to Jas 1:18. He says that the begetting there is ascribed to the power of God. That is right. That is what my proposition says. "Of his own will begat"-that is the same as regeneration-he has agreed to that. "Of his own will begat he us." How? That is the question. "With the word." That is what my proposition says. God employs the preaching as a means. My friend undertakes to prove that "word" means Christ because it is "logos." I read the whole connection in order to show that interpretation is not correct. Give me your ears, Brother Daily. "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." You say, "with himself, Jesus Christ." I say it means the word that is preached. Read on: "Wherefore, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear." Hear what? The word. "Slow to speak, slow to wrath, for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." The reason the saint should be thus is because he has been begotten "with the word." So he should be swift to hear it. But read on: Wherefore, lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted (implanted) word." (Paul says, "I plant, God makes it grow.") "And receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." Next verse: Be ye doers of the word." (That means the word we preach; we do the word; we do the preaching.) "And not hearers only, deceiving your own selves. For if any man be a hearer and not a doer he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass." Now I think I have proved that the word in Jas 1:18 means the written word, the preached word; and, therefore, I have proved that God employs the preaching of the gospel, or written word, or spoken word, as a means in the regeneration of sinners. "Of his own will God begets us with the word of truth." Almost the language of the proposition. Exactly the meaning which Dr. John Gill, the prince of commentators and the greatest scholar of his age, gives as the correct interpretation. And that will go in the book. Brother Daily comes to what he calls his Seventh Negative Argument. He says, "Whatever is essential to regeneration in one case is essential in all cases." That means that God cannot do otherwise. He is limiting God in this controversy. God cannot, he says, do any other way except in this way that he mentions. Now here is the way it looks to me: God, according to his divine method, employs a preacher. God, being Almighty, may go outside of that means and regenerate in exceptional cases, such as heathen, infants, insane, and so on. We are not talking about those who are not actual sinners, though. My opponent says there would be souls in heaven today, according to my doctrine, if money had been furnished to send them the gospel, who, as it is, are lost in hell, and didn't he tip-toe? Now suppose that was so. I reckon he was trying to get even with me for showing him up so. Why didn't you say, "Pull down the curtain"? Again I say, let us have the truth, if the heavens fall. If what he says is true-I don't admit that it is, but grant that it is-what has it to do with my proposition? Nothing at all. Not a thing. So we have time wasted. Then he makes the bread illustration. If a baker has bread and a family are starving and a messenger carries the bread to them, to whom would the starving family be under the most obligations, the fellow that took it to them, or to the baker who had and sent the bread? He thought, if anything, they would be under more obligations to the man that took it to them. Suppose I grant that; what has it got to do with our proposition? God (he is sovereign, and he uses means to carry out his decrees as the Old London Confession says) that has provided, the same God that makes the decree, can just as easily, if he will, carry it out by that method, and if the preacher isn't there, we haven't been faithful enough to the great commission to send him there. As Dr. John M. Watson says concerning the matter, "We have violated our commission." Yes, we

have done it. I want to read to you what the brethren who subscribed to the Old London Confession said: "May not the gross ignorance and instability of many, with the profaneness of others, be justly charged upon their parents and masters, who have not trained them up in the way wherein they ought to walk when they were young, but have neglected those frequent and solemn commands which the Lord hath laid upon them, so to catechize and, instruct them that their tender years might be seasoned with the knowledge of the truth of God as revealed in the Scriptures; and also by their own omission of prayer and other duties of religion in their families, together with the ill example of their loose conversation, having inured' them first to a neglect and then contempt, of all piety and religion. We know this will not excuse the blindness and wickedness of any, but certainly it will fall heavily upon those that have been thus the occasion thereof; they indeed die in their sins (that is, those that have been neglected), but will not their blood be required of those under whose care they were, who yet permitted them to go on without warning, yea, led them into the paths of destruction?" Those old brethren taught the very same thing that my opponent says we do-that by our neglect of those that ought to be taught, their blood will be upon us, when they die in their sins. Of course they are not excusable, but we are responsible for not having done what we ought. Again Brother Daily went after the bankers and high-salaried preachers. That is all right. I say go after them. I don't think much of the religion of a man myself who wouldn't give to spread the gospel. I am like Dr. Watson on that. We have "violated our commission," in a measure, and you people are violating it altogether. Here are a few questions I was about to forget to notice. He asks: "Are infants who die in infancy regenerated?" What has that got to do with our proposition? It is about as much akin to my proposition as the moon is akin to a green cheese. If it is akin, how? I believe that all who die in infancy are saved; and I think God gives them his own nature and fits them for heaven. I don't know how. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." If God does not give them his own nature, how are they saved? Giving them his own nature is regeneration. "Is opportunity the measure of responsibility?" Yes, sir. Yes, sir. Are the heathen who die without ever having heard the gospel saved or lost?" If they have sinned, and God has not gone outside of his method as laid down in the book, and given them faith and through that faith regenerated them, they are lost, of course. "If lost, why?" Not because they have rejected Christ, but because they have sinned. "If saved, how?" Like we are. The Gentiles who have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law. That is the doctrine. If one of those heathen over there should, by the providence of God and the inward teaching of God, be led to trust himself upon the mercy of God, a; a sinner lost, having violated that law which he is bound by, the mercy of God would save him, Whether such a thing occurs or 'not, I don't pretend to' know. It may occur. I pray God that it may. "If the true light which is life, lighteth every man that cometh into the world, in the sense of all the human race, why do you and your people teach that millions of heathen are going down to hell in gross darkness for the want of the gospel?" I think that is a little far fetched. Now Christ is the true light; there is no doubt about that. But my time is up. We will attend to this later, maybe. Thank you. (Time expired.) ELD. DAILY'S FIFTH REPLY Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Before proceeding to notice the speech to which you have just listened, I call your attention to the contrast as presented on this blackboard between the Bible teaching and the teaching of my worthy opponent: BIBLE A corrupt tree (alien sinner) cannot bring forth good fruit. "Ye (alien sinners) cannot hear my words." "He that knoweth God, heareth us." "He that is of God, heareth God's word." "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." THROGMORTON A corrupt tree (alien sinner) can bring forth good fruit. Alien sinners can and do hear in

order to obtain eternal life. Alien sinners hear us. Alien sinners hear God's word. The natural man can and does receive the things of the Spirit. According to the Bible: A corrupt tree, alien sinner, cannot bring forth good fruit. According to Brother Throgmorton's position, a corrupt tree, alien sinner, can bring forth good fruit, the fruit of faith, for instance. According to the Bible Jesus says, "Ye, alien sinners, cannot hear my words." Brother Throgmorton's position is, alien sinners can and do hear in order to obtain life. According to the Bible, he that knoweth God heareth us. Brother Throgmorton's position is that alien sinners hear us. According to the Bible, "He that is of God hears God's word." According to Brother Throgmorton's position, alien sinners hear God's word. The conclusion from these two terms, by completing a syllogism, would be: Therefore alien sinners are of God. According to the Bible, the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God. According to Brother Throgmorton, the natural man can and does receive the things of the Spirit of God. This will go into the book. From what Brother Throgmorton and I say about the book there will evidently be a great deal in it. We are trying to advertise the book. In reference to my last argument, which I had not finished when I took my seat, the brother asked this question: What has his argument to do with this proposition? My argument kills the proposition. It shows the proposition to be false. It shows it to be absurd, because God would not set on foot a scheme of salvation that he knew would be so ineffectual in accomplishing the work that it would be his pleasure to accomplish in the salvation of sinners. That is what the argument has to do with this proposition. He says that God can regenerate without the gospel. But he said in his debate with Elder Potter that God does not give the increase except where the seed is sown. If he does not do what he can do, will he ever do it? In reference to the state of the heathen he says if God should go out of his method as set out in the Bible that he might regenerate some of the heathen; but he has said God doesn't do it. Then if God does not do it, will he ever do it? Will one of the heathen ever be saved who never hears the gospel preached, if God doesn't give the increase except where the preacher goes and sows the seed? Alluding to himself: "Don't I look like a fiest dog?" When I said that if he is a dog he is merely a bench-legged fiest, I didn't have reference to his stature—a stature over six feet and four inches tall, beating me just a shadow. I had reference to his success in this debate. He is far behind and can't catch up. He says I might not do the pleasure of God. "Brother Daily," he said, "God does not bring to pass all he desires." Now, my not doing the pleasure of God, and his not doing the pleasure of God, is not something that God brings to pass, but something we bring to pass. I am talking about what God brings to pass. I am talking about what God desires to do according to his own pleasure. Now if it is his pleasure to regenerate that sinner, will he not do so? I am not talking about what that sinner does; I am talking about what God does. He says he will do all his pleasure. If it is his pleasure to regenerate that sinner, will he not do his pleasure? And he will regenerate every sinner whom it is his pleasure to regenerate, or he will not do his pleasure. In reference to faith and regeneration, he said this: It is a fruit, but has the fruit anything to do with the tree? The fruit has nothing to do with producing the tree, and if the faith is fruit of regeneration, faith has nothing to do with producing regeneration. Now notice: He says that I take 'the position that faith has nothing to do with regeneration. I did take the position that faith has nothing to do with regeneration so far as producing it is concerned. Then he says, "Yes, it is a fruit." But does the fruit have no relation to the tree? Oh, yes. But what relation does it have to the tree? It doesn't produce the tree. The peach does not produce the peach tree that bears it. So if faith is the fruit of regeneration, faith does not produce regeneration. Regeneration must be first, if faith is the fruit of regeneration. You said that faith is the fruit of regeneration. (Mr. Throgmorton: I think not. I did

