

F. GUY BROWN
PRIVATE LIBRARY.
NO. 441.

430
J. D. Stollman's

Bought Nov. 27th 1881

Finished reading, first
time, Dec. 5th 1881

00.90

AN

ORAL DEBATE,

BETWEEN

BENJ. FRANKLIN, ✓

Of Anderson, Indiana,

AND

JOHN A. THOMPSON, ✓

Of Lebanon, Ohio,

The former a Disciple of Christ and the latter a Baptist.

HELD AT

REYNOLDSBURG, OHIO,

Commencing November 10, 1873, and lasting four days, four hours each day, on the following Propositions:

- I.—Remission of sins, as set forth in the gospel, is offered to the unconverted, or alien sinners, on conditions in which they exercise free-will, and have power to perform.
- II.—The quickening of the sinner by the Spirit of God into new life, or eternal life, is independent of the written word or Scriptures.
- III.—Baptism, as commanded in the Commission, is in order to the remission of past sins.
- IV.—The Eternal Salvation of Christians, as set forth in the Scriptures, is the work of God, independent of conditions to be performed by man.

CINCINNATI:
FRANKLIN & RICE, PUBLISHERS.
1874.

INTRODUCTION.

THE undersigned need simply inform the reader that the following is an oral discussion held by them and reported by themselves, and prepared for the press, as found in this volume. They claim that they have fairly and faithfully reported the argument from first to last about as fully as delivered. But they do not claim, that, *from memory*, or any *notes they possessed*, they have been able to report *every word*, or even the *precise language used*, in every instance, or that the different matters are in the *precise order* as originally delivered. They claim, simply, that they have in no instance departed from any argument, or even the very words, or the order in which the items occurred, *intentionally*, but not that they could, in all these respects, give the whole *precisely* as delivered. They trust, however, that in none of these respects is the debate injured on either side. On the other hand, they do not think it is improved, but will be satisfactory to those who heard it.

They may state to the reader further, that however they have differed on the points in debate, and sharply as they have contested the points involved, they have exchanged their speeches and written the whole out, without a word of misunderstanding or an unpleasant occurrence, in reporting and preparing it for the press. Each one claims to be alike sincere and conscientious in what he has presented, and takes pleasure in now committing it to an enlightened public, and in requesting a candid and dispassionate reading and consideration of the argument on *both sides*. They both claim, at least, to desire that truth and righteousness may prevail, and to this end, that all may read with the desire that the

(iii.)

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1874, by

G. W. RICE,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, for the Southern
District of Ohio.

truth may prevail, not only in this instance, but in all similar investigations, and with the single purpose in view of attaining to the knowledge of the truth—an understanding of the “right way of the Lord.”

They have nothing to gain themselves in being wrong, but everything to lose; and, certainly, they have nothing to gain in leading others wrong. They trust, then, that truth will be elicited by the reading of the following discussion. It has already been read by many thousands, as it has appeared in the columns of the *American Christian Review*. They trust, now that it appears in a substantial volume, by itself, so that all who desire to do so may read it, that it may be perused by many thousands more, and that abundant good may result from it.

With best wishes, therefore, to all and to each other, they subscribe their names to this Introduction.

BENJ. FRANKLIN.

JOHN A. THOMPSON.

Reynoldsburg Debate.

Proposition.—REMISSION OF SINS, AS SET FORTH IN THE GOSPEL, IS OFFERED TO THE UNCONVERTED, OR ALIEN SINNERS, ON CONDITIONS IN WHICH THEY EXERCISE FREEWILL, AND HAVE POWER TO PERFORM.

[FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS.]

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—I come before you with a view to a religious investigation of certain points of difference between the worthy gentleman who is to assist me in this investigation and myself; with an explicit understanding that it is to be conducted in a kind, courteous and Christian manner. I want no victory over the gentleman who is my opponent in this discussion, but a victory over *error*, no matter where it may be found. I aim not to contend against *men*, but *error*; not against the *people* who differ from me, but the *errors* which I think they hold. If I know my own purposes, I desire simply that the right way of the Lord may prevail. I do hope that nothing but good feeling and kindness may abound; that a deep and earnest desire to inquire into “the right way of the Lord”—“the truth as it is in Jesus”—may dwell in us all.

Without further preliminary, I proceed to define the terms of the proposition. “Remission of sins” is pardon, justification from sins. It is the act of God. God forgives

sins. This act is not something done *in man*, but *in heaven* for man. "Set forth in the gospel" limits it to the remission granted in turning to God, and not to the remission obtained by erring Christians. The "unconverted, or alien sinners," are such as have not turned to God, or have not become Christians, or obtained remission. The remission concerning which we inquire relates to these. "Conditions" in the proposition mean items to be performed by man, in order to the obtaining of pardon. They are items to be performed by man in view of pardon, in seeking pardon, on which the Lord has made pardon contingent—steps to be taken to come to the promise of pardon. They are not meritorious nor efficacious. They have nothing in the form of purchase in them. They contain no equivalent. The pardon is a gracious act of the pardoning power, but by the Lawgiver himself only promised to those who perform the conditions. "Exercise free-will." By this is meant that man is free, and acts voluntarily; that he exercises volition; determines that he will or will not comply with the terms on which pardon is offered. I do not use the term "free-will," as there can be no will unless it is *free*. There is no such thing as *bound-will*. Man chooses, decides, or determines whether he will serve God or not. This is the ground of all responsibility and accountability. The words, "has power to perform," simply mean that man can perform the conditions on which God proposes pardon, or remission of sins; that what God requires him to do in order to pardon, he can do.

The points that I am required to prove, as intended in this proposition, are that God proposes to the people of the world, or the unregenerated, remission of sins on conditions which they can accept and with which they can comply. This is what I understand my worthy respondent to deny. This is the issue between us, as I understand it. This, then, is sufficient by way of defining the question.

Is man *free* in turning to God? Does he act voluntarily? Does he exercise volition? Has he any choice in becoming a Christian? Are those who become Christians made such by irresistible power, and are those not made such simply not made such because the irresistible power did not come and make them such? Are men who are not Christians in that deplorable condition because *they can not be* Christians, or because *they will not*? My position is, that they *can*, but *will not*. The position of my respondent is that whether they *will* or not, they *can not* be Christians till the irresistible power comes and makes them such. Does a man *yield himself* to be a servant of God? The apostle says: "Know ye not that to whom you yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants you are to whom you obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" Rom. vi. 16. This Scripture shows that a man *yields himself* to be a servant, and is not made one by irresistible power, either of sin or righteousness. This makes man an accountable being; but if he can not *yield himself* to be a servant of God, he can not be accountable; for it is self-evident that a man can not be accountable for not doing what he never had the power to do.

In the clearest and most explicit terms the apostle says: "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 2 Pet. iii. 9. Here it is asserted that the Lord *is not willing* that any should perish, but that all should *come to repentance*. The Lord is *willing*, but they are *not willing*; *will not come*. This shows that man is free, and can come, and the reason that he is not saved is that he will not come. This is enough on this point for the present.

I now invite your attention to the commission. We do not get this commission entire from any one of the holy biographers of our Lord. Matthew has the words, "Go you

therefore and teach," or, as some render it, *disciple*, "all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. In this we have the command to teach, or disciple all nations, not reported by either Mark, Luke or John, and also to do so, "baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," and the additional clause, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." In Mark we have the following: "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16. In these words we have the command to "Preach the gospel to every creature," not given by Matthew, and also the words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Luke has "repentance and remission of sins," Luke xxiv. 47, not found in Matthew or Mark. Mark, however, has the word "saved" instead of "remission of sins," which is the same thing in other words. It is saved from sin, or justified.

We have in this commission three distinct conditions, to be received and complied with by man before he has the promise of pardon or remission of sins. This, too, relates to the people of the world or unregenerated. The first thing to be done for them, as set forth in the commission, is to preach to them the gospel. The first thing required of them when they hear it is to believe it. This is a condition with which they must comply before they can be saved or pardoned, and with which, if they do not comply, they will be condemned. This is clear not only from this Scripture, but from many others. I will refer to some of these: "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii. 36. This

makes faith, or, which is the same, belief, a condition, and shows that he who does not comply with this condition shall not see life.

Another Scripture clearly in point on this is the account of the conversion of the jailer in Philippi. He said to Paul and Silas, "What must I do to be saved?" Paul replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Acts xvi. 30, 31. This is clearly a condition. The sinner is required to believe in order to salvation. The belief is a condition to be performed by the sinner in order to his salvation or pardon. As Paul expresses it, "Without faith it is impossible to please him, for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. xi. 6. This shows that without faith it is impossible to please God, and that he who comes to him *must believe*. This makes faith a condition to pleasing God and coming to him. As the Lord says, "If you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sins." John viii. 24.

This is sufficient to show beyond doubt that faith is a condition on which man is to be saved, or an act which man must perform in order to be saved, and without which he can not be saved. Repentance is also a condition. Luke records "repentance and remission" in the commission, and the Lord shows that repentance is in order to salvation, in the words, "Except you repent you shall all likewise perish." Paul brings out the same, in his opening address in Athens, in these words: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now he commands all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts xvii. 30, 31. In this Scripture repentance is set forth as a commandment to all men everywhere, and that, too, in view of

the judgment. When the three thousand, on Pentecost, inquired, "What shall we do?" the meaning of the question was, What shall we do to be saved? The first thing in the answer is "Repent." This shows beyond a doubt that repentance is a condition, or one thing to be done in order to the remission of sins. See Acts ii. 38. The same is seen in the second discourse under the great commission. When the apostle proceeded to tell them what to do to be saved he commanded them to *repent*. "Repent you, therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out." See Acts iii. 19-21. Blotting out sins is remission of sins. In order to this they were commanded to repent. This makes repentance a condition in the clear-est terms. This is sufficient for the present on this.

In the same sentence in the commission the Lord includes baptism with faith as a condition. "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved." Here are two things to be done, in order to, or as conditions to the same end—salvation, or remission of sins. The same words that make one a condition make the other a condition. The two requirements, to believe and be baptized, are joined by the conjunction in the same sentence in order to the same end. They are both things in which man is free; exercises volition; determines whether he *will* or *will not* do, what is required, and in both cases he has the *power to perform*. He can believe and be baptized, or he can refuse to believe and be baptized. In the words of Peter, Acts ii. 38: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," we have the two things, repentance and baptism, connected in the same sentence as conditions or things to be done in order to the same end. When the whole is put together we have the faith, repentance and baptism, as three conditions or things to be done, in order to the same end—the remission of sins. If argument can prove anything, this proves my proposition: that

remission is offered to the unconverted on conditions, and that, too, on conditions in which man exercises volition or is free, and decides or determines to obey or not obey, and conditions which he has power to perform.