not say that.) "He that believeth," John says, "is born of God." If that is true, he does not believe in order to be born of God. The position cannot be true that he that believeth is born of God and the position be true at the same time that men believe in order to be born of God. That last position requires that the believing be before being born of God. If believing is before being born of God, then it cannot be said that he that believeth is born of God. It is like we were to undertake to ascertain whether a man, who is apparently dead, is really dead or not, and we examine the man. He lies before us, and we find him breathing, and we say: He breathes. He is alive. Therefore this man is alive. He wasn't breathing to get life. His breathing was the evidence. So he that believeth hath everlasting life. The believing is the evidence of it. He came over, you remember, all this in his last speech; the statement that you are all the children of God by faith. You remember my answer to that. We are said to be children by obedience. I proved that. Not that our obedience makes us to be the children of God, but that it manifests that we are, and so we are the children of God by faith, because faith manifests that we are. Wherever I find one believing, giving evidence by a shining faith, I am convinced by the faith I see that he is a child of God, and therefore is a child of God by faith, manifestly, just as we are children of God by obedience manifestly. In reference to Eph 2:8, where I said, or in regard to which I said, that faith is what relieves us from our trouble, he says, what is our trouble? Listen! We are never troubled on account of sin when we are dead in sin, because the dead are not troubled. The very first cry of the troubled one is evidence of life, and hence our Saviour said: "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." Your mourning is not what brings you life, but is evidence that you are already in a blessed state, and comfort is going to follow. And so the dead in sin, whose hearts are enmity against God and despise the truth, and are in sin, are never in trouble. You never heard a person who was dead in sin troubling over it. It is never until his heart is touched that he becomes troubled, and the first cry is evidence of life. Crying comes from life, and not from death. But he turns to Ps 51 and gives a little part of David's prayer, wherein he says: "Create in me a clean heart." That doesn't allude to regeneration at all. David had committed an enormous sin, and he felt the guilt of that sin and desired that God should give him a disposition never to sin that way any more; to cleanse him from that guilt in his actual experience; that he might realize God's love in his heart, notwithstanding the great sin. It has no allusion to regeneration. In reference to the seed planted in the soil, I suppose he means if it is corn that the corn stalks are children of God. I suppose that is the lesson he aims to get. That there will be just as many children of God as there are good seed sown. But I want to know if the children are the stalks, is not life in the seed? The sower sowed the same identical life, and is not that eternal life? Let him come to that and answer it. His explanation of the parable of the sower is wrong. I had it in my mind to quote a proverb: "The legs of the lame are not equal; so is a parable in the mouth of fools." But maybe I had better not quote that. It might not read well in the book. He calls your attention to 1Pe 1:23, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." The Bible is not the word that liveth and abideth forever, and preaching is not that word. It was many centuries from the beginning of time until the first word of the Bible was written. Besides, life is not in it. It never was in it. It was never intended to communicate life, neither the Old Testament nor the New. That is not the design of the Bible. A distinction is made between the preaching and the word itself. He is the incorruptible seed. In his life we have life. We cannot give him, however, to others. We haven't the power to do that. No more power for that than we have the power to raise the dead. The Jews made the same mistake my brother is making. Jesus informed them that the Scriptures only testify of

him; that he is the life. Mere testimony of this word, this eternal life, will not impart the life. There must be a communion of the life itself. "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." He did not say he would authorize and empower the preachers to do it. He said, "I will." Regeneration is the impartation of divine life. Doesn't that come before the spiritual action of the sinner? He said God could make an oak, that he did once. That must be in his head of supposition. How does he know but that God made the acorn first? All that is in the oak tree, so far as life is concerned, is wrapped up in the acorn. He said as to faith, it is a fruit of the Spirit. If it is a fruit of the Spirit, the Spirit must be there before the fruit is produced. If the Spirit is there before the fruit, eternal life is there-or else the Spirit is a dead thing. Come to that. If it is a fruit of the Spirit, the Spirit must be there before the fruit. If the Spirit is there eternal life is there, if the Spirit is eternal life. He said dead sinners do not have divine life. When they have the Spirit of God, when they produce the fruit, I want to know if they don't have eternal life then? What is essential in one case is essential in all. I am not limiting God. I say again what is essential in one case is essential in all. He is taking the position that it is absolutely essential. He takes the position that there can be no increase without the preaching. That the preaching must be done. If it is essential in one case, it is essential in all. And as to the infant, he says God may change its heart. I say if his doctrine is true he cannot. I say if his proposition is true that preaching is the means in regeneration, God cannot reach the infants. Why? Because God cannot reach the little infant by the preaching of the gospel. As to the way the little infant is saved, we can know if we can find out how the adult is saved. Mr 10:15, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of heaven as a little child; he shall not enter therein." The Spirit reaches the heart by direct contact. It reaches the heart of the heathen by direct contact. It reaches the heart of every sinner regenerated, and therefore no means comes in between the thing operated upon and the thing operating. So God is not limited. It is all by direct contact. He does according to his own will. I had not finished my argument when I took my seat. I will finish that. How much better, how much sweeter is the truth as taught in the word of God than the ridiculous system we are now examining. There is but one method of regeneration, and it reaches to the farthest borders of the continents, to the most remote islands of the sea. It touches the hearts of impenitent sinners, turns their impenitency into sobs and tears, their unbelief into a confiding, loving trust. It pierces the hearts of the little babes as well, and gives them a birth of the Spirit by which they are made spiritual and prepared to see and enter into the kingdom of heaven. It is the sovereign Spirit of God that quickens in all these cases. It gives life to the dead in sins and they live, for life eternal is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord. And the Ephesians, the Apostle wrote that they had been going the wrong way until the very moment God quickened them. They didn't turn in order to get the quickening done. The Ephesians didn't turn in order to get God to quicken them. They didn't turn and long after life, seek after life, in order to get God to quicken them, but according to the Apostle they were going the wrong way until the very moment that God quickened them. That turned them about. "For his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ." Not when we were seeking him, but when we were dead in sins, when we were going the wrong way. And when they were out of the reach of the preaching of the gospel, and the preaching would have been as a dead letter, God went into the chambers of the soul and quickened them, changed their condition from death to life. The system we are examining in making this argument-or rather refuting-gives man too much glory and God too little praise. The true plan of salvation gives God all the glory and man no praise. I know it is humiliating to proud mortals, but it is God's way. All who are finally saved in glory will have

been born again from above, of God and not of man. Not of the will of man, not of the will of the flesh, but of God. I want to draw a picture here. I sketch a continent of wealth, inhabited by people who live in luxury, who believe their money will send the incorruptible seed to an island just across the sea, where heathens are in darkness and dying and sinking down to endless suffering because that seed does not reach them. A rich man dies in the favored land and goes to heaven. On the heathen shore a poor man with his wife and infant are dying with starvation. The infant is saved upon some other plan than the one stated in this proposition we are discussing. But it is impossible for the adult to be saved upon any other plan, for the preachers alone plant the incorruptible seed, and no preacher has ever planted that seed in the hearts of these heathen parents. As they die, they sink down to the bottomless pit of endless despair, while their babe rises to the dimes of immortal glory. Why did the rich man from the Christian country ascend to heaven while two poor parents in the heathen land sank into endless misery? Why did these parents land in the fiery domains of woe while their babe entered the sunny realms of everlasting delights? The everlasting separation, according to this theory, is because the rich man in the Christian country did not do his duty. The poor parents separated from their darling babe, and consigned forever to the regions of helpless despair, while the rich man basks in the smiles of his approving God, all because the rich man did not send a preacher to that heathen island to plant the incorruptible seed. I reckon if people want to believe that doctrine and spend their money to support those who teach it, they may, but excuse me from accepting it. It is irrational, and will not stand the test of logical investigation. It is unscriptural, and sinks before the light or divine truth. I remember reference is made to certain ones in Ac 19. The seven sons of Sceva tried to cast out evil spirits by using the name of Jesus Christ and of Paul, "We adjure you by the name of Jesus Christ whom Paul preacheth." I remember in their case the evil spirit said, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?" It may be that these preachers, in trying to get the evil spirits out, in order to save sinners, may be addressed in that way, and they may ask, "Who are ye?" and that the strong man armed will keep his palace till the stronger comes upon him. The stronger is not Brother Throgmorton, is not all the preachers in line with him put together. The stronger is Jesus Christ, my blessed Saviour. The strong man armed will never be unarmed by them. These men cannot cast out the evil spirits in the one case, or instill the good Spirit in its place. It does not depend upon them. No, my precious friends. If I have time I will at least notice my next negative argument, because I will not get through with the preparation I have made. My eighth argument to the utter overthrow of this proposition is founded upon the absurdity of the idea that Satan is unbounded in his field of operation, is not dependent upon human aid or books, but operates everywhere by his own personal presence. All around the world and in all ages of the world, from the beginning of the human race down to the end of it, Satan is bringing ruin. He is dragging sinners down to hell according to the system which this proposition expresses: God cannot get where the preacher cannot take him. He gives Satan the advantage of him by allowing him to encircle the whole world, while God, who would save them, cannot do it, because the preacher does not take the incorruptible seed there! The devil, then, not having tied himself up in any book, or limited himself to any territory by human agencies, is in every part of the world, dragging people down to hell by the thousands every day, while God cannot reach the vast field of his operations because no preacher is there and no Bible has been circulated among the people! Elder Throgmorton, remember, said, in his debate with Elder Potter, that God has made the preaching of the gospel and other things inseparable in the conversion of sinners in all lands, countries and nationalities, since the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Page 6. So it will not do