The Lord had all this in view in his conversation with Nicodemus, in the words: "Except a man be born again he can not enter the kingdom of God," and still further on, where he amplifies more in the words: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." In this process man has an agency, or is free and determines whether he will enter the kingdom of God or not. This is clearly brought out in the words of the prophet, quoted by our Lord, Matt. xiii.: "Lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." Instead of "be converted," Dr. Conant, in the Bible Union Revision, gives us *turn*, thus making them *active*, instead of *passive*. It is not "be converted," nor *be turned*, but *turn*. The turning is their own act, as much as the seeing with their eyes, hearing with their ears, or understanding with their hearts. They were required to see with their eyes, hear with their ears, understand with their hearts and turn, that the Lord might heal them. In each of these items they were free and had power to perform. They could see, or close their eyes and not see, hear or close their ears, or, as those who stoned Stephen, stop their ears and not hear, harden their hearts and not understand, and refuse to turn, in which case the Lord would not heal or pardon them, but leave them in their sins. This involves their accountability. There is nothing clearer than that if man is not free he is not accountable. If he can not believe he can not be condemned for not believing. If he can not repent he can not be condemned for not repenting. If he can not be baptized he can not be condemned for not being

baptized. If he can do nothing till the irresistible power comes, the cause of his remaining in his sins is not that he *would not*, but that he *could not* turn, that he might be cleansed or pardoned.]

The same thing is involved in Paul's conversion. The Lord appeared to him and explained to him: "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." When he heard this he inquired: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" The Lord did not tell him that he could not do anything, nor to wait for power to enable him to do something, but to "Arise and go to Damascus, and there it shall be told thee what thou must do," as recorded, Acts ix 6, or "it shall be told thee of all things that are appointed for thee to do," as recorded, Acts xxii. 10. The words, "What thou must do," and "all things that are appointed for thee to do," contain the conditions, or the things required of him to be done in order to being pardoned. As commanded, he arose and went to Damascus, and Ananias was sent to him to tell him what he *must do*, or *all things appointed for him to do*. In doing so he commanded him: "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." The reason that he did not command him to believe was that he already believed what the Lord declared to him, that he was Jesus of Nazareth, whom he persecuted. The reason that he did not command him to repent was that he had already repented. But he had not been baptized, and he commanded him to do this. This was a condition, in which he exercised volition, or in which he was free, and he accordingly decided to do what was commanded. This proves that he *could* and *did* thus decide and was *free*, and he arose and *did* what was commanded. This proves that man *has power to perform* the conditions appointed, in order to salvation, and proves my proposition beyond a peradventure.]

This view is in harmony with all such Scriptures as the

following: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." The same world that Christ was sent into, through him *might be saved*. "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already; because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God." Why is this condemnation? "Because he hath not believed," and not because God did send the power. But we will hear the Lord tell what the condemnation is. It is, that "light has come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." See John iii. 17-19. Why did not the Lord gather the children of Israel together? Was it because he *would not*, or because *they would not* be gathered? They were *free* and had a *will*, and their will was contrary to the will of the Lord. "How often would I have gathered your children?" says the Lord. Why did he not gather them? Because they would not. They interposed their will in the way of the Lord's, and prevented his will from being done. See Matt. xxiii. 37. The Lord taught the disciples to pray, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." See Matt. vi. 10. This prayer has been going up from the people of God eighteen hundred years, and only on a part of a few has the will of God been done on earth. Why has it not been done by all? Because they have interposed *their will* and refused to do the *will of God*.

The Lord involved this same idea of *doing* in the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount. He has it there, "He who hears these sayings of mine and does them, I will liken him to a wise man," but, on the other hand, he likens "him who hears these sayings of mine and *does them not* to a foolish man." See Matt. vii. 24-27. What does the Lord make all this turn on? On *doing* and *not doing*. This *doing* and *not doing* is a matter in which man is free.

He can decide to do or not do the sayings of Jesus, and he can perform as he decides, to do or not do these sayings. This vindicates the Lord in saying, "I have called and you refused; I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded." See Prov. i. 24. This sentiment runs through the Bible, and through all the Lord's dealings with men, and this is the ground of all accountability to all law, both human and divine, as also between man and man. We regard each other as free, able to decide between right and wrong, good and bad, and we hold men responsible for the decisions they make and the actions they perform. This is the foundation of all law, both human and divine. It was in the mind of Joshua when he said, "Choose whom you will serve." Men make their choice and yield themselves to be servants of righteousness on the one hand, and of sin on the other hand, and must take all the consequences. Every invitation in the gospel is based on this principle. The Lord does not invite, "Come to me, ye ends of the earth, and be saved," when he knows that man can not come. He does not command men to believe, knowing that they can not believe. He does not "command all men everywhere to repent," knowing that all men can not repent. It would be mocking his helpless creatures to say, "All the day long I have stretched forth my hand to a gainsaying and a disobedient people," knowing that they can not come and obey him. He does not tantalize his creatures, saying, "Harden not your hearts as in the day of temptation in the wilderness," knowing that they could do nothing; nor does he cry, "Now is the accepted time and the day of salvation" to those to whom he knows there is no day of salvation.

THOMPSON'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators—Respected Audience:—I hope that I feel grateful to the Giver of every good and perfect

gift, for the privilege of appearing before you on this occasion, under such propitious circumstances. The privilege of meeting together as a Christian people, and in earnest desire to know the truth, as God has revealed it, to investigate the record of the Scriptures, is a great privilege, truly, and should be appreciated by us all. And that it is appreciated by many is apparent here by the large audience now before me, with, as I humbly hope, that purpose in view. I hope that such a course of argument may prevail, and such a deportment of conduct govern in this discussion, that truth shall prevail, and good feeling among us all be firmly established.

I now proceed to reply to my worthy friend, who has just taken his seat. I shall not differ materially from what he has said upon the term "Remission of sins;" that it is pardon, or freedom from sins. That it is an act of God I also admit. That it is done in heaven, for men, I also admit. But that it is done in men, by the sanctifying power of God, I shall certainly show in this discussion. And that men are justified in the righteousness of Jesus Christ, by grace, and not by works or conditions by them performed, will appear abundantly, as we search the Scriptures. That God has put conditions between the "alien sinner" and the "remission of sins," which have no merit in them, or "are not meritorious," nor "efficacious," to me appears really absurd. The remission of sins, offered on conditions, and, consequently, enjoyed when the conditions are performed, and yet the conditions have no merit, not efficacious? Pray, where is the merit, if it be not in the condition performed? If alien sinners exercise free will, and have power to perform conditions upon which the remission of their sins is offered, and if they perform these conditions, and receive the remission of sins by so doing, will the gentleman please tell us how much of the grace of God such a sinner needs? When and how can grace ever profit a man

who, of his own free will and power, fulfills the conditions of the remission of his sins? What profit is the blood of Christ to that man? If the alien sinner is free, free in himself and of himself, can Christ make him free? Can grace make him free?

The real issue in the propositions before us, and that will appear in all the arguments to be brought forward in the discussion, may be briefly stated thus, *i. e.*: That which results in the remission of sins, a holy life, a glorious resurrection, and a future eternal bliss, *is the work of man*, Franklin affirms. Or, that which results in the remission of sins, a holy life, a glorious resurrection, and a future eternal bliss, *is the work of God*, Thompson affirms. We, then, have the issue clearly before us, and whether this work of the remission of sins, or upon which it depends, is written about or preached by the prophets, apostles, or by Jesus, our great Prophet, or whether it be the song heard in heaven, let us be attentive and learn to whom this work is ascribed, and to whom the performance of conditions in order to the remission of sins is attributed. I call attention to the Scripture quoted by the worthy gentleman as proof of his free will and power in the alien sinner—Rom. vi. 16. To whom were these words addressed? To "alien sinners?" No; but to the beloved of God, called to be saints. The called of Jesus Christ. Rom. i. 6, 7. We ask in what relation do they stand, as the called of God, to their sins? *Answer*: "They are justified by his blood, and saved from wrath through him." Rom. v. 9. Why do they yield themselves servants to God? Because they are not under the law, *i. e.*, conditions performed of their free will and power; but under grace, the gift of God. Rom. vi. 14. Eph. ii. 8

We are next invited to 2 Peter iii. 9: "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is of long suffering to us-ward, not willing that any

should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Mr. Franklin says, "The Lord is willing, but they are not willing, will not come." And I answer, Jesus says, "They shall all come." John vi. 37. And God says, "They shall all be willing." Psalm cx. 3. The language of the apostle, in the quotation, clearly refers to the saints addressed in the epistle, and all who shall be called into the same relation to God. Therefore, the long suffering is to *us-ward*.

We are next called to notice the commission commanded by Christ. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Mark xvi. 16. Luke xxiv. 47. From the commission, as given by all the evangelists, I derive the following order, *to-wit*: 1. Remission of sins is to be preached in all the world, and to every creature, in the name and through the blood of Jesus Christ. And I now assert, without fear of a successful contradiction, that since the world was, no man by divine authority ever preached or taught the remission of sins, as set forth in the gospel, *on any ground save the blood of Christ*. I go further still. No man by divine authority ever taught that an alien sinner could perform either faith, repentance, or baptism, in a gospel sense, *whose conscience had not been purged by the blood of Christ*. 2. The believer is to be baptized, as a visible expression of his faith in a crucified and risen Jesus as his only Savior. 3. He is to obey all the commands of Christ, because of the relation he bears to Jesus, as both Lord and Christ. His obeying the commands of Christ does not create the relation of a forgiven child, instead of being an alien sinner, but is a service beautifully symbolizing that relationship through the blood of the Lamb. Mr. Franklin says: "The first thing required of them, when they hear it, is to believe it." But Jesus says, "He that is of God, heareth God's word: ye, therefore, hear them not, because ye are not of God." John viii. 43. The Apostle John says, 1 John v. 1:

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus the Christ is born of God." Mr. Franklin says he is an alien sinner. The difference is very clear between them. I will notice Acts xiii. 38, 39, and, for the present, dismiss this part of his proof. Paul here says: "Through this man" (Jesus) "is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Believing is not a condition or work performed by an alien sinner, but a fruit of the Spirit of God, and an evidence and grace of salvation through Christ. The unbeliever is damned, or condemned, because his unbelief is an evidence or fruit of his state as a sinner, and alien from God. "But," Mr. Franklin asks, "is he condemned because he does not do that which he has no power to do?" I answer, He is responsible for all his inability to do, whether of will or motion. God declares the sinner dead in sin. Eph. ii. 1-5. If he has by sin destroyed himself, is he accountable for his inability? But Paul told the Philippian jailer to believe on Jesus, and he should be saved. Yes; and the Philippian jailer was very far from being an alien when Paul told him this, as his manner and speech clearly indicated. Instead of being alienated in heart from God, he sought to learn his duty, and did it cheerfully. If alien sinners cheerfully obey God, having free will and power to do so, in what sense are they aliens?