for him to say that God may go there if the preacher doesn't. He has taken the position that God cannot do that! (Time expired.) ELD. THROGMORTON'S SIXTH SPEECH Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: Brother Daily gave you some contrasts, as he thought, in his speech a while ago. I don't think really that the contrasts exist altogether as he stated them. For instance, he says that "Brother Throgmorton takes the position that the alien, the corrupt alien, can hear and understand, and that the Bible says he cannot." What Brother Throgmorton says is that the alien can understand when God helps him and not without God's help. He didn't represent me correctly. So as to the rest. I want this to be remembered: I say that the first thing in order to the conversion and salvation .of a sinner is the drawing of the Holy Spirit. In other words, God moves first in the bringing of the sinner to Christ. God draws the sinner and then the sinner comes. Without that drawing the sinner cannot come. But, remember, drawing is God's act and coming is the sinner's act. The sinner does the coming. Now for some contrasts I want to show you: CHART On this side John R. Daily. On this side Confession of 1644. Confession of 1656. Old Philadelphia Confession. Dr. John Gill Dr. R. W. Fain Dr. John M. Watson On one side is John R. Daily. On the other side is the Confession of 1644-the Old Baptist Confession of seven churches, 1644; the Somerset Confession of 1656; the Old London Confession; the Old Philadelphia Confession; Dr. John Gill; Dr. R. W. Fain; Dr. John M. Watson. Now with some of these Brother Daily professes to agree, but he denies my proposition, and all these agree with my proposition. And that will go in the book. I will furnish the stenographer a copy of the chart if she desires. And here are some contrasts between John R. Daily and the Bible: CHART JOHN R. DAILY Regeneration before faith and without faith. God saves before and without faith. Life that we may believe. God does not use the written or spoken word of truth in regenerating sinners. THE BIBLE Children of God by faith. Saved by grace through faith. Believing that we may have life. God begets (regenerates) us with the word of truth. Here are certainly contrasts. There is John R. Daily on that side. John R. Daily says, "Regeneration before faith and without faith." The Bible says, "Children of God by faith." It doesn't take more than half an eye to see that, does it? "God saves before faith and without faith," says John R. Daily. The Bible says, "Saved by grace through faith." Not without it; not before it. John R. Daily says, "Life that we may believe." You have got to have life, divine life-you may have animal life, mental life, and moral life; but he says you have got to have spiritual life, the divine life in order to believe! The Bible doctrine is this: "Believing that we may have life." You can see that, can't you? Just like that is our contention. One is "life in order to believe,"- and one is "believing in order to life." And one is Bible and one is John R. Daily. John R. Daily does not use the written or spoken word of truth in regenerating sinners. The Bible says, "God begets (regenerates) us with word of truth." I think that is as complete a contrast as I ever saw between the two things. So much for contrasts, Brother Daily. Now let us see where we were. Getting so much stuff in my notes here gets them a "little mangled up," as the fellow said. About Brother Penick. I am inclined to think you misunderstood Brother Penick, Brother Daily. (Mr. Daily: I think not.) I believe that God's "opening the heart" is the first thing that is done in bringing a sinner to Christ, and that it is equivalent to drawing. God opens the sinner's heart. His Spirit does that. The Holy Spirit does that absolutely and directly, and may do that in the absence of all means. Many a man's heart is opened in the absence of the word of truth; but that opening is not regeneration. Lydia's heart was opened that she attended to the things that were spoken or Paul. One of the things was to believe the message. And Brother Daily thinks that according to my doctrine God cannot regenerate without the word of truth or seed of the kingdom in any case. Suppose that was possible. Isn't it just as possible for God to provide the seed and sow it in a

heathen's heart as it would be to regenerate him without the seed? My friend wants to limit God. He thinks it possible for God to regenerate without seed, but not possible, he thinks, for God to furnish the seed. Remember we are talking about the method that God uses, and if I show that this is the ordinary method as in every case of New Testament it is conversion, it appears my proposition is sustained. When he spoke of me as a fiest he had no reference to me as to physique. He says it was my inability to follow-and yet he had me right after him, my level best! He says our not doing God's will is not the question. Of course that is not the question in debate. The question in debate is in the proposition on the chart. You, Brother Daily, are springing all sorts of questions in this discussion, instead of confining yourself to the particular question before us. If God's will is for you to do all right all the time-if that is his will, according to your doctrine, will not God make you do it? If he doesn't, God's will isn't done, is it? Surely not. He has been quoting Isa 46. I want to read a little of that. Here it is. Isa 46:9-11. I will read a little further than he did: "Remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me. Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient time the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure: Calling a ravenous bird from the East, the man that executeth my counsel from a far country; yea, I have spoken it, I will bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it." So if God has purposed to save his elect wherever they are, he is just as competent to send a preacher as he is to send a ravenous bird. Now we are both agreed that faith is the fruit of the Spirit as produced by the Spirit; and you have agreed, Brother Daily, that it is not produced by the Spirit without the word; you have agreed that the Spirit and the Word work faith in the hearts of the elect! Brother Daily agrees to that. We are both agreed that faith is a fruit of the Spirit. The Spirit puts faith, works faith in the heart of the elect by the ministry of the word, but faith is not a fruit of regeneration. Being a fruit of the Spirit, it is that by which regeneration takes place. Thus God's Spirit effects regeneration. Do you understand? God regenerates, but he regenerates through faith, by faith. "Ye are all the children of God by faith" if children at all. And Brother Daily says that whosoever believes is born of God. But he says the birth is before faith. You ought to know better than that. Necessarily that is not true. What is believing? Accepting. See Joh 1:12. Accepting him or receiving him and believing on him are the same. Whoever accepts any gift has the gift, hasn't he? Does he have it before he accepts it? Huh? No, sir; the acceptance is in order to the possession of it. Whoever believes is born of God, and he is born by believing and the two things are simultaneous. The one doesn't exist without the other. You cannot have the two separate. The accepting and the having are simultaneous, but the accepting is in order to the having. The same way with faith in Christ and regeneration. But Brother Daily tells us that we are children of God by obedience manifestly. He has to read that word "manifestly" into that passage in Galatians. Of course he has found a place where God says, "You my sons and daughters," and that refers to manifest sons, because they were already sons, as we know, and were children of God by faith, actually before. Remember the difference between manifest and actual. Remember always every statement in any book is to be taken literally, unless the sense compels the contrary. We have it here now. Brother Daily says we are never troubled by sin until made alive. Then what is the matter with us? What have we to trouble about if we have eternal life? Instead of troubling we ought to be rejoicing! Sure! Instead of that, you have a man going around saying, "Lord, have mercy upon me; I have got religion!" -- crying and troubling about it, when he ought to be rejoicing. If the Holy Spirit makes a man believe he is lost when he is saved, what does the Holy Spirit do in doing that? Doesn't he tell a falsehood? When you was already saved, didn't he make you believe a

falsehood? Brother Daily, that is what your doctrine teaches. The Holy Spirit makes a man feel he is lost and undone, and then leads him to believe in Jesus Christ, and then to have life, and rejoice because he has it. "Well," he says, "it is absurd to think that a creature can have any desire for its own creation." Yet I called his attention to Ps 51:10, and he didn't get in a thousand miles of it. David said: "Create in me a clean heart, O God!" Here was a creature desiring his own creation. He says he makes the creation of a dead sinner just like the creation of the heart. Then this creature that David prays for, a heart, the creature that wants to be created prays to be created-"Create in me a clean heart, O God!" Don't you see that answers it? Here is the sinner crying for a new creation of his own heart. Brother Daily says he supposes that I think that if corn is planted it will grow up children of God. I suppose he is competent to suppose anything he wants to; and I thought of two proverbs just as he said that: "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest ye become like him"; "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit." Don't take that to yourself, because it might not be parliamentary to apply it to you, but I thought of the proverb, you see. There is hardly any game but that two cannot play at, you know. The idea of his supposing that I thought if corn is planted it will grow up children. Does he really suppose I thought anything of that kind? That was a pointless joke you got off, Brother Daily. In 1Pe 1:23, my opponent tries to show that the "word" means Jesus. But did he examine my proofs? Remember our rule of controversy here-Hedges' Rule of Controversy-that it is the duty of the disputant to examine the proofs presented by his opponent, and show if he can that they do not contain the terms of the proposition to be proven, or their equivalent. He didn't do that. I must call your attention to the facts. I proved that the "word" in 1Pe 1:23 was incorruptible. I proved from the connection that it is the written or spoken "word." It is the "word" that is preached by the gospel; it is the word that is the sincere milk for babes. Yes, sir, just by a wave of the hand he passed it by and affirmed that the "word" in all that connection means Jesus Christ. If you are going to take his word for it, he proved it, but if you are going to take Peter's word-the word of the Holy Spirit-he didn't prove it; nothing of the kind. He tells us Jesus says, "I give unto them eternal life." That is right, and I believe it. He didn't say, "I give to the preachers to give this life." Who said he did? What are you after now? Why do you make a straw man here and throw rocks at him? Come after me; I am not straw, and I never said that at all. I never said the preacher could give life. How absolutely you missed the issue! But Brother Daily wants to know if the oak was before the acorn. There have been a great many who have philosophized on which was first, the hen or the egg, and I don't know whether it is settled yet. But I read this about the tree: "The earth brought forth the tree, yielding fruit" (Ge 1), "Whose seed was in itself after his kind." The tree was first, and the seed in the tree and not the tree in the seed. That is where I get it. That helped you to fill up your time, brother. But Brother Daily says: "If sinners have the Spirit, they have life." But they do not have the Spirit in the gospel sense. The Spirit works on them, but there is quite a difference between having the Spirit and being wrought upon by the Spirit. The world cannot receive the Spirit, but the Spirit operates on the world. He draws, he opens, he reproves, he gives; but having the drawing, having the opening, having the giving, having the reproving, is not having the Spirit. It is having done on you what the Spirit does. Those things are the work of the Spirit. My opponent says again that I have taken the ground that unless the preacher preaches there can be no one saved. How will this look in the book? I have said nothing of the kind. How will such a statement look in the book, iterated and reiterated? Again Brother Daily affirms that where there is impact no means can be used, but he has drowned himself on that in making faith the direct gift of God and in admitting that it is wrought by the word. You yourself, Brother Daily, in