Again, Paul says: "Without faith it is impossible to please God." Heb. xi. 6. True, he does. But the alien sinner does not have faith, does not come to God. Therefore faith is not a condition, but a gift. Take a parallel passage, Rom. viii. 8: "So then they that are in the flesh can not please God." Are alien sinners in the flesh? They are; and can not please God. For, "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." *He is alien to Christ.*

We are told in the next argument that repentance is a condition to be performed by *alien sinners* in order to obtain the remission of sins. Here the gentleman fails again by attributing to the *alien sinner* that grace which God gives to the *reconciled*. Acts v. 31: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Also Acts xi. 18: "When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles *granted repentance* unto life." But we are told that, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." And did they not perish in the destruction which came upon them as a nation? But is the law by which the nations are judged conditions set forth in the gospel, by the performance of which alien sinners obtain the remission of sins? If justification be by the deeds of national law, *Christ died in vain*. Gal. ii. 21: "I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if *righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain*." So then there is a national repentance commanded, that has no reference to the remission of sins set forth in the gospel. And there is a repentance unto life which God gives; and not, therefore, a condition performed by alien sinners. But those who believe are commanded to repent, and be baptized. True. Had they *power to obey*, to do what was *commanded* them to do? I answer, yes. In what did their *power to perform* consist? I answer, *The grace of God, and not free will, and power of an alien sinner*. Instead, therefore, of three conditions for alien sinners to perform, in faith, repentance and baptism, we have gracious gifts from God, and the attendant fruit of those gifts in obedience—not the obedience of a graceless alien, but of a reconciled and sanctified heir of God. Heb. x. 10: "By the which will ye are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Also 14th verse: "For

by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."

We are now brought to consider the words of Jesus to Nicodemus. John iii. 3, 5, 6. Mr. Franklin explains that "born again," "born of water and the Spirit," "born of the Spirit," mean not *be converted*, not "*be turned*," but "*turn*." The Savior said to Nicodemus, Except a man *turn*, he can not see the kingdom of God. Was not Nicodemus very ignorant not to understand so simple a statement? Is it not strange that the wisest men in the Church in all ages, since Christ spoke these words, should have failed to understand them! Look at it now through the light of "Christianity restored!" To be born again is the act of an *alien sinner*. It is his own act, in turning to God, as much as seeing with his eyes, or hearing with his ears, or understanding with his heart. Tell us, dear sir, in your next speech, do you mean natural, optical sight, or seeing, and natural hearing, etc.? But this matter is fully disposed of. John i. 13: "Which were born *not* of blood, *nor* of the *will* of the flesh, *nor* of the *will* of man, but of *God*." Again we have it repeated, that if a man can not believe, and be saved of himself, he is not accountable. If *his* works do not take him to God, reconcile him to the divine government, and procure his eternal glory, he is not accountable. This is poor logic. It denies the mediatorial work of Christ, the reign of grace in salvation, and grounds the present and eternal salvation of the sinner on his own work. We now come to Paul's calling. In this case, as in the others, Mr. Franklin has Paul an alien sinner till after he was immersed. Although Paul called Jesus Lord (Acts ix. 6), and although he afterward testified that, "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. xii. 3), yet Paul was an alien sinner still. One thing will remove his alienation. Not faith, nor repentance, though they be conditions; but they will not do, without the finishing, final work, *immersion in*

water. I have but one answer to this argument; and it is this: "Paul never refers to his baptism as the condition which he performed to obtain pardon, or justification; but at all times, with all the emphasis of his great gift, rested the whole work on the merits of Jesus, and by the grace of our God. 1 Cor. xv. 10: 'But by the *grace* of *God* I am what I am.' What he *must do*, and what he *ought to do*, was in the new relation in which he stood to Christ, not an *alien sinner*, but a *called saint*. And in that new relation he says: 'I can do all things through *Christ* which *strengtheneth me*.'" Phil. iv. 13.

Let us now consider the language of Christ, as given in John iii. 17-19: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world *through him* might be *saved*," etc. What he did *not* come to do was to condemn; but he came to *save*. Matt. i. 21: "*He* shall *save* his people *from their sins*." What is the condemnation, then? Not his coming into the world; but that men "loved darkness rather than light, *because their deeds were evil*. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are *wrought in God*."

Mr. Franklin asks, "Why did not the Lord gather the children of Israel together? Was it because he *would not*, or because *they would not be* gathered? They were free," etc. I answer, they were *not free*. "Jerusalem that now is, and is in *bondage* with her children." Gal. iv. 25. But Mr. Franklin says, "they had a *will*?" Yes, but it was a negative will: "Ye will not come to me." John v. 40. But Mr. Franklin says: "They interposed their will in the way of the Lord's, and *prevented his will from being done*." God commands his children to pray, "*Thy will be done*;" but men interpose *their will*, and *prevent* his from being done. So what is done will not be the *will of God*, but the interposed *will of men*. The *will* under which Jerusalem *would not be gathered* was a *national law*; but the will of God,

confirmed by his immutable oath, is not *interposed* and *prevented*, but is *yea* and *amen* in Christ Jesus.

We are told that our Lord involved the idea of *doing*, in the conclusion of his Sermon on the Mount: "He who hears these sayings of mine, and *does* them, I will liken him to a wise man" (an alien sinner), etc. Jesus is here teaching his disciples their duty in their relation to him as disciples to their Lord, and not what an alien sinner of his own free-will and power can do as conditions upon which he may obtain remission of sins. But Mr. Franklin says: "This *doing*, and *not doing*, is a matter in which *man is free*." He should state it: "This *doing*, and *not doing*, is a matter in which the *alien sinner is free*." Now we have the doctrine in full. It is this: All the duties set forth in the Sermon on the Mount are *done* by the *alien sinner of his own free-will and power*, and he shall be great in the kingdom of God, because of himself he has *done* these things. If an alien sinner can rise to a position of greatness in the kingdom of God, of himself, by his own act, will he need the grace of God to prepare him for any other position of glory or honor, either in time or in eternity? And if so, please state what it is, and where it is.

In the last argument of the gentleman we are told that the principle of all *law* among men recognizes man's ability to *do* and *obey*. I agree to this, as a principle of *law*. But can the alien sinner obtain the remission of sins on the principle of *law*? If the argument of Mr. Franklin means anything at all, it means that the alien sinners whom God pardons are pardoned on the ground of conditions performed by them, just as men, by obedience to law, obtain favor among men. He therefore quotes from the Old Covenant: "I have called, and you have refused." "I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded." And again, "Choose ye this day whom you will serve." These quotations have no more relation to the remission of sins as set forth in the

gospel, than do the laws of Great Britain. They relate to an entirely different matter. But some commands, as given under the old covenant, are in form brought down to the gospel service. See Ps. xcv. 8, and Heb. iii. 7-15. Also, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else." "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Isa. xlv. 22. Matt. xi. 28. Under the former covenant these commands were spoken to national Israel, and were the duty they owed to God as a nation. Under the latter they are spoken to spiritual Israel, and are the duties they owe to Him in that relation. But in neither case do they refer to conditions to be performed by the alien sinner, in order to the remission of sins. Neither does God tantalize his creatures by these commands; but he puts them in such relation to his people that they *willingly* do them, under the reign of grace, by Jesus Christ our Lord. "For it is *God* which worketh in them both to *will* and to *do* of his good pleasure." Phil. ii. 13. "So then, it is *not* of *him* that *willeth*, nor of *him* that *runneth*" (of his own free-will and power), "*but of God* that showeth mercy." Rom. ix. 16.

Should Mr. Franklin get to see the contrast set forth in the Scripture between grace and works; between gospel and law; between the work of Christ and the work of alien sinners, I shall hope to hear, at least, the name of Jesus used in connection with the remission of sins. And I shall be glad if he should have courage to say, "Not of works, lest any man should boast." But he can never say in truth, "That not of ourselves; it is the *gift of God*," while he believes the proposition which he affirms. He has repeatedly asserted in the speech before us, that it is of the alien sinners' free-will and power; that it all turns on their doing, etc. And now Paul comes forward and tells him just as plainly as language can speak: "*Not of ourselves*; it is the *gift of God*. *Not of works*" (conditions), "lest any man should

boast." How a man can hold the doctrine of this proposition, and ask God in prayer to do anything, either for himself or others, I can not see. For he affirms most tenaciously that the will of God is prevented by the interposed will of man. Therefore God can only do what the will of man permits to be done. The conclusion is, the will of man governs, and God is the subject. How very different from this is the word of truth! Eph. i. 11: "Who worketh all things after the counsel of *his own will*." Ps. cxv. 3: "But our God is in the heavens; he hath done whatsoever he pleased." "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen." Matt. vi. 13.

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—My worthy friend has given you a sample of his style of response. Had you not heard my speech you would have been puzzled to learn what issue he made as he proceeded to notice some of the points in my speech. He alluded to the Scriptures and arguments in such an obscure manner that it was, in many instances, difficult to see what he was aiming at. He has scarcely stated a point, a position or an argument in my speech with sufficient clearness to enable any one to tell what it was. He mixes up things, confuses questions and so mystifies matters in general that no one can see the force of much he says. I shall aim to strike through and grasp such matters as have the most appearance of relevancy to the question in debate.

The gentleman can not see how pardon can be offered to the alien sinner, on conditions in which he is free, and has power to perform, and the whole matter be by grace! I will try and explain the matter so that he can see it. In the first place, I do not like to accuse him of playing upon

a term, and refusing to take it as it was obviously intended. What are the words "alien sinner" inserted in the proposition for? Simply to show what remission of sins is intended in the proposition—that it is the remission obtained at the time of turning to God, or what the apostle styles "old sins," and not the remission obtained by an erring follower of Christ, after he is converted, or, in other words, all the sins of the past life, or before turning to God, and not sins that may be committed after that event. The remission is offered to an alien who will turn to the Lord and give himself to God, not to be received while *he is an alien*, but when he turns and is naturalized. I hope he will readily see that I have no idea that an alien sinner can obtain pardon, or any other blessing from the Lord, while *he is alienated from him*. It never entered into my mind that he could take up such an idea, till I heard his speech. Pardon is offered to an alien, not that he may receive it in his alienation, but on the conditions laid down, among which is the condition that he will turn from his alienation and *yield himself* to be a citizen in the kingdom, and a servant of the Lord.

My respondent can not see how remissions of sins can be conditional and yet by grace. He can not see how an alien sinner can be *free* and have power to perform things required as conditions. He has a string of Scriptures that he runs over without looking at their meaning, and jumbles together in a confused manner, that are clear enough in themselves. Let me give you a sample. He quotes, "By grace are you saved," and then *assumes* that as salvation is by grace that there can be no condition on which it is received. But the thing assumed here is the very thing in which he is under mistake. The entire system is of grace. The grace, or favor of God, brought the Savior to the world, gave us his life, his death, his resurrection, his mediation, his blood, the atonement, the gospel, the conditions on

which we come to him and receive the benefit of the atonement, his mediation, the remission of sins and the impartation of the Holy Spirit. The entire scheme of redemption is of the grace of God, and through the efficacy of the blood of Christ. It is an emanation of the grace of God, which has appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world. The whole system came from this grace, and not without it. Christ is the foundation of it, and it has its efficacy in his blood, and not in the conditions which we are required to perform, and which we *can* perform or refuse to perform. Had it not been for the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ in becoming poor that we might be rich; dying for our sins; shedding his own most precious blood, through the efficacy of which we may obtain remission, the gospel would never have come to us; the terms of pardon would not have come to us. The *ground* of it is in the one sin-offering, and not in the *conditions*. But the Lord knew what we could do, and has not required us to do what we *can not do*, but what we *can do*, and proposes to save us if we *do it*, but to condemn us if we *do not do it*. It is all in the name of Christ and through the merit of Christ, and the efficacy of his most precious blood, all of which is of grace. Without the name of Christ, his blood, the reconciliation, all of which is by the grace of God, we never would have been pardoned on conditions or without them. The entire gospel, with all its terms, is founded on Christ, and is of the grace of God. Had it not been for this grace, and the mediation of Christ, the gospel and all its terms of pardon, or its conditions, would never have come to man at all.

When the sinner believes, repents, confesses and is immersed, and, according to the promise, he is cleansed from sin, through the efficacy of the blood of Christ, it is not of *himself*, as my worthy friend has got into the habit of say-

ing it, to give it a prejudicial turn. The Savior, on whom he is to believe, is not of *himself*, but of God who sent him; the gospel which is to be received and believed is not of the sinner *himself*, but of the Lord who gave it. The terms, or conditions of the gospel, are not of the sinner *himself*, but of God. The pardon offered, and the impartation of the Spirit, are not of the sinner *himself*, but of God. But the Lord requires the sinner *himself* to believe the gospel, and declares that if he does not do it he shall be condemned. The Lord never believed for the sinner. The Lord commands the sinner to repent; this the sinner must do *himself*, and if he does not do it, he will perish. The Lord will not repent for him. The Lord commands the sinner to be baptized; this the penitent sinner must do *himself*. The Lord will not do it for him. 'The man that refused to be baptized by John, while his baptism was in force, "rejected the counsel of God against himself." John was the lesser and Christ the greater, and if he who rejected John, not being baptized by him, in so doing, rejected the counsel of God against himself, what shall we say of him who rejects the Lord, in refusing the baptism appointed by him? Does he not reject the counsel of God against himself?

I want to save my worthy friend from the trouble of straining his lungs in emphasizing the words "not of works," but "by grace." He has things terribly mixed up. One of the conditions, and one of the first I have adduced, and one on which I desire to place all due emphasis, is *faith*. When Paul says of our justification, it is "not works," does he include *faith* in the word "works?" Does he intend to teach that our justification is not of *faith*? Certainly not; for he teaches that we are "justified by *faith*." Rom. v. 1. What, then, does my friend mean by vociferating the words "not of works?" Certainly the apostle does not mean, "not of *faith*," nor does he mean "not of *grace*," for he says, "By grace you are saved,

through faith." The fact that salvation, or remission, is "by grace," does not set aside the statement that it is "through faith." There stands the *faith* connected with remission, as it does in the commission, a condition to be performed by man, and a condition that he can perform. What means the clause from Paul, "not works?" Does it mean *not by obedience to the gospel*? Surely not. The impartation of the Holy Spirit is promised "to them that *obey* him." See Acts v. 32. The words, "not of works," do not include this obedience. "Received you the Holy Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Gal. iii. 2. Do these "works of the law" include faith, and mean that the Holy Spirit was given without *faith*?

"Not of works," "by the deeds of the law," and other similar expressions, have reference to the works required in the law of Moses, and not "good works which God hath ordained that we should walk in them," Eph. ii. 10, nor the works mentioned by James ii. 20, nor the conditions clearly laid down in the commission. These conditions are never styled "works of law," nor "good works" in Scripture. Paul says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit." See Titus iii. 5. Here, in the very sentence, declaring of our salvation, that it is "not of works," it is declared to be "by the *washing of regeneration* and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." The washing of regeneration here is an allusion to baptism, as all the commentators of any note are agreed.

When the Scriptures say "not of works," "not by works of the law," "not by works of righteousness," "not by the deeds of the law," etc., the meaning is only that justification is not by the works, deeds, righteousness, etc., prescribed in the law of Moses, and not that salvation is not by obeying the gospel of Christ, or not that that salvation or the remission of sins is not by believing, repenting and being

baptized. And when salvation is declared to be "by grace," it is not by grace *alone*, but "by grace *through faith*," and not *without faith*. When the apostle says, "and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God," he does not mean that they do not *themselves* believe, repent or be baptized, but that *salvation* is not of yourselves, but that *salvation* is the gift of God.

While it is true that man can not redeem himself, can not give himself the grace of God, or remission of sins, it is also true that he can believe the gospel when brought to him by the grace of God; that he can repent when the Lord grants the privilege, as he has now done, since he "commands all men everywhere to repent," that he can be baptized, when commanded to be baptized in the name of the Lord. There is a human and a divine part to be done in saving the sinner. There is a part that man is commanded to do, and a part the Lord does. When Peter commanded the people on Pentecost, saying, "*Save yourselves* from this untoward generation," he alluded to something that *they could do themselves*, and something that they *must do* or not be saved. In the same way when Paul commanded the jailer, saying, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," he commanded him to do something, not only that *he could do*, but something that *he did do*. When the Lord said to Saul, "It shall be told you what *you must do*," he not only referred to something that Saul *could do*, but something that *he did*. If he had refused to do what he was commanded to do, and what the Lord said he *must do*, there was no grace of God that would have saved him.

I quoted the words, "To whom ye *yield yourselves* servants to obey," to show that man is *free*. Bro. Thompson immediately informs us that they were not *alien sinners* to whom Paul wrote, but *saints*. True; but what were they before they *yielded themselves* to be servants of righteousness? They certainly were not saints then. Who were

those on Pentecost to whom Peter said: "Save yourselves from this untoward generation?" Surely they were not saints. What was the jailer, in Philippi, to whom Paul said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house?" Surely he was not a saint before he believed. What was Saul when he was told what he *must do*? Surely he was not a saint before his sins were washed away. Who were those to whom the prophet said: "Choose you this day whom you will serve?" Were they saints who had not decided whom they would serve? I quoted these Scriptures not only to prove that salvation is conditional, but the general principle that *man is free*; that he is a subject of law; that otherwise law could not consistently be addressed to him; that this is true in reference to any law, either of Moses or of Christ, either of sin and death, or of faith, human or divine; that this is true of the alien sinner, or he would not be a gospel subject.

My worthy friend has an old theory in his mind that constantly darkens counsel. He is not only thinking of an alien sinner "dead in sins," in the Scripture sense, but one dead in the sense of *his theory*; that is, so dead that he can do nothing; that he can not believe the God that created him, the Lord that died for him, and that he must have irresistible power exercised on him, as supernatural as that which brought Adam into existence, to quicken him into new life, or eternal life, before he can believe God, or Christ, or the Holy Spirit. But the man "dead in trespasses and sins," in the Bible sense, is not a man that *can not* believe the gospel when it is presented to him, but simply a man that *does not* believe it. The man "dead in sins," in his sense of the term, is no more to blame for being where he is than a block of marble in its native state is for not being a beautiful statue. He has no power to be anything else than what he is. In this helpless condition, he thinks

the Lord, by irresistible power, quickens some into new, or eternal life, leaving others in their helpless condition, and then he preaches the gospel to them, that they may believe. Thus, you see, he has a sinner, yes, an alien sinner, quickened into new, or eternal life, *before he believes*, or while *in unbelief*. His Bible teaches him that he who believes not is condemned already, because he believes not the testimony that God has given of his Son. But he will have it, that the alien sinner is quickened into new, or eternal life, without faith, or before faith, and then he believes; and thus he has a man quickened into new, or eternal life *in unbelief*. But the Bible knows nothing of this new life, or eternal life in unbelief. This doctrine is an outside system. The Bible doctrine is, that without faith you can not please God; that he who comes to God *must* believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.

The Lord "Came to his own, but his own received him not: but to as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name." See John i. 11, 12. To whom did he come? To his own; that is his own people, the Jews. Were they *free*? "His own received him not." But what of those who did receive him? To them that *received him* gave he power. Power to do what? Power to receive him? Not a word of it; but to them that *received him*, gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that *believe on his name*. The power was not given to enable them to receive him, or to believe; but given to them who *did receive him and believe on him*, to become what they were not before—"the sons of God." This Scripture could not have been more against the theory of my friend than it is. The Lord did not give the power to enable them to believe, or to receive him; but to them that received him and believed on his name. To these he gave power to become the sons

of God. These "were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This birth is not of blood, or not in any lineal descent, nor of the will of the flesh; that is, not of any inclinations of the flesh; nor of the will of man; it did not originate with man, nor was it devised or ordered by man, but by the will of God; that is, it was ordered by the will of God; devised by and had its origin in his will. They did not have a miracle performed on them to give them power to receive the Savior, nor power to believe; but to them that received him gave he power, or the *privilege* to become the sons of God. They received him and believed on his name before he gave them the privilege to become the sons of God. This, then, has nothing of the doctrine of quickening into new life before faith, in it. That is a doctrine that is not in the Bible at all.