this discussion, make faith the direct gift of God, and yet have it wrought by ministry of the word. Why not have direct impact and have means in giving life or regeneration? He can make answer to that and it will be in the book. Another advertisement, Brother Daily. In regeneration life is given. That is the sum and substance of regeneration. He tells us that God quickens the sinner when the sinner doesn't want him to. God just runs a man down and makes him take it! This is my friend's theology. That may be the way of it, but the book doesn't teach it; not a bit of it. "My people shall be a willing people in the day of my power." He gives us a picture of a rich man that went to heaven and a poor man that went to perdition from an island. And this rich man was to blame because the gospel hadn't gone to that poor man. The way he did soar! he was actually eloquent. I could begin now and tell how that, according to his position, there are millions and millions that are now in torment because Christ never died for them, and that they are lost forever. There are little infants in their mother's arms for whom Christ never died, and they are to grow up and go to hell forever, with not the remotest chance to get to heaven. And what would that have to do with this proposition? Not a thing. That is not in this issue. It was in the former proposition, which was about the death of Christ. This one is about the method of salvation. He tells about the seven sons of Sceva, and compares Missionary Baptists to them. If there is anything in that for you folks, you may use it, of course. He reiterates that according to us God cannot save sinners because the preacher doesn't get to them. We never said that. We say God's method is like my proposition. That is what my friend evades; instead he makes straw men and throws stones at them. He tells us the devil thus has the advantage over God Almighty. I have another argument here I want to present, if there is time. Paul teaches clearly that God in regenerating sinners uses both the preacher and the preaching of the gospel. That is not saying he cannot do the thing some other way. Not at all. That is not in this issue. But such is his method. 1Co 4:15, "For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." Gennaw (Gennaos) is the Greek word rendered "begotten." It is also the word rendered "born." In regenerating these Corinthians God employed Paul and Paul's preaching. Paul begot them as an instrument or means which God used. An ax is the instrument in cutting down the tree. Sometimes we say the ax cuts down the tree. I want to quote Dr. Gill as sustaining my interpretation of 1Co 4:15: "For in Christ Jesus have I begotten you, through the gospel; which is to be understood of regeneration, a being born again, and from above; of being quickened when dead in trespasses and sins; of having Christ formed in the soul; of being made a partaker of the Divine nature, and a new creature." That is what Dr. Gill says. He says further; "The apostle speaks this of himself, only as the instrument or means which God made use of in doing this work upon the hearts of his people." That is exactly my proposition. We have the Apostle Paul; we have Dr. John Gill; we have my proposition. Brother Daily says nay. As to the value of his proofs, that is another question. I have another one here which I will give you, because I want my friend to have full opportunity to examine all my twelve pillars. Argument Twelve.-The salvation to which God's children were chosen from the beginning, is through the word of truth as a means. Now there have been a great many dissensions among the brother's people on the means question. I heard of some brother telling his theory-it seemed he was a preacher of that order -about what he thought. He said he didn't think God needed any means. If he wanted to burn a hole through a board he could burn the thing through without using any red-hot poker, or anything of the sort. And that didn't prove a thing! Listen: 2Th 2:13-14, "But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through

sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." Now who did that? God! God chose them from the beginning. God loved them. To what did he choose them? Salvation. Through what? Sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. Remember we are both agreed that God works that belief in the heart by means of the ministry of the word. Paul says, "God has called you by our gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." Belief is wrought in the heart through preaching. Ro 10:17; Joh 20:30-31. "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written that ye might believe"-and then what? "And that believing ye might have life through his name." My friend says he already had life before believing. The difference is between him and John; between him and Paul; between him and Jesus. I desire now to quote from 1Th 1:4-5 to show how in the case of the Thessalonians the preaching worked and was employed: "Knowing brethren beloved, your election of God. For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sakes." The gospel came in word, but also in that which employed the word in regenerating. This is involved in the statement concerning power and concerning much assurance. Thus it is, my brethren and friends and Brother Daily, that I have presented to you twelve pillars hewn out from the word of God, clear and unmistakable in their meaning and invincible in their strength. (Time expired.) ELD.

DAILY'S SIXTH REPLY Brethren, Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: The first thing I shall attend to will be to answer the questions that my worthy opponent handed me this forenoon: "Do you deny that faith comes by hearing the preaching of the gospel?" No. Creed faith does come that way. "Do you deny that, until a sinner believes in Jesus, he is condemned and in a state of death?" I do. He is in a state of death until quickened. "Do you deny that the failure of Christians to instruct others may be the occasion of the blindness and wickedness of those others?" Not the occasion of their spiritual blindness. "Do you deny that the blood of those who die in their sins may be required at the hands of those who failed to warn them?" People go to hell for their own sins, not the sins of others. "Do you think there will be any people in hell at last, who might have repented in their life-time on earth, had greater opportunities been given them?" No: for repentance is evidence of life. "Do you hold that God in justifying a sinner employs no instrument on the sinner's part?" We are not contending about justification. Stick to the proposition. "Do you believe that men in heathendom can attain to saving grace or repentance without the gospel?" Men in heathendom are regenerated by the Spirit of God without the gospel. "When an elect sinner is brought by the Holy Spirit to feel that he is condemned and lost, is the impression true or false?" True. Just when, in personal experience, does God forgive a person's sins?" We are not discussing forgiveness of sins. "Can a child of God be tempted and drawn to sin?" He can. "Does a Christian ever actually sin? and does he suffer on account of it?" He does. "Is a Christian dead to sin?" He is. "If a Christian who is dead to sin may be drawn to sin, and may actually sin, and may suffer therefor, and still be dead to sin, why may not a sinner who is dead to righteousness be drawn to righteousness and take some steps in the direction of righteousness and suffer even to weeping and trembling, and still be dead to righteousness?" Because he is in a state of death or complete enmity till quickened, as the Ephesians were. "Does God want everybody to do right all the time?" Yes. "Does the devil want everybody to do wrong all the time?" Yes. "If God has more power than the devil, and wants everybody to do right all the time, do they do right all the time?" No. "Do not those born of God love God?" Yes. "If those born of God love God, does every elect man, as soon as regenerated, love God?"

Yes. "If there is any regenerated man who does not love God, is he lost or saved?" If regenerated, he is saved. "If there is any regenerated man who has not both faith in and love for God, have you not a man saved without either faith or love?" If he is regenerated, he is saved. "Is it according to God's will that one of his elect should live on and do wickedly for years and years before he is regenerated?" God regenerates when he gets ready to. "If not, whose will prevents his regeneration?" Nothing can prevent his regeneration when God gets ready to regenerate him. "Reconcile the idea that the wickedness of an elect man delays his regeneration, and show why it is that, during that delay, his will (as you put it) is stronger than God's will?" Nothing can delay his regeneration when God regenerates him. He says I might fool away my time answering those questions. It was fooling away my time, for there wasn't anything in the questions. He says the first thing is the Father's drawing. Drawing is God's act, coming the sinner's act. Does the sinner come and get God to draw him? Which is cause and which is effect in this? God does the drawing. Does God draw him because he comes? No. Does he come because God draws him? Yes. What is the cause? God's drawing. What is the effect? The sinner's coming. If God draws the sinner he comes. Whenever effect intended is not produced, the fault is not in the effect; the fault is in the cause. Study the law of cause and effect a little more. He brought up again some of the statements of Dr. John Gill and Dr. John Watson, when I showed in the beginning that Dr. John Gill in his stronger works, his most mature works, was squarely on my side, and positively contradicted things he said in his earlier works. I brought Dr. John Gill against Dr. John Gill, and so set him aside in this court. When a witness contradicts himself, his testimony is set aside. A drowning man will catch at a straw. He says John R. Daily contends that life is before faith and without it. My contention is that faith is because of life, because he that believeth is born of God. His being born of God is the cause of his believing. Faith doesn't come from death. Faith comes from life, and eternal life at that. Faith is the evidence or fruit of the Spirit, and the fruit of eternal life. Then he quotes "children of God by faith," when I have answered that argument two or three times already, which the book will show. The other supposed contrasts have already been set aside in the arguments I have made. But he said the Lord's opening Lydia's heart was not regenerating her. He and I differ about that. The difference is between Dr. Throgmorton and Dr. Daily. We just differ, that is all. My position is that when God opened Lydia's heart he gave Lydia love in her heart and faith in her heart for those things spoken by the apostle. She had faith and love, and one that loves is born of God. The opening of the heart is the work of being born of God, and the love comes from that; not from the dead heart, but from the open, living heart. He said God can provide the seed and sow in heathen lands, but he has said he never does it. He said God never gives the increase unless the preachers sow the seed. He has said God never does. If he takes back what he said, we will welcome him over on the side of truth. If he takes the position now that God' ever does regenerate sinners where the gospel is not preached, he goes back on the position he has taken that God never does regenerate sinners where preachers never get to the people. Either he was wrong in his former position, or he is wrong in his position now. The fact is, his construction of the parable of the sower and his construction of Ro 10 places him now where he was when he had his debate with Elder Potter, when he said: "God has made these things inseparable in, all ages of the world, and never operates outside of where the preacher preaches." There is business along this line. I want him to say whether he stands where he did then, or have you changed in your opinion? That will go down in the book. He says if it is God's will, will he not make me do right? God is not around making us do everything we do. I tell you that. No, sir. You cannot hold God responsible for your actions, sir, in the way of making you do what you do. Not by any