But, now, what has my worthy friend done with the clear conditions in the commission? Matthew has the command to "Go *teach*, or disciple, all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Mark has the command to "Preach the gospel to every creature; he that believes and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believes not shall be condemned." Luke has "Repentance and remission of sins in his name." Are there any conditions here? The Lord makes the clear statement that "he who believes and is baptized shall be saved." Luke has "repentance and remission of sins." When both are put together, we have faith, repentance and baptism, and the object in view is salvation, or the remission of sins. When Peter preached the first sermon under this commission, the people inquired, "What shall we do?" If my friend had been there, he would have told them that they could not do anything. But the preacher that was there did not tell them that; but told them to "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ

for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." They demonstrated that they could do what was commanded, for they rose and *did it*. The things they were commanded to do were conditions. For instance, the Lord made *faith* a condition; if they had refused to believe, could they have obtained remission? The Lord says, "He who *believes* and is baptized shall be saved." When they heard Peter preach, if they had refused to believe, could they have obtained pardon? I know that the grace of God was present, the atonement, the blood of Christ; but would the grace of God save a man who *would not believe*? Would the blood of Christ take away a man's sins who would not believe? Would the Lord pardon the man who would, when he heard the gospel, *refuse to be baptized*? Come, my brother, we are talking of the regular and legitimate administration of the gospel. Tell us, then, squarely, whether the man who hears the gospel, and *refuses* to repent, will obtain remission? The Lord has connected repentance with remission of sins in the commission, in Acts ii. 38 and in Acts iii. 19, 20. May man put it asunder? Can man *refuse* to repent and still obtain remission of sins?

When the Lord commanded Saul to go to Damascus, and there it should be told him what he *must do*, if he had refused to go, would he have been pardoned? Ananias went to him and told him what *he must do*; if he had *refused to do it*, would he have been pardoned? Ananias commanded him to "Arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord." If he had refused to be baptized, would his sins have been washed away? If he had refused to call on the name of the Lord, would his sins have been washed away? Will my friend tell us, if a man refuses to obey the Lord, will the Lord pardon him? I know what the Book says about "them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ;" but I

want to know what he will say. The Lord says, he "will take vengeance on them that *know not God and obey not the gospel* of our Lord Jesus Christ."

When I said, "Everything turns on *doing* and *not doing*," I supposed my worthy friend would understand that I was speaking of the *human* part, and not of the divine part, or what man is required to do, and not what the Lord does for him. But he appears now not so to have understood, or, at least, he did not so represent me. The Lord says: "Whoever hears these sayings of mine and does them, I will liken him to a wise man." Here are two conditions to be done by man. One is to *hear* the sayings of our Lord, and the other is to *do* them. This *hearing* and *doing* would avail nothing without the grace of God and the atonement; nor will the grace of God and the atonement avail anything for the man who *refuses* to hear or to *do* the sayings of our Lord. There is no failure on the part of the Lord, either in reference to his grace, which brings salvation, and has appeared to all men, the influence of the Spirit, the atonement, or anything else. If there is failure at all, it must be on the part of man, either in *refusing to hear*, or *refusing to do* the sayings of the Lord. The hearing will not do alone, but they *must do*. On the part of the Lord, all things are done well; are ready; and the preaching of the gospel presents it to man, who is required to *hear* and *do* the sayings of the Lord. I am aware that our God is in the heavens, and that he does all things according to his *own will*; but among the things he does according to his own will, he presents the gospel, and requires man to *believe it*; and that, of course, the "alien sinner," for all who do not believe are aliens. The first step, in turning from their alienation, is to *believe God*; believe the testimony God has given of his Son. This they must do; *do it themselves*, or the Lord will condemn them. This same gospel "commands all men everywhere to repent," and this command shows that all men

can *repent*. This is another thing that man *can do*, and that he *must do*, or he will perish. If he refuses to do what he *can do*; refuses to *do the sayings* of Jesus, he will be counted a foolish man.

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators: Respected Audience: — Judging from the character of the speech to which you have been listening for the last half hour, and from the confused utterances of which it is made up, I must be guilty of having mixed up things terribly for my worthy friend's theory. It looks but the wreck of its former self; and it is not to be wondered at, by any means, that his piteous cry should be heard coming out of the ruined heap of his *self wrought* citadel, "*Confusion!*" "*Confusion!*" But the intelligent audience before me is not confused. You will judge impartially of the arguments and proofs before you, and who it is that is confused. I am willing to abide your decision.

How the alien sinner can save himself by exercising his own free will, by his own power performing the conditions thereof, and his salvation be by the grace of God, I can not see. So says the worthy gentleman, I reply: No, sir; I can not see it, neither can you see it. The best of all reasons exists for not seeing it, namely: because it can not be seen, having no existence in fact. God himself has put a line between conditions, or works, performed by alien sinners, and his grace, putting them in antithesis to each other, so that the one eternally excludes the other. Rom. xi. 6: "And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace: otherwise work is no more work." Eph. ii. 8, 9: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. Not

of works lest any man should boast." But the gentleman here becomes a great admirer of grace. Hear him: "*The entire system is of grace.*" These are his own words. If the entire system is of grace, the salvation of alien sinners is of grace. But the proposition affirms that the salvation (or pardon) of alien sinners is offered to them on conditions performed by them, of their own free will and power. But the free will and power of an alien sinner *is not the grace of God.* Therefore, the proposition is not true; and the free will and power of alien sinners do not belong to the system of salvation, or pardon. Again I quote his own words: "*The entire scheme of redemption is of the grace of God, and through the efficacy of the blood of Christ.*" Permit me to prove this sentence by the word of God before I proceed with the argument. Eph. i. 7: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins *according to the riches of his grace.*" But the proposition affirmed by the gentleman asserts that the remission of sins is *according to the free will and power of alien sinners, exercised in performing conditions.* This is the ground upon which he rests the remission of sins. Without the performance of these conditions the alien sinner is damned: with them, or by them, he is saved. Therefore the efficacy lies in what the alien does, and not in the blood of Christ. If the alien sinner, of his own free will and power, can *believe, repent, and obey* the gospel to divine acceptance, he does not need the blood of Jesus. Christ is dead in vain. But the remission of sins is through the blood of Christ, according to the riches of his grace; therefore, the proposition of the gentleman is not sustained, and the alien sinner is not pardoned, on conditions which he performs of his own free will and power. Again, the gentleman says: "*The ground of it is in the one sin-offering, and not in the conditions.*" True, sir, it is. Why do you not stand to that position? It refutes your whole

proposition, and denies the argument by which you try to sustain it. It contradicts and overthrows what you say in the very next sentence. You say, "The Lord knew what *we could do*, and has not required us to do what *we can not do*, and proposes to *save us if we do it.*" And yet you say the merit is in Christ. The alien sinner does the work of his own free will and power, upon which God proposes to save him, and which if he does not do God will condemn him, and the merit of it all is in Christ, because the alien did it of his own free will and power, independent of the virtue of the blood of Jesus Christ applied to him in its cleansing, purging power. I am not astonished that he who labors to bolster such a theory as this should imagine "*everything confused and mixed up.*" God has revealed no such medley of absurdities and self contradictions in his precious word. From Abel to Zachariah, and from Matthew to the close of Revelation, but one united testimony is borne by the entire family of God that have spoken or written, and the sentiment of all is joyfully expressed in that rapturous song which John heard the glorified singing around the throne of God, Rev. v. 9: "Thou wast slain, and hath redeemed us unto God *by thy blood*, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."

But the gentleman kindly proposes to relieve my lung labor in emphasizing, *not of works*, but "by grace grace." Well, how does he administer his relief? 1st. The first condition that the alien sinner performs of his own free will and power is *faith*. 2d. The obedience to the gospel is the second condition that the alien sinner performs of his own free will and power. 3d. The term, *not of works*, etc., means not of the works of the law of Moses. I suppose I should now pitch my key-note very low when I say, *not of works*. and should quietly say, not of the works of the *law of Moses*, but of the faith and obedience of alien sinners, rendered to God, of their own free will and power.

But was God talking by Paul to the Ephesians about Moses' law? Was Moses' law any part of the theme discussed? It was not. The connection discloses the theme to have been the power of God, which he wrought in Jesus Christ, when he raised him from the dead. See Eph. i. 19, 20, and ii. 1-9. The doctrine of the connection is that God, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, quickened us from death to life with Christ. That it is by his grace that we are saved from that state of death in sin and made partakers of eternal life. That the dead sinner performs no works to get life, the dead do the works of death, and we are told here just what they are. They are according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. What saves the alien sinner from this state? God says, by his servant: "By grace ye are saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the *gift* of God; *not of works*, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship." Not the workmanship of alien sinners, who, of their own free will and power, have raised themselves up to heavenly things or places, but God hath raised us up, as he did Jesus from the grave. His divine power hath wrought the work *in us*, and not we of our own power or will. In our saved state, therefore, we are of God in Christ Jesus. "Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That according as it is written. He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." 1 Cor. i. 30, 31. But is not this salvation through faith? Certainly; but it is not of the alien sinner, but is the gift of God, being the fruit of the Spirit.

But is the alien sinner a servant of God before he is made free from sin? Does he render obedience to God while he is under sin? Let the word of God answer. Rom. vi. 20: "For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from

righteousness." When did they become servants to God? "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end, everlasting life." How are they made free? Col. i. 12, 13, 14: "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." But Mr. Franklin asks, were they saints before they *yielded themselves* to be servants of righteousness? I answer, they were saints *when they yielded themselves as servants to God*. The yielding was not the act of an alien sinner of his own free-will and power, but it was the act of one in whom God had wrought to will and do of his good pleasure. Phil. ii. 13. But the Pentecostian alien sinners, who were cut in the heart, and cried out, What shall we do? And the Philippian jailor, who cried, What must I do to be saved? And Saul, stricken to the earth in the presence of Jesus, saying, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? What of these? They were all of them subjects of divine power, and made free from sin, or they would never have cried for instruction to obey the Lord. Do alien sinners of their own free will and power cry out to know their duty to God? No. We are pointed to these cases in God's word as the works of God in the gift of his grace, and not to exhibit the wondrous free will and power of alien sinners. "But were they told to do something they *could not do*?" No, sir. Christian duties were pointed out to them, as the obligation they owed to Him that had *called them out of darkness into his marvelous light*. 1 Pet. ii. 9. Not to get the salvation of God, but because "He hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, *not according to our works*, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." 2 Tim. i. 9.

I now come to notice the wonders of my friend's profound logic, and deep genius in the use of language, in that brilliant comment of his given in explanation of John i. 11, 12, 13: "He came unto his own, but his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name. Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The first position of the gentleman is that God gives a believer power to become a son of God. We admit it in the sense of the text. But the believer, as stated here, was born of God, in the past tense. Who believe on his name in the present tense. To become the sons of God, in the future indefinite. We get the order here, as given by our Lord: First, born of God; second, believe on his name; third, have power to become the sons of God. The whole theory of the gentleman is that the alien sinner must do the conditions first, and that will give him a birth of God. That is, he must be born himself of his own free will and power, and then call it being born of God. Did you notice how the gentleman squirmed, and twisted, and hesitated, and blundered, when he came to the words, "*nor of the will of man?*" There was a reason for his hesitation. The text said his proposition was not true. Mr. Franklin, Jesus was telling them *who* they were born of, and by what power, and *not* who had originated conditions by which alien sinners could born themselves of their own free will and power. Will you hear God's word? "Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, *nor of the will of man*, but of God."

I will now notice again his reference to believing, repenting, turning and obeying. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." 1 John v. 1. And as that birth is of God, and not of the free will and power of an alien sinner, so believing on the Son of God is not the act of an alien sinner. Therefore repenting, turning

and obeying are gracious fruits of divine life within and produced by the grace of God. The child of God, in whom this grace of God hath wrought the *will* and *do*, is commanded to work it out in visible action. The theory of Mr. Franklin is that God no more works the salvation of those who are saved than he does the damnation of those that are lost. For the Lord only proposes in either case and leaves the sinner to his own free will and power. If he wills and does, in obeying condition, he gets his reward, and if he wills and does in disobeying he gets his reward. Heaven or hell turn upon his free will and power; he does as he pleases of himself, and yet Mr. F. says there is no merit in what he does; it is not of himself. Please put *this* and *that* together. Paul would tell him, You can not put them together, "for if it be of grace, then is it *no more of works*."

I shall now proceed to the proof of the doctrine of the remission of sins as set forth in the gospel more fully. And in giving a statement of that doctrine I propose to give it in the words of my worthy friend, as given in his last speech. I can not say whether it was the confusion which my first speech occasioned him or not, but from some cause he has uttered truth that refutes his proposition, condemns his theory and states the true system of the remission of sins. I will now give these statements in order: First, "Remission of sins did not originate with man, nor was it devised by man, but by the will of God; that is, it was ordered by the will of God, devised by and had its origin in his will." Second: "The entire system is of grace." "The entire scheme of redemption is of the grace of God, and through the efficacy of the blood of Christ." Third: "I am aware that our God is in the heavens, and that he does all things according to his *own will*." Here we have the theology of the Bible and the system of the remission of sins according to the will of God.

penitance is in the commission and is a commandment, not to the child of God, as "a delightful service," but to "all men everywhere," and in view of the day of judgment. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commands all men everywhere to repent: because he has appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he has given assurance to all men, in that he has raised him from the dead." See Acts xvii. 30, 31. Repentance is a command not to a child of God, a fellow-citizen, as "a delightful service," but an "alien sinner," an impenitent person, as an act to be performed by himself, in turning to God, a condition in which he is free and has power to perform, and he is to do this in view of the judgment and that he may not perish.

My friend may talk about grace, repeat it, and strain his fine lungs in emphasizing it, but there is no grace that will save any man without faith or repentance. The "alien sinner" who will not believe, or will not repent, will be damned; will perish. The grace of God is ready, and the blood of Christ, the atonement or reconciliation, but not to save any man without faith, without repentance, or without yielding himself to be a servant of righteousness, in the method clearly set forth in the system of grace found in the New Testament.

The worthy gentleman can not see how a sinner can *save himself*, and thinks I can not see either. Had he been present and heard Peter, on Pentecost, exhort his hearers, saying, "*Save yourselves* from this untoward generation," as reported, Acts ii. 40, he would have exclaimed, "I can not see how people can *save themselves*, and the salvation still be by grace." No matter whether he can see it or not, the apostle told them *how to save themselves*, or to obtain the salvation secured to them by the grace of God and the blood of Christ, when they inquired, "What shall we do?"

And if he would learn of the apostle, he could see how they were saved, or what he told them to do for the remission of sins, and to come to the promise of the Holy Spirit. But he does not like the instruction given on that occasion. He does not instruct sinners in that way. Hear the apostle tell these inquirers what to do: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." See Acts ii. 38. Here we find two of the conditions found in the commission in one sentence, telling inquirers what to do. This was telling them how to be saved by grace, by the blood of Christ, and the atonement. What would my friend tell inquirers who would put the same question to him? Would he give the same answer given by Peter, or, rather, by the Holy Spirit? Let him tell this audience whether he would give the same answer. He could not according to his system. His system requires him to give some other answer. He never tells his hearers to "*Save yourselves* from this untoward generation," nor to "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Yet here is an instance of alien sinners inquiring what to do, of their being told what to do, of their doing what they were told to do, and their being added to them. These plain instructions, and this clear example, are not needed by him. Yet this occasion was the one on which the keys of the kingdom were used the first time, and the first persons entered into the kingdom.

We are not discussing the question of *works*, or *good works*, we are discussing the question about *conditions*. When Paul says, "Not of works," does my friend understand him to mean *not of faith*? Certainly not; for, as I have before shown, the apostle says, "it is by grace, *through faith*," and not *without faith*.

Elder Thompson says that my proposition "asserts that

the remission of sins is according to the free will and power of an alien sinner in performing conditions." Is he so excited that he has forgotten what the proposition is? I shall have to quote it to him, that he may see what it is, and not beat the air: "Remission of sins, as set forth in the gospel, is offered to the unconverted, or alien sinners, on conditions in which they exercise free will, and have power to perform." The words, "in which they exercise free will," simply explain that sinners are *free*, can decide whether they will accept remission on the conditions proposed; and the words, "have power to perform," explain that they have ability to comply with the conditions, or do the things contained in the conditions. The ground of remission, on the divine part, is the sin-offering, the blood of Christ, with which he appeared in the true holy place—heaven itself—for us, and without *this ground* there could have been no remission, either with or without conditions. This is all of grace. The merit is all in this; not in the sinner, nor in anything he does. But this remission, or salvation, which is of grace, is *through faith* and not *without faith*. Faith is a condition. "He who comes to God must believe." "Without faith it is impossible to please him." See Heb. xi. 6. This is an item on the part of the sinner, and he is *free*; can *will* to do or not do; can *yield himself* or not; and he has power to perform—can believe, and thus please God. It is a condition, and there is no voiding it. On the divine part, the sin-offering was made to *procure* remission; but on the human part, conditions are divinely required as the means of receiving remission. The merit is in the sin-offering that *procures* remission, and not in the acts of obedience performed in complying with the conditions; and the idea that remission can not be by grace and yet conditional is without any foundation.

My friend mystifies things with a verbosity of words. He speaks of the sinner believing "of his own free will

and power." Let him rid the matter of all redundancy, by leaving out the words, "of his own free will and power," and I put the matter to him to answer: Can the sinner believe? That is all there is of it. Can the sinner, saying nothing about free will or bound will, believe? Come up to the work, my dear sir, and let us have some debating, and not playing upon words. Never mind the will, *free* or *bound*, nor the words, "of himself," but answer the question directly: Can a sinner believe? This is a plain matter, and there ought to be nothing hard in it for a preacher of years and experience. The man who has not believed is "unconverted," an "alien sinner," and the command is to "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." Can he do this? or does God command him to do what he knows he can not do? Come up to the work and answer. You are in a dilemma, sir. If you say the alien sinner *can* believe, your theory is gone; if you say he *can not* believe, you make it that God commands what he knows *can not* be done, and declares that the man who does not do it shall be damned. From this there is no escape. It is useless to give us a rehash of the confusion already uttered about works and grace. We all understand that remission of sins, as set forth in the gospel, is not of Moses, but of Jesus; not of the blood of slain beasts, but of the blood of Christ; not of the old covenant, but of the new; not of the law, but of the gospel; not of the letter, but of the spirit; not of works, but of grace. But the new covenant, which is of grace, has conditions in it, and the first item in these conditions is, to believe. Can the unbeliever perform this item? Can he believe? or does this system of grace require him to do what he can not do?

He complains of these conditions, and says, "Without the performance of these conditions the alien sinner is damned." Well, sir, I put it to you to say before this audience, whether the man that does not believe is damned?

Will Elder Thompson say whether a man *without faith* is damned? Tell us, sir; can a man be saved without faith? I stand to what I said: "*The ground of it is in the sin-offering, and not in the conditions;*" but the terms of receiving it must be complied with on the part of man. Can the sinner receive remission without faith? Tell us, my dear sir, as we must both account to God, can the sinner receive the remission of sins without repentance? If you say he can, I can not say, as one of old, "You are not far from the kingdom of God," but you are certainly *not far from Universalism*.

My worthy friend has a bad memory and can not take notes that he can read, and this leads him to misrepresent. He says, "And yet you say the merit is in Christ. The alien sinner does the work of his own free will and power upon which God proposes to save him, and which if he does not do, God will condemn him; and the merit of it all is in Christ, because the alien done of his own free will and power independent of the virtue of the blood of Jesus Christ applied to him in its cleansing, purging power." I can not see how a more distorted representation than this could be made. What *work* did I say the alien sinner does? I was not talking about the *work* the alien sinner does, but the *terms* of pardon, or *acts* which he is commanded to perform, as *believing* and *repenting*. These are not put down in the Scriptures as *works*, but acts of obedience, or terms on which the sinner receives the remission of sins *procured* by the blood of Christ and extended to us by the *grace of God*. But he has the words "independent of the blood of Christ," and ascribes them to me. There was nothing of that kind in my speech, or anything ever uttered by me. It is simply his own misrepresentation.