means. But, sir, whatever it is God's will that God shall do, God will do, whether you do his will or not. Faith is the fruit of the Spirit, but not without the word, he says. Does the word affect the heart favorably without the heart believes the word? While the heart is in unbelief, can it affect the heart favorably? Does not the heart have to believe it first before it can receive the preaching favorably? He takes a good deal of time talking about the 'word.' It is the preaching that he has to prove is used as a means. He would have to prove, in order to prove his proposition, that God employs the preaching in the regeneration of sinners. Is not regeneration effected by the Spirit? And when the Spirit is in the heart, is not eternal life there? Faith is the fruit of the Spirit? The Spirit being in the heart is what causes the heart to believe; and if the Spirit being in the heart is what causes the heart to believe, isn't faith the fruit of eternal life, and isn't the tree before the fruit? But he says in reference to John's declaration, that he that believeth is born of God, "You can be born if you will just accept it." The idea of accepting a birth is preposterous. Being born is not accepting a gift. Being born is being born. We are passive in it, and when we are born we may believe and not before. I stand right there in this contention. When we are born we can believe and not before. One not born of the Spirit doesn't believe, not until he is born of the Spirit. His believing is a fruit of it, just as a person's breathing is evidence of his being born naturally. He is perfectly astonished that I thought he meant that the corn growing up in the field represents the children of God. I was just trying to find out what he did understand the parable of the sower to mean. In the first place he had it that the ground was the heart. I showed that the good ground was the good and honest heart. I showed that that meant a regenerated heart, and to this hour he has not replied. I don't think he will reply in his next speech, for I don't think he knows how. But he cannot, to save his life, tell what represents the children of God in that parable, according to his disposition of it. In reference to the word "incorruptible," I want to say to you that the preaching of a thing and the thing itself are to be clearly distinguished between. When I preach Christ my preaching is not Christ. Paul said that we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord. Their preaching was not Christ; it was not their preaching that regenerated sinners; it was the Christ they preached. It is not our preaching that does the work. We preach the Spirit of God; we preach his salvation. It is that which we preach, and not our preaching, for there is a distinction between our preaching a thing and the thing preached by us. He spoke about my throwing rocks at a "man of straw." It is the man he has set up here, because that is the thing I have been throwing at all the time. If he wants to call it a man of straw he may. I don't know but that is about so. He says they do neglect the Spirit when the Spirit operates in the heart. Without the Spirit in the heart there is no faith there. If the Spirit is there they have the Spirit. The very idea of a person having the Spirit in his heart and the person not knowing it! He says there can be regeneration without preachers. But he has taken the opposite position. I come now to his 11th Argument, which is that Paul teaches that God uses both the preacher and the Spirit in 1Co 4:15. To this I desire your attention briefly. This is the only text in the Bible that has the slightest appearance of favoring the doctrine expressed by this proposition. It requires, therefore, a careful investigation. The question involved is whether Paul meant that he had actually regenerated the Corinthians, so that they were his children by regeneration, or whether he used the term sons and fathers in the same sense as he does in speaking of fathers and mothers in the church. One thing is in the text beyond dispute: He claims to be the father of such as he had begotten. No begetting of his could make them the children of any other than himself, nor did he claim beyond this. He says he begat Onesimus in his bonds (Phm 1:10), and in the same sense he claims Onesimus as his own son. In the same figure of speech he calls Timothy and

Titus his sons. It was not that he claimed to be the cause of their regeneration that he claimed Onesimus and Timothy and Titus as sons. The Corinthian brethren might, in Paul's supposition, have had ten thousand instructors in Christ Jesus, yet they had but one father as an instructor in this figurative sense, and that one father was Paul. He did not claim that he was a means in begetting them in the sense of regenerating them, or that God had employed his preaching as a means to effect their regeneration, for that would not have made them his children or him their father. He would not have done the BEGETTING or the regenerating in that case, and the one who had done it, and not Paul, would have been their father. He was their father as their chief instructor. Whatever Paul did, it was of his will, who had been blessed to bring them or beget them to a knowledge of the truth and conformity to the gospel. In this sense he writes to the Galatians, "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you," (Ga 4:19.) In this he calls the Galatians little children, his little children, and says he travails in birth again in their behalf. For what purpose? That he might regenerate them again? Not by any means. It was that Christ might be formed in them. They had been regenerated, but had departed from the gospel practice, and Paul stood in much doubt of them. He desires that they might be renewed in the spirit of their minds, and put on the new man practically. Here was a travail in a kind of birth, but no one understands Paul to mean regeneration. So he had begotten the Corinthians through the gospel, and in that sense it was possible for him to beget them again and again. I desire to attend to my Ninth Argument, as this is the only speech in which I can introduce new argument. My Ninth Argument is that as Christ is an unrivalled, peerless preacher of his gospel, the power that attended its proclamation was the greatest possible when he preached it. Never man spake as he did. (Joh 7:46.) If God had intended the preaching of the gospel to be a means in the regeneration of sinners, the preaching of the gospel by Christ would have been preeminently successful in the accomplishment of that result. But, instead, his preaching was very unsuccessful as to its favorable reception on the part of the people who heard its sound. One of the most important and impressive discourses preached by him is recorded in Joh 6. It was delivered to the multitude who sought him for the loaves and fishes, but instead of being regenerated by it and receiving it with glad hearts, they were highly displeased with it. The cause of this ascribed by our Saviour to unbelief and inability to come to him. These are his words: "But I said unto you that ye have also seen me and believed not. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me." "Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." "There are some of you that believe not." "Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come to me except it were given him of my Father." This shows that, though Jesus preached to them the truth in its purity and greatest power, they were not regenerated by it. The reason assigned is that the Father did not give them to him, and did not draw them. This proves that the drawing by the Father in regeneration was not accomplished by means of the preaching of the gospel, even when it was preached by Christ. It is conclusive proof that regeneration is not effected by means of the preaching of the gospel, but, is accomplished by a power entirely separate and apart from it. At Nazareth, Jesus preached from the prophecy of Isaiah. The people wondered at the gracious words that came from his lips, but what were the effects of that sermon? Was a sinner regenerated by it? Not one. They reproached him on account of his humble origin. "Is not this Joseph's son?" they said. In accounting for this, Jesus preached the doctrine of discriminating grace, illustrating that doctrine by alluding to the one widow of Sarepta and the one Syrian leper, at which the people were so angered that they thrust out the Divine preacher and would have cast him headlong over the cliff had he not passed through their

midst and gone his way, withdrawing from them in a miraculous manner. The gospel when preached by the greatest and best of all preachers was not heard by the unregenerated populace with hearing ears and understanding hearts. I insist that if it had been God's plan to make it a means in regeneration, it would have proved to have been such when Jesus preached it, The failure of his preaching to effect that end is plain, positive and irrefutable proof that preaching is not so employed. If God had intended that the preaching of the gospel should be a means, so powerful would have been the preaching of Jesus Christ that every sinner would have been regenerated. I have shown that they were angered with the preacher. There had to be something apart from it; there was something apart from it to accomplish the great work of regeneration. But I come to my next argument. My Tenth Argument is that the proposition we are discussing is contradicted by the following well-authenticated fact: The same measure of power, under the same circumstances, must produce similar effects. If Christ died for all sinners, and the preaching of the gospel were a means used by the Spirit in the regeneration of sinners, and all unregenerated sinners are in like condition, dead in sins, deaf to the sweetness of the gospel, and blind to its heavenly beauties, in love with the darkness of error rather than with the light of gospel truth, and in a condemned state, there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. (Ro 3:22-23.) If, then, Christ died for them all, God's intention is that all should be benefited by his death; and if he uses the preaching of the gospel as a means in their regeneration, he will use it with the same measure of power. As the same measure of power, under similar circumstances, must produce similar results, it follows that all to whom the gospel is preached will be regenerated if this proposition is true. But all to whom the gospel is preached are not regenerated. Therefore this proposition is not true. If a number of unregenerated sinners are under the sound of the preaching of the gospel, and some are regenerated while others are not, and if God employs the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of those regenerated, why does not the same means regenerate the others? How can we account for three thousand being favorably affected by Peter's preaching at Pentecost, while under Stephen's preaching of the same blessed gospel not one heard with a hearing ear and an understanding heart? Under the one the lambs cry out, and under the other the lions rage. How can we account for the difference? Can we do it by saying that God uses the preaching as a means? The Ninevites, under one sermon by a prophet, melted into repentance, while the inhabitants of Capernaum, under the admonitions and teaching of a far greater than all prophets, seconded by the performance of wonderful miracles, are not persuaded. Many of the Jews who had heard the doctrine of Christ, had seen the purity of his life, and witnessed his great miracles, cried out for his life and consented to the crucifixion of his person, while the thief on the cross, who perhaps had never seen a miracle or heard a single sermon, of the precious Saviour, turns his dying eyes to him, and dies a regenerate man, going into Paradise with the Son of God, The only way to account for all this difference is to accept the truth that regeneration is solely the work of Gael, independent of all means and instrumentality, The change wrought in the soul in regeneration has the same Author as the fashioning of the dust of the ground into a human body. God needs no help in regeneration, and if he did he could not find it. As Christ is the sole worker in redemption, so is God by his Spirit the sole worker in regeneration, who creates us in Christ unto good works. Therefore God does not employ the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners. I insist that God would not set on foot a plan that makes a failure. The plan represented by my friend here makes a failure. God being all-wise and knowing all things, having all power, would not devise a system that would be inadequate to reach the people and those that never heard it. I say he