"The yielding was not the act of an alien sinner," my friend says. Were they alien sinners before they yielded themselves to be servants of righteousness? I put this

question to my friend. He did not answer, but evaded, saying, "They were saints *when* they yielded," etc. I did not inquire what they were *when* they yielded, but *before*. Before they yielded they were servants of sin—alien sinners. What did they do? *Yielded themselves*. To be what? What they were already? or what they would be after they yielded themselves? Before they yielded they were servants of sin. After they yielded they were servants of righteousness. The *act* of yielding was to become, what they were not before, servants of righteousness. They did not become servants of righteousness first and then yield to become what they were already, but yielded first and became what they were not already—servants of righteousness. This is fatal to my friend's theory and shows that the servants of sin can yield themselves to be servants of righteousness.

The Pentecostians, the jailer and Saul, my friend says, "were all of them subjects of divine power, and made free from sin, or they would never have cried for instruction to obey the Lord." This is foreign doctrine and not in the book. Why did Peter tell those on Pentecost to "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*?" If Bro. Thompson had been there, he would have cried out, Hold, Bro. Peter, they already are made free from sin, or have remission of sins; and had he heard Ananias say to Saul, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," he would have said, Ananias, please let me correct you. That young man's sins are already washed away, and you should not command him to "be baptized and *wash away* his sins." This doctrine of my friend was not born yet in the time of the apostles. It is another gospel; or, if not another, a perversion of the gospel of Christ.

My friend has no system, no plan of salvation, no gospel for sinners, and can not tell a sinner how to come to God.

He can tell him that he can not believe, that he can not repent, that he can not yield himself to be a servant of God ; that he can not come to God at all. He can tell him that he is sinful, and that the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin ; but how to come to that blood and obtain remission of sins he can not tell. He can tell of the power of God than can save the sinner, but how to get that power to save him, he can not tell. He can tell of salvation by grace ; but how the sinner is to get the grace to save him he can not tell. He will not open the book and read of the thousands saved by the grace of God on Pentecost, in Solomon's porch, and the Samaritans, for there he will find *how* they were saved by grace ; what they were commanded to do, in coming and accepting salvation by the grace of God and through the blood of Christ.

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S THIRD ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators : Respected Audience :—The antithesis presented in my last speech as set forth in the Scriptures, between the new covenant and the old one ; between sacrifices, and offerings, and services rendered by men, and the one perfect offering, sacrifice, and service rendered by Jesus Christ ; between the works of *alien sinners* and the grace of God through faith ; between conditions performed by *alien sinners of their own free will and power* and the fruits of the Spirit of Christ reigning in the saints, has so completely overthrown the system of Mr. Franklin and destroyed his proposition by the positive negative of God's word, that the gentleman himself, to hide his defeat, has trampled upon the common rules of language, and has rendered himself ridiculous, to say the least of it, in the eyes of this intelligent people. Hear what he says as

to the proposition : "We are not discussing the question of works, or good works, we are discussing the question about *conditions*." Again, "What *work* did I say the alien sinner does? I was not talking about the work the alien sinner does, but the terms of pardon, or the acts which he is commanded to perform, as believing and repenting." It requires but very little thought or perception to detect in these sentences of his not simply a play upon words, but a perversion of language.

In his opening speech he brought forward the *principle of law*, as it is taught by all law, as illustrating the principle taught in his proposition, and from which he concluded that it all turned upon the alien sinner doing and performing. But now he sees that this principle of law is contrasted with the grace of God, and is declared not to be God's method of saving sinners ; that it is not of works, not of themselves, not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God ; and he denies all his argument, if it be worthy of the name of argument, and says he is not discussing the question of works, or good works, but conditions. What are conditions? His answer is, *terms*, or *acts*, which the alien sinner *performs* in obedience to the commands of God. How are the *terms* or *acts performed*? *Answer* : By doing them. How does the alien sinner do them? *Answer* : He exercises free will and power. Are they not, then, his works? Does he not do them of himself? They are, therefore, just as much his works as any obedience that was ever required to the law of God. Nay more, they are law. The whole remedial scheme depends upon them, if his theory be true, and has no effect but to damn men, without them. Sir, you have denied your own system, and defeated your own arguments. And I see that my own friends not only triumph in the success of truth over error, but the whole congregation before us see your failure. When you deny that salvation is of works, you

deny that it is of ourselves; the two being united by Paul in the same argument. And it being admitted that it is not of works, and not of ourselves, denies it to be conditions performed by alien sinners, and, therefore, your proposition is not true. He says, "I did not know the ground on which he stood." I acknowledge I did not think of any sensible man trying to stand on such ground as he has taken, and I hope the fall which has resulted to him from his temerity in attempting to stand on such absurd ground, may prove a lesson of profit to him in time to come. I do not see how he could hope for me, or any one else, to understand him, when he does not understand himself, but goes on denying in one part of his speech what he tries to prove in another part of it. This renders my notes distasteful to my friend, because, like the servant who took notes of his master's sermon, there was nothing in the notes, for the very good reason that there was nothing in the sermon. When Mr. Franklin speaks of *my* bad notes, bear in mind *his* speeches and I am sure you will not attribute what I take down of his speeches to excitement on my part.

As to furnishing sinners with a cloak for their sins, I believe we do not differ as to sin being the act of man in violation of law. But when my friend teaches man's unaccountability till Christ died for him, and that God knowing that the death of Christ would put man in such relationship to God that the millions of the race who are damned are damned because Christ died for them, he assails the character of God, and not of sinners. Thus the cloak furnished the sinner by Mr. Franklin is that he is not accountable for his sins as a sinner, and by exercising free will and power of his own in believing, repenting, and obeying, God forgives him something for which he was not accountable. My friend therefore preaches remission of sins through the obedience of alien sinners, for which they were not accountable to God. But man is accountable for

being a sinner, and is therefore justly condemned, not only for what he is, but for all the inability of that state so fitly called death in sins.

But he says that I make the reason of an unbeliever not believing, the impenitent not repenting, and the penitent (here he departs from logic—it should be the disobedient) not obeying, is that grace has not done its work, etc. But he fails here again, for I find the reason in man's depraved state by sin. But how does he account for man's believing, and repenting, and obeying? Simply that the grace of God has done nothing, the Spirit of God has done nothing, the *irresistible* power done nothing, the blood of Christ has done nothing, but the alien sinner has exercised free will and power, and has believed, repented and obeyed independent of all these, save in one thing. Well, what is that? Let us all hear. God gave him the *privilege* to do all this himself! This is his *grace* that he talks about when he *plays on words*. God gives the alien sinner, by proposing *terms* to him, the privilege of doing them, and remits his sins, for which he is not accountable, for embracing his privilege and doing the terms of his own free will and power. Now if you can see either grace, or the Spirit of God, or irresistible power, or the blood of Christ, or eternal life, in that system, you can see what I can not, and what I am sure is not in it at all.

But he says if a man can not of his own free will and power believe, repent and be baptized, or obey, "he is no more to blame for not being a Christian than the tree of the forest is for not being a useful piece of timber in a building." Did the tree of the forest make itself what it is? No. God put it there. Did man make himself the depraved sinner that he is? Yes. So says the word of God. Rom. v. 12. Is he no more to blame for being dead in sins than a forest tree for being a forest tree? Then he is not to blame at all, and Mr. Franklin has given him a complete

cloak. But let me help Mr. Franklin out of his trouble. He is no more to blame for not being a Christian than he is for being dead in sins. How much is that, sir? Mr. Franklin, like the great John Wesley, has planted his feet, and he is not going to be moved. We will now have some *debating* if his feet do not slip as they did just now. Where has he planted them? Hear him. He is speaking of man as an alien sinner, or else he is playing with words that do not belong to the proposition: "He can *do good*, or evil; *right* or *wrong*; *believe* or not; *yield obedience to the commandment of God* or not; *yield himself to be a servant of righteousness* or sin." There his feet are planted and his system, too—both planted so deep in the mire of the alien sinner's free will and power that all the roaring and bellowing of his sonorous voice, nor the spasmodic throes of his ever changing theory, will never extricate him from the denunciation of God's word, which declares *it is not of himself, it is not of the will of man, it is not of works; it is of God*. I need not to overthrow his argument. It is already overthrown, planted, buried in the grossness of its own contradictions and perversions, and utterly refuted at every point by the word of God. Again, he takes up what he calls three conditions—to believe, repent and be baptized. To these he says the alien sinner, of his own free will and power, can yield obedience.

And again he says these three things he does in turning to God. "The first of these," says he, "is certainly to an alien sinner." What makes it certainly to an alien sinner? The command to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. To whom is it given? Mr. Franklin says it is to alien sinners. Where is his proof? He says the unbeliever is an alien sinner. But where is his proof? We have heard him say so many curious things that we want the proof of God's word as to who are alien sinners. He says the Philippian jailer

was an alien sinner when he was asking instruction from Paul as to his duty. I say that he was not, that he was reconciled to God, that the Spirit of God was in him, that he was thus prepared, or called to hear God's word and obey it, and his words showed his heart to be alive to God, and therefore not alienated. Was it a delightful service to believe? My friend thinks not. I know it was, and is to every child of God, without which blessed relation no man ever yet believed in spirit and in truth. It is because the child of God is free—free through Christ (John viii. 36: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Gal. v. 1: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free")—that the service of God is delightful and the child cries for instruction how to obey the commands of God.

Repentance from dead works also follows this relationship to God, in Spirit, as sons. It follows the purging of the conscience by the blood of Christ, from *dead works*, to serve the *living God*. And baptism to an alien sinner would be an empty form, unless, like some, he had more confidence in it than in the blood of Christ. But to the child of God that has "tasted that the Lord is gracious" it is a delightful service—a beautiful figure of their salvation. Neither of the three are conditions in order to salvation from sin, nor to be performed by alien sinners. My friend is exercised deeply about my fine lungs being strained in *emphasizing grace*. But if he was a friend to grace he would not be so exercised about it. His repugnance to the grace of God ill becomes his profession. If the grace of God is offensive to him, I can say he is not far from infidelity.