would not. I want to read some things here that seem rather startling. I read from the Cumberland Lutheran, that denomination standing exactly as this denomination stands relative to the proposition we are discussing today. There is given in one of the copies of the Cumberland Lutheran, a monthly journal published at Cumberland, Md., a table of statistics under the title, "Do Missions Pay?" in which it is shown that the cost of saving a soul in India is \$18, while the cost in this country is \$72. Under this table is given the following statement: "It costs nearly three times as much to maintain our churches here as in India. It takes seven members to win one from heathenism but ten to win one here with Christian surroundings. Measured in dollars, it costs four times as much to save a soul here as there, and who will put God's estimate of the value of a soul when heaven rejoices over one sinner that repents?" Now with reference to civilized lands, Rev. Dr. Talmage said: "I simply state a fact when I state that in many places the church is surrendering and the world is conquering. When there is one man brought into the kingdom of God through Christian instrumentality, there are ten men dragged down by dissipations. Within the last twenty-five years the churches of God in this country have averaged less than two conversions a year each. There have been an average of four or five deaths in the churches. How soon, at that rate, will this world be brought to God? We gain two; we lose four. Eternal God! what will this come to?" How about it in heathen lands? How about it in this country? We call this a Christian country today, and only a little over one-third of the inhabitants make any profession at all right here where our schools are and our churches, but crime is on the increase. I want to read now from a statement made by Rev. James Johnson, published in 1886, where he says: "The heathen population is more by 200,000,000 than it was a hundred years ago; while the converts and their families do not amount to more than 3,000,000. The numbers now generally accepted as accurate, and quoted by missionary and other societies, are 173,000,000 of Mohammedans and 874,000,000 of heathen, 1,047,000,000 in all. We mourn over the sad fact that the increase of heathens is numerically seventy times greater than that of converts." (Time expired.) ELD. THROGMORTON'S SEVENTH SPEECH Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I come before you now with my last speech on this proposition and in this discussion. We have had a pleasant time, and of course we are going to close out pleasantly. Brother Daily seemed to think he fooled away his time in answering those questions. I think myself you did, brother, the way you answered them. If you had put something into the answers, then perhaps you wouldn't have been fooling away your time altogether. I want to show you where he gives away his whole theory. He doesn't think so, but you can see. Does God want everybody to do right all the time? He says, "Yes." Does the devil want everybody to do wrong all the time? He says, "Yes." If God has more power than the devil and wants everybody to do right all the time, do they do right all the time? Brother Daily said, "No." According to his theory that he has been preaching all the way through, if God absolutely determines to do his pleasure in every sense, the devil has more power than God. "It is not a question of what we do," he says. Nearly every purpose of God has to do with what somebody else does, brother. He didn't pay any more attention to Isa 46:9. Then he begins to talk about the drawing. He says, "Is the sinner drawn because he comes?" Why do you ask that question? I made it as plain as that nose on his face that God draws the sinner first. You all remember that. In the face of that he asks: "Is he drawn because he comes?" No; but his coming is in consequence of the drawing. He contends that every one that God draws comes. "If I be lifted up I will draw all men to me." (See Joh 12:32.) They will all come then, according to Brother Daily's theory. The trouble is that Jesus Christ died for just a few, according to his position, and the rest are not drawn; they are the children of wrath, born that way, and must be

eternally that way, and must go to hell forever. And he says, in harmony with that doctrine, that if God draws the sinner comes, and wants to know if I can tell the difference between cause and effect. My friend thinks that God draws the sinner just like the yoke of oxen draws the log. The truth is God reproves the sinner; God opens his heart; God makes him feel his great need, and then the sinner comes. He is commanded to come, and must therefore do the coming. My friend says God has nothing to do with what the sinner does. If this is right the sinner may come or not, and God's will not be interfered with! Then he comes to the charts and notices one thing - well, maybe two things. He said that he showed that Gill was against Gill, and that was enough. We will have this on record, that Brother Daily, the leader of the "Old School" Baptists, has set it down in debate, and it has gone into print, that the famous John Gill is not a good witness to quote in a debate of this sort, because he contradicts himself. When Dr. Gill is quoted it amounts to nothing, because in his old age, in an essay, when he was talking rather as a denominationalist than a scholar, he said something different from what he had said before in his commentary! My opponent proceeds to affirm that regeneration is before faith because faith is a fruit. But he assumes the point he ought to prove. Faith is that by which, under God, regeneration is effected. "Ye are all the children of God by faith." You can't get me away from that, Brother Daily. He says opening Lydia's heart was giving her love, or something to that effect. David said, "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold that wonderful thing out of the law." According to Brother Daily, whether he obeyed God or not, when he did understand, had nothing to do with God's will. David might obey or not. God's will was not concerned in it. Well, after his resurrection, Jesus opened the understanding of his disciples that they might understand. That is what he did for Lydia; and thus understanding she fell in and attended to the things that she understood. She wasn't dragged in; she was drawn and came in. But he says that my construction of Ro 10 in connection with the parable of the sower makes it impossible for any sinner to be regenerated except according to the method laid down in the proposition. I suppose that is his opinion, but it is not true. And here he lays down something that upsets his whole theory. "Whatever is God's will for God to do he will do." I say so too. We are agreed on that. Let's shake hands on it. (They shake hands.) (Mr. Daily: I am glad you are converted. Come along. Bless your soul. I love you better than ever.) Whatever the sinner does and whatever any man does has no reference to God's will. That is what my friend says. He doesn't agree with me on that exactly. (Mr. Daily: I am glad I have got you that far. If you can't see it, everybody else does.) (Mr. Throgmorton: They look like it out there in the audience.) He says I am talking about the word of God itself all the time, and the proposition is preaching of the word. It is the preaching of the word of truth. So it is the preaching of the word of truth that God cannot employ! Is not the word preached, or is it not the same word of truth that it is elsewhere? That was a quibble; that was an evasion. To show you further how Brother Daily misapprehends, I quote this from him: "Whoever heard of anybody accepting being born?" Nobody said anything about accepting or not accepting being born. Not a word of it. I was talking about accepting Christ. God comes and offers us Christ, and we accept him as God's free gift to us, and when we accept him, we have him. That was the point. And when we have him we have regeneration, because that and every other blessing is in him. Brother Daily said, "Who ever heard of anybody accepting being born?" and said it was preposterous. Well, I think it would be. Then he proceeds to that when we are born we may believe, and not before. Whenever a man is born of the Spirit of God he may believe on Jesus Christ, and not before, says Brother Daily. How a man can persist in taking issue with the word of God, and reiterate it time and again, is past my comprehension. The

word says that regeneration is by believing. Those are not the exact words, but here are the exact words: "Ye are all the children of God by faith." But my friend persists in saying they are born of God before they believe, and that a man who has mental life and moral life and is moved upon by the Spirit of God can't believe until after he is born again. That is where the preposterous part comes in, Brother Daily. Then he says I thought it preposterous that he thought that I considered that if corn was planted it would result in the children of God, but instead of putting it that way this time he puts it the corn representing the children of God. Just what he wanted with that it is hard to understand. I pass to another thought. He says I didn't explain who the children of God were in the parable of the sower. Let me say this: The soil is the heart of the sinner, the heart of the unregenerated. The preparation of the heart is what God's Spirit does when he draws the sinner. The heart that refuses the drawing is not a good and honest heart. But this preparation, which is the drawing or opening, put these hearts into this category, good and honest. Then the seed or word, falling into these, through it life is produced and the sinner is regenerated. But he says that which the apostles preached was Christ, and that was what did the work, and not the preaching. Didn't he rather, whom the apostles preached, do the work through the preaching? That is the point in my proposition. Then he comes again to the question of sinners having the Spirit before faith. It is true the Spirit works on them as I said. The Spirit reproves them and opens their heart, but they do not possess the Spirit. Coming to 1Co 4:15, he reads quite a discussion into it. "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you." He asks, Did Paul mean God had regenerated those people? Yes, and I showed you by Dr. Gill's exposition of the passage that Paul's preaching was the means through which God regenerated them. Of course Paul doesn't mean that he himself literally begat them. My friend proceeds on the theory that Paul was talking of himself as an instructor, but he speaks of himself as more than that. "For though ye have ten thousand instructors, yet have ye not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the gospel." The other instructors had not begotten them. Paul was the one whom Jesus Christ used as the means. Christ did it through Paul's preaching. Now look at that and examine it, and you have something like an answer. He told how Paul travailed suffering in birth for certain saints. Quite a difference in that, however, from 1Co 4:15. Brother Daily appears to think that God is another name for Necessity. He seems to hold to the doctrine of Fatalism. Here is what he says, alluding to power through preaching: "Power through preaching should have been the greatest when Jesus preached." Isn't it owing to whether Jesus purposed to make it so? Now we didn't say that Jesus' preaching nor that Peter's preaching nor anybody's preaching regenerates anybody without God, but what we say is, that when God would regenerate a sinner he employs the preaching of the gospel or word of truth, written or spoken. That is God's method. And the fact that God does not regenerate at one time is not proof that he doesn't use the means at another time. He employs the means when he does regenerate. "Of his own will begets he us with the word of truth." My friend gave us what he called "Argument Ten." and he says, "The same measure of power under similar circumstances must produce the same effect." If God uses the means, he uses it always in the same way and measure. He makes God the same as he turns himself on, as the water is when you turn it on a mill wheel, or as the electric fluid is when it is turned on to make the light. How wise! He leaves God without choice, but the word says: "He quickeneth whom he will." God is sovereign. But my opponent proceeds: "God would not set on foot a plan that would fail or that would be inadequate to the end desired." I don't think God has done such a thing. God has set on foot a plan that has not failed and will not fail. God has set on foot a plan that is entirely adequate to the end desired-in the long run. And in this plan

are his means for the regeneration of sinners. My brother had to talk about the cost of converts. He gave us one of those little sermons which he has preached some time along that line. I tell you, he soars. I have something I want to give you on that subject. He talks about our paying so much per convert, and finds literature in which there is talk about that, because so much money is spent in mission work. The Old London Confession made Christians responsible for failing to instruct those for whom they were under obligations, and held them responsible for the loss of souls. It takes time to go after those souls. It costs money to get literature with which to teach them. Time is money. So we might figure up how the Old London Confession Baptists made souls saved cost so much per head. There is nothing to such an argument. But remember this: Instruction and literature and expenses connected therewith are second causes, and decrees even do not take away the contingency of them, but rather establish the same, as teaches the Old London Confession. I promised to read something from Dr. John M. Watson. It is on page 520 of his Old Baptist Test. I begin at the bottom of page 519. "But our preaching does in one sense, when we preach to all unregenerated persons alike, for with us there are no evidences of distinction; we do so in faith, believing that the Lord knoweth them that are his; hence, our commission includes 'every creature,' but the calling of the Lord, the chosen few. Shall we presumptuously close this part of our ministry against the 'other sheep' which Christ said he must also bring? We know them not, but our commission embraces them, as fully as though we did, provided we address 'every creature,' all men are everywhere alike in a state of unregeneracy. Assuredly our preaching to them is in holy accordance with the purpose, which included both the preaching and the blessing. 1Co 1:21. Their connection with each other involves, in the plainest manner, the duty of preaching to every creature repentance toward God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord has ordained this way; our violation of it in the 19th century will not cause it to fail; others will do the work; it needs must be done; and this may be the cause why so few are coming into our churches." (That is what is the matter with you, Brother Daily.) Dr. Watson continues: "We have violated our commission." (That is what you and your people have done.) Preach the gospel to every creature and let God use it as he wills. He doesn't turn it on like a miller turns the water on the wheel. If he has an elect the use of his word is his method of calling them, as you have agreed when you endorsed the London Confession. There is something else along this same line, I want to give you, but I don't want to spend too much time with it. However, speaking of the preachers, Dr. Watson says "their payment would supply the needs of many pastors that are toiling without it and many hearts that are now burdened almost past endurance would be comforted; or words to that effect. And so this great and good man, Dr. Watson, goes on to show the errors of his people and how to remedy them on pages 283 and 284; and one of the remedies he says, is by making weekly contributions; another, the reviving the deaconry, as he calls it. Brother Daily has the book if these quotations are disputed. Chapter Three, London Confession. I wanted to get that: "Nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, not yet is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." So there we see the harmony between decrees and means. Now what have we done in this debate? I think we have established that proposition on the chart beyond doubt and by the plainest possible passages of scripture. I want to give you a review of some of them. I began with the gospel by John, first chapter, 6-8 (Joh 1:6-8): "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." (Joh 1:6-8) That is God sent him to preach. What was the purpose? "That all men through Him might believe." Then the purpose of preaching is that believers may be made. Not that the preaching makes them. God makes them through the preaching. My friend didn't notice that passage.

He said he would, but he never got back to it. Then that other passage: Joh 20:30-31, "And many other signs truly did Jesus, which are not written in this book, but these are written." What for? "That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ." Men come then to believe that Jesus is the Christ through these things that are written when they are read. God through them makes believers. Is that all? "And that believing ye might have life through his name." You have surely never been able to touch that, Brother Daily. I don't blame you. You cannot help it. I called attention to Joh 17:20, where believers are made through the apostles' word. Through their word! Believers made through preaching the word; and through believing in Jesus Christ comes regeneration. From Joh 6:35, believing on Christ and coming to Christ are seen to be the same. From another passage I showed you that by receiving Jesus Christ, partaking of him, we receive life: "I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." By 1Co 1:21 I showed you that it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save sinners. My opponent has contended that I think the preacher or preaching by itself, or by themselves, produces believers. Not so. God employs the preacher and the preaching to produce believers, and "it pleased God by the simplicity of preaching to save them that believe." I showed you that Dr. John Gill agrees with me that this salvation involves regeneration. My opponent touched that passage very lightly. Nor has he been able to show about the quickening. His effort was to show that Dr. Gill was not a worthy witness. Yet I read you of the great confidence that our fathers had in that (Gill's) commentary when they wrote to each church to subscribe for a copy of "this incomparable work for the use of their ministers." But Brother Daily makes it a work unworthy of trust! I also called your attention to Ac 15:7-9. What was accomplished as stated there? Peter went and preached to the Gentiles that by his mouth they might believe: "Ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." They were made believers. My brother cannot dispute that. Who can dispute that? Nobody! Surely, my friend has agreed to it. But he says that regeneration didn't come that way. I showed you what God did through this faith: "God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witnesses, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between them and us purifying their heart by faith." Purifying the heart is regenerating it, when God does it; and he does it not without faith, nor before it, but by it. In his last speech my opponent referred again to Ro 10:17. I understand he agreed with me on that passage. We shook hands on it - that faith comes by hearing. Yes, you gave me your hand on it, Brother Daily. I got him in on this question yesterday, but he is like the woman that said "scissors." He agreed with me yesterday that God, the Holy Spirit, ordinarily produces faith in the hearts of the elect by the ministry of the word. That is all I got out of Ro 10:17. Let us read. "So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Don't go back on it. It is on record against you. You have agreed that this is so, and later you have said it again. Again you have said that by faith we are manifestly the children of God. Paul doesn't put it that way. He says, Ye are all the children of God by faith." Not without it. Not before it. That is enough for me so far as this controversy is concerned, because this faith is wrought by the ministry of the word, and that is my proposition. I also showed how Dr. John Gill agrees with me in this. I shall not burden the recapitulation with re quoting him, however. Yes, here is another passage I called your attention to and that I want in this review: 1Co 3:5-7. Who is Paul and who is Apollos, but "ministers by whom ye believed." That is plain enough. "Even as the Lord gave to every man." Through Paul's preaching God gave believers. He wrought faith in their hearts. Then Paul goes on: "I have planted, but God gave the increase." God gave the converts. "Neither is he that planteth anything,

neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase." How did he give it? Through the preaching. That is my proposition, and all my friend's long arguments (?) count as nothing against this solid phalanx of passages from the word of God. 2Co 3:3, concerning which so much was said, I think you remember, also. Likewise the others. (Time expired.) And now, as my time has expired, can I have a half minute? (The request was granted.) Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies, and Gentlemen, Brethren and Sisters and Friends – and Brother Daily: We have had a good time. This has been my last speech, and completes my part of the second discussion I have had with my worthy brother, and I believe we will close it at the last as we said in the beginning-better friends than before. I like this man. It is true we have differed. We have gone after each other. We have said what some of you may have considered sharp things, but it has been done in Christian spirit and good feeling on my part, and I believe on his. To that you will all testify. A great many said concerning the debate we held a year ago at Marion: "If we could always have discussions conducted like that one, we would be glad to have more of them." I heard one of our prominent preachers in that city say that he had been prejudiced against public debates, but said he: "I have changed my mind. You men conducted that discussion on a high plane. You have caused the people to study the Bible more and to have more respect for it." I trust the result will be the same with this. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your kind attention to everything I have had to say. I pray God's blessing on you. I thank these moderators for the impartiality with which they have ruled. They have worked together before. They are friends as we are, and they part friends. And as to my opponent my prayer is this: That whether he is right or whether he is wrong, or whether we are both wrong, we may both at last in the light of that better country enjoy God and know and be what is right and enjoy what is right forever. I want to thank our reporter. She gave me a demonstration of what she could do in the way of reporting before this debate began, and I have the utmost confidence in her ability. God bless her. And now, Brother Daily, let me give you my hand in brotherly love. (Disputants shake hands.)

ELD. DAILY'S SEVENTH REPLY Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: You have been so very patient. This has been a warm time. But you have, under the oppression of heat, sat and listened patiently to our speeches up to this good moment, and I come before you for the purpose of closing this debate by making the last address. I shall expect the same exercise of patience on your part and undivided attention that has thus far been given us. My first duty is to attend to the things which I consider relevant that have been said by my brother opponent in his closing speech. He said that he made it as plain as the nose on a man's face that God draws first, and that the sinner comes because God draws him. So far we are agreed. What is the issue regarding God's drawing? The issue between Brother Throgmorton and myself relative to that point is this: I believe that every sinner comes to Christ that God draws to Christ. It seems to be his position that God tries to draw a great many sinners to Christ, or at least some sinners to Christ, that he fails to draw to Christ. God does the drawing. The sinner comes because he is drawn. The effect is produced by the cause. In all this we are agreed. I claim that the cause is sufficient to produce the effect, where the cause operates. He has contended that the cause is not sufficient to produce the effect in all cases where the cause operates. That God tries to draw some sinners to Christ that do not come. As to this drawing, the word is elkush (helkuse). (Mr. Throgmorton: You have had opportunity before to define it.) (Mr. Daily: If it is new matter I don't mean to introduce anything new.) The primitive meaning of this word is drag. I just drop that as a thought (Mr. Throgmorton: Read the other part of the definition.) (Mr. Daily: I am willing to strike it out. I don't want to introduce anything new.) (Mr. Throgmorton: I know you want to be fair.) (Moderator: Go on with

your argument.) What it is God's will for God to do God will do, he said. Notice what he said: What it is God's will for God to do God will do. Now we repeat that God regenerates the sinner; that God draws the sinner. It is God's will to regenerate, to draw every sinner that he wills to regenerate and draw. As God will do what it is God's will to do, he will draw every sinner that it is his will to draw. It is impossible to reconcile that position with another position taken by him that God draws at some sinners and tries to draw some sinners who are not drawn. There is a contradiction that will go down in the book. He says: Accepting Christ is the work of the unregenerated sinner when Christ is offered to him, and when the unregenerated sinner accepts Christ he has Christ, and when he has Christ he has regeneration. He has said that the sinner in an unregenerated state does not love Christ. Then it follows that he accepts Christ when he does not love Christ! The sinner, in a state of unregeneration, when he does not love Christ, must accept what he does not love in order to have Christ, and he must accept him in order to be regenerated! He must accept what he does not love in order to be regenerated! My contention is that it is impossible for anyone to accept what he does not love. He may get what he doesn't love, but there is a difference between getting and accepting what one does not love. On the parable of the sower he says again that the soil is the heart of the sinner. Then it was the heart of the sinner before the seed was sown into it, and it was a good and honest heart before. In our other discussion he said that a good and honest heart was simply one that was morally better than the others. He has been a little more careful this time, and has not said that in this discussion; in fact, he has hardly said what it does represent. I take the position that the good and honest heart is one that is regenerated, because the heart of an unregenerated person is evil. It must be regenerated to be good. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good, and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil. The preaching of the word is simply the preaching of the truth, and when the regenerated heart receives the truth as preached he simply receives it as truth, and not as life, because there is a difference between truth and life. Just as we can tell where good ground is when we sow our wheat upon the ground, so we can tell where good and honest hearts are. The effect of our preaching tells us. If some are moved by our preaching to shed tears of joy, while there is another who listens and despises the preacher because of what he preaches, we know that to the one the word has come in power. Hearts which have been prepared to receive the truth in good and honest hearts, receive it as good soil receives the seed sown into it. He says God quickeneth whom He will. To be sure. We are agreed to that. God quickeneth whom He will. Then as many as God wills to quicken will be quickened. We are agreed in relation to that. My contention is that not only in enlightened countries, but in heathen lands as well, God quickens whom He will. He is not limited or bound by a system that is not of the Bible. He says God has not set on foot a plan that will fail. I contend, my precious friends, that according to his system God has set on foot a plan that does fail. I claim that the devil exerts more extended power, according to my friend's system, than the Holy Trinity exerts, and that has been true in all ages of the world, all over the world. Satan has power where God cannot go. Is It not a failure when it is said that Christ dies for the whole race and that God and Christ and the Spirit cannot operate except where preachers carry the Spirit, and can operate nowhere in all the world except over territory where preachers preach? It seems to me like the plan fails. It seems to me it does if the saved are confined to a very small minority of the portion of mankind that hears the gospel proclaimed publicly, while those that never hear it cannot be saved! It seems to me the plan is a failure if God, who in the beginning was just as independent as the devil, because he had no book to confine him, has set on foot a plan that has

finally developed into his being confined to a limited territory, while the devil continues to have universal sway over the whole human race. It seems to me, according to that, that God has set on foot a plan that fails! As to Dr. Watson's Old Baptist Test, I have read that work. There are many things in that Old Baptist Test that I admire. Whatever in Dr. Watson's Old Baptist Test agrees with the teaching of God's word I am willing to accept. But I will not accept from Dr. Watson or any other man, even from Dr. Throgmorton, as well as I love him anything I don't understand the Bible to teach. The Baptists have been an independent people regarding this matter. We take the Scriptures as the only Divine rule of faith and practice, and for that article we contend. But Dr. Watson has said some things I think ought to be read and ought to go into the book in addition to what my friend has said. I want to read from page 61: "The true gospel would have utterly failed had it been presented to the world for its approval or rejection according to the natural understanding, judgment and reason of man; but a false gospel may and does prevail in that manner over the judgment and feelings of 'many;' while the true gospel in its hidden power and embraces only a 'few.' " And further in connection I read on page 72: "Were Christ to descend personally from heaven to earth, and to declare the same truths, and reveal the same Gospel ordinances, natural men would, notwithstanding all this, continue to hate his truths and oppose his ways. Their state requires something beyond this-the birth of the Spirit-the very blessing which he has secured to them, given them in the election of the Father." What I said in reference to the interpretation of the Tenth of Romans was, that his present interpretation of it showed that his position is that the preaching of the gospel is absolutely necessary in the regeneration of sinners, while he said a number of times during this debate that God may do it without the gospel! How are we to understand my brother, when with one breath he says that God cannot give the increase unless the preacher does his work, and in the next breath he says that God may do it without the preacher? I think it is the result of my brother's confused mind, not that he intended to take that position, positively to contradict himself. It is not very safe for a man in a public discussion to bring a fair and square contradiction before the people. And when a disputant contradicts himself squarely by saying time and time again that God employs the preaching of the gospel just as the sower sows the seed, and that faith comes by hearing, and that is the way regeneration is produced, making a preacher necessary, and then says in the next breath that he may do it without, it is a contradiction he wouldn't make if he were not confused! That is the only way I know how to account for it. Now I want to invite your patient attention to just a brief recapitulation of a few things that have been brought out in the discussion of this proposition. You remember that I started out with the statement that where there was direct contact, where there was direct impact of the Holy Spirit with the human heart, no means was used, because there was no medium between the power that operates and the thing operated upon. My friend has admitted that the Spirit operates by direct contact. He has contended, however, that, notwithstanding that fact, means are used. Now the issue between us on that is, my contention is that means must come between the power that acts and the thing acted upon, through which the power acts, and that if the thing acting comes in direct contact with that upon which it acts, there is no means used because there is nothing between, coming to this conclusion by the definition of the word means, something that comes in between. Now our difference upon that is before the people and will go to the people for their study. I contend in the second place that regeneration is represented in the word of God as a resurrection from death. I showed that in the resurrection of the body by the Spirit no means are employed. Since the resurrection of the soul is from death, then it follows in that work no means are employed. I showed that if the Spirit dwells in the child

of God, having resurrected his soul from death in sins, that same Spirit will also quicken his mortal body and by the same almighty operation. As the one is without a means, so the other must be. He has contended that death in sins, however, does not signify a helpless state; that one dead in sins has power to do in a spiritual way. There is the issue between us in reference to that point. That has been already discussed. I have contended that as natural action must come from natural life, so spiritual action must come from spiritual life. That the life must be first. In the third place I have contended that regeneration is represented in the Scriptures as a creation, and that in every case of creation, where a creation is effected or accomplished, the Spirit of God operates on the creature without means, without any medium or agency. I have contended that in the parable of the sower the good ground represents the honest and good heart, that it is made good in the work of regeneration before the seed is sown, and that the sowing of the seed makes no difference in the nature of the ground, and so does not represent regeneration. I have contended, next, that the sinner must first be of God, or, in other words, be born of God, before he can spiritually hear God's word. I have proved that people that are of the world hear the world, while people of God hear the true gospel of Jesus Christ with a spiritual understanding and spiritual hearing. It has been my argument, further, that whatever is essential in regeneration in any case must be essential in all cases. Understand what I mean here. What is essential-I do not mean the way the thing may be done. I don't contend for that. I have argued that whatever is essential in one case must be essential in all cases. If sowing the seed in hearts by preaching to the hearts is essential to the regeneration of these hearts in one case, it is in all cases. If it can be done without that in one case, it can be done in all cases. That has been my contention. I have proved that position. I will not take time further in recapitulating, as my time is now almost up. I will leave the matter before you as I have presented it. I want you to bear this one thing in mind, however: that I showed by the teaching of the Apostle in Eph 2 that these Ephesians, before they were quickened or regenerated, had pursued an evil course, and had gone the wrong way, and that the Apostle doesn't teach that they first turned about and sought the Lord, whom they did not love, and then the Lord quickened them because they sought Him, but that they were going the wrong way. That even when they were dead in sins God loved them so much that by His Holy Spirit He quickened them together with Christ. It signifies that just as Christ was raised from the dead, just as He was resurrected, so the Spirit of God raised the dead souls of the Ephesians; He quickened them. To quicken is to give life. He quickened them when they were going the wrong way. Saul was going a wrong course. God quickened him while he was on that course. It was not when Saul had turned himself about. God did it for him, and that brought him down. So my contention is that a person may sit under the sound of the true gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, his heart being unchanged, his mind being in enmity against God, not subject to His law and cannot be, and like a stone his heart will continue while the gospel is preached in his hearing. He will sit there and care nothing about it. Like the Jews that despised our Saviour, so people unregenerated will despise the gospel. They will have no love for the gospel until God, by His omnipotent Spirit, changes their hearts. A person may be sitting under the gospel; that sinner may make fun of the preacher. He may say in his mind, that is not my condition. At another time the same preacher may be preaching the same thing, when that sinner, under the sound of that preacher's voice, will melt down into weeping and say, "He is talking about me; he is describing my condition." What made the change? It was not the preaching, but the Spirit of God, that changed his heart. It was not the sound of the preaching. No sir. It was not the sound of the preaching, but it was the Spirit that did it. It was the Spirit that reached his heart, and as the Spirit

changed his heart he melted down into weeping. He says, "Oh, I am a sinner, and I never saw it before. I never realized it before in my life." But not only may that be the case, but persons may be away off, far from any preacher of the gospel, far away from any of God's faithful children. Yes, sir, he may be far away from relatives, far away from friends, and God's blessed Spirit finds his heart. I call to mind a precious young man whom I met in Southern Virginia a few years ago while conducting a discussion over there. The father was a preacher of our order. That young man had gone out in the navy. While he was down in the cabin of his vessel he was brought to feel he was lost, a hell-deserving sinner, far away from his precious father and his dear mother. But he was not far away from Jesus, not far away from the blessed Lord. God was there. I say to you, my friends, God is not dependent upon the vehicle of preaching to take Him anywhere. David said, "If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me." (Time expired.) Just a moment or two, now grant me. I want to thank you, my precious friends, for your patient attention, not only to the part that Brother Throgmorton has spoken, but also especially to that which I have said. I appreciate it. I feel to love you. If you do not agree with me, let our disagreement be in friendship. Let it be with good will. God knows I intend malice toward none. I have good will for all. I believe what I have contended for. I believe you will grant my sincerity in that. I do not believe you are disposed to doubt it. I want to thank these brethren moderators. I appreciate your being with us and sitting and acting in this capacity, and I am glad in my heart, Brother Danbury and Brother Ratcliff, that Brother Throgmorton and I haven't given you any more trouble than we have. We have tried to demean ourselves as Christian gentlemen, and wherein I have failed I ask your pardon. It has been of the head and not of the heart. Again I want to take the hand of Brother Throgmorton. You were at my home once. I invite you again. I will do my best for you; I will keep you a week or a month, and charge you nothing. That is the way the Old Baptists are. I want to thank you, Miss Parish. You have labored hard. Sometimes I have spoken rapidly and made you hurry, but I believe you have succeeded. I have confidence in you. As a last word, farewell to all, and if we meet no more in this world of sorrow and separation, my prayer is that we may meet in heaven, where there will be no tears, no sorrow, no separation. This comes from the depth of my poor heart. Farewell.