He desires to show me how an alien sinner can save *himself*. How is it? Acts ii. 40: "*Save yourselves from this untoward generation.*" Now take what the gentleman said on Eph. ii. 8: "*And that not of yourselves: it is the gift*

of God." He said *that* related to the salvation. Or he would render the text thus: "*That* salvation is not of *yourselves*: it is the gift of God." Now he comes forward and asserts that alien sinners *save themselves*. Does the term *salvation* or *saved* mean the same in both these quotations? If they do, Mr. Franklin and Paul, in the quotation from Eph. ii. 8, contradict Mr. Franklin and Peter in Acts ii. 40. If the sentence, "*Save yourselves from this untoward generation,*" does not refer to the pardon of sins, or salvation from sins as set forth in the gospel, and it certainly does not, then Mr. Franklin is *playing on words* and handling the word of God deceitfully. But he applies the term *salvation*, as used in Acts ii. 40, to remission of sins, as stated in Acts ii. 38. In both cases the apostle refers to external service, and not spiritual or internal grace. Jesus puts away our sins and saves us from our sins. Matt. i. 21: "He shall save his people from their sins." And his people, being quickened to a sense of this salvation, Peter tells them to do in visible form that service which is founded on the remission of sins through the blood of Christ. If there had been no remission of sins through the blood of Christ, there would have been no service to represent it. But, as God has ordained, in the scheme of salvation, the remission of sins through the blood of Christ, all services, ancient or modern, commanded of God, are because of remission of sins through Christ, and therefore not as conditions in order to it.

The term *salvation*, as used in this place, refers to the Jewish practices, or, rather, the turning from them by the followers of Christ. But Mr. Franklin says Peter was telling them how to be saved by grace. I should state it thus: Peter was telling them what they should do who were saved by grace, and had the spirit to do these things through Christ, who strengthens them. What should I tell inquirers—such inquirers as Peter was speaking to? I

should do as I have ever done—point them to the command of Christ; not to put away their sins, nor give them eternal life, but to serve the Lord Jesus that had given them both. We next learn from the gentleman that the keys of the kingdom were used the first time on this occasion, and the first persons entered into it. This is extreme ground, if he means by the kingdom the promise to Abraham of the blessing in Christ. If he does not mean this his remarks do not apply to the proposition. The keys of the kingdom, as given to the apostles, were government in the church, and not the remission of the sins of alien sinners. But does the gentleman deny that his proposition asserts the remission of sins according to the free will and power of alien sinners? What is the remission of sins according to, if it be not according to the free will and power of alien sinners? God gives them the privilege to *do*, but the alien sinner *does* the conditions upon which he receives the remission of sins. The remission is procured by the alien sinner, and without his action the whole scheme fails. In the language of Mr. Franklin, it all turns on the doing the conditions. In doing the conditions we are told that the alien sinner acts free, of his own power, and yet it is not of themselves—it is all of grace. Such logic is too self-destructive to require refutation.

But we now come to the question upon which this whole proposition rests, and the answer to which decides the issue between us. Too much care can not be given this important question. To answer this question, the assertions of men will not be taken; the word of God alone must give us the answer clearly and definitely. The question is, "Can the alien sinner believe in Jesus Christ unto salvation by the exercise of his free will and power?" Says Mr. Franklin: "Let him rid the matter of all redundancy by leaving out the terms, 'of his own free will and power.'" Who put these terms in the proposition, and also the term "alien?"

Mr. Franklin put them there ; and to my mind the request coming from him at this time to rid the proposition of them is a virtual confession that he is unable to sustain his proposition by the word of God. If he could sustain it, why wish to drop the terms of it? The terms employed convey the sentiment or doctrine of the proposition he affirms. To drop the terms so as to make the question read, "Can the sinner believe?" would be to change the entire issue between us, and leave no issue at all. The real issue is as to what alien sinners do of their free will and power. Come up to the work, my dear sir, and let us have some debating, and do not go back on your own proposition, and try to dodge your own words, just because they defeat you! Come out like an honest man, and give us a "Thus saith the Lord" to prove your proposition, or say you can not do it, and yield the point. You know there is no such language in the Bible as that remission of sins is offered to the unconverted or alien sinners on conditions in which they exercise free will and have power to perform. This audience knows it also. With all the excitement you attribute to me, and which you put in your speeches to make effect, this audience knows that I am fully as calm as yourself. I know, sir, that there is no such language as your proposition in the Bible. Come, sir, give us some proof aside from your assertions on the proposition. The commission, as given by Matthew, Mark and Luke, says nothing about the free will and power of alien sinners. The Pentecostians are not called alien sinners, or said to have exercised free will and power as such in being added to them. The Philippian jailer is not called an alien sinner, nor are his free will and power, as such, spoken of in believing in Jesus. There is nothing said of Saul as an alien sinner washing away his own sins. Where is his proof? He has none.

We now come to the question, "Can the alien sinner, exercising his free will and power, believe in Jesus Christ?"

1. Let us hear Jesus on the power of an alien sinner to come to Christ. John vi. 44: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." Can they come to Christ without this drawing? Jesus says they can not. John vi. 65: "Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come to me except it were given unto him of my Father." These are the words of Christ, not in giving history, but in stating doctrine. 2. Can an alien sinner please God? Rom. viii. 8, 9: "So then they that are in the flesh can not please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Does the Spirit of God dwell in alien sinners? Will you say he does, sir? If the Spirit of God does not dwell in them, they are in the flesh, and can not please him. They are not Christ's unless they have the Spirit of Christ; they are aliens. Heb. xi. 6: "But without faith it is impossible to please him." Gal. v. 18, 22: "But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith." Eph. ii. 8: "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." 1 Cor. xii. 3: "Wherefore I give you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed, and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." Now, there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. The doctrine of these texts fixes the faith of God's elect so clearly in the work of the Spirit of God, that there can be no escape from that conclusion. Mr. Franklin's theory denies to the Spirit of God any work in the heart of man that prepares the heart to believe in Jesus. But these texts attribute to the *drawing of God, the gift of God, the Spirit of God, the Holy Ghost*, that gracious work in man that brings him to Jesus, and enables him to believe in Jesus. Here is the life, the power, by which we have

access unto God. Eph. ii. 18: "For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Faith is the fruit of this Spirit, and therefore *not of ourselves, not of the will of the flesh, but of God.*

I have traced that power by which the sinner is saved from death in sins, from unbelief, and drawn to Jesus—believes on him and obeys him—to the Spirit of God. I have given you the word of God to prove this point, and not my assertion. I therefore retort upon the gentleman, that he is in a dilemma from which he has no escape: To deny to the Spirit the grace by which the sinner believes is to deny God's word; to accept the word of God, that the grace of believing is of the Spirit of God, is to deny that it is of the alien sinner's free will and power. Or, making a trilemma of it, that the Spirit of God and the free will and power of an alien sinner are identical. Which horn will he take? He takes the proposition before us, and thereby contradicts God's word, and thus destroys his own theory. But he does not want a rehash from me of grace and faith contrasted with works. No. He does not relish grace. He has rehashed works, conditions, terms, and acts of the alien sinner, till an ordinary lover of these things would have become disgusted with the oft-repeated mess. But it is not so with him. Just exclude the grace of God from the system, and let it all turn on the alien sinner's doing, acting, performing and obeying terms, conditions, acts and works. (See his comment on Acts ii. 40; and he never tires of it, though it be repeated a hundred times or more.) It is the grace of God that so annoys him, because it destroys his proposition.

But one item in the new covenant, the first condition in it is to believe, he says. Will you tell us who the new covenant commands to believe? Have you found a text that uses the terms "remission of sins offered to alien sinners on conditions in which they exercise free will and have power to

perform?" No, sir. You have found no such words, nor anything equivalent to them, neither in form nor sense. I defy you, in all that you produced from the word of God, to show anything approaching to a proof of your proposition. Your sinner dead in sins, who is under sin, and is free from righteousness, is so far from being in such a deplorable condition, that all the life and goodness there are in believing, repenting and obeying, all the merit and righteousness there are in these three things, is of the exercise of the alien sinner's free will and power. But do dead sinners believe? Do dead sinners repent? Do dead sinners obey? Do dead sinners yield themselves to God? They would be strange *dead sinners* that would do these things. What higher, holier or purer life has God ever revealed to man than appears in the doing of these things?

Faith is that sublime grace in man that distinguishes him as a child of God in all dispensations of time. Gal. iii. 26: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." 1 John v. 1: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is *born of God.*" This grace is of God, and being of him, every one in whom it dwells is of God, is born of God. Therefore it is by grace we are saved through faith; and that not of ourselves, *it is the gift of God.* What is the gift of God? I answer, *eternal life.* This eternal life God gives us. Rom. vi. 23: "The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." It is this life into which God quickens us, and it is this quickening that saves us from death in sins. Eph. ii. 1-5. The fruit of this life is faith. John v. 24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, *hath everlasting life,* and shall not come into condemnation; *but is passed from death unto life.*" John vi. 47: "He that believeth on me hath *everlasting life.*" John viii. 47: "He that is *of God* heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." Have alien sinners eternal life? Have

access unto God. Eph. ii. 18: "For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Faith is the fruit of this Spirit, and therefore *not of ourselves, not of the will of the flesh, but of God.*

I have traced that power by which the sinner is saved from death in sins, from unbelief, and drawn to Jesus—believes on him and obeys him—to the Spirit of God. I have given you the word of God to prove this point, and not my assertion. I therefore retort upon the gentleman, that he is in a dilemma from which he has no escape: To deny to the Spirit the grace by which the sinner believes is to deny God's word; to accept the word of God, that the grace of believing is of the Spirit of God, is to deny that it is of the alien sinner's free will and power. Or, making a trilemma of it, that the Spirit of God and the free will and power of an alien sinner are identical. Which horn will he take? He takes the proposition before us, and thereby contradicts God's word, and thus destroys his own theory. But he does not want a rehash from me of grace and faith contrasted with works. No. He does not relish grace. He has rehashed works, conditions, terms, and acts of the alien sinner, till an ordinary lover of these things would have become disgusted with the oft-repeated mess. But it is not so with him. Just exclude the grace of God from the system, and let it all turn on the alien sinner's doing, acting, performing and obeying terms, conditions, acts and works. (See his comment on Acts ii. 40; and he never tires of it, though it be repeated a hundred times or more.) It is the grace of God that so annoys him, because it destroys his proposition.

But one item in the new covenant, the first condition it is to believe, he says. Will you tell us who the new covenant commands to believe? Have you found a text that uses the terms "remission of sins offered to alien sinners on conditions in which they exercise free will and have power to

perform?" No, sir. You have found no such words, nor anything equivalent to them, neither in form nor sense. I defy you, in all that you produced from the word of God, to show anything approaching to a proof of your proposition. Your sinner dead in sins, who is under sin, and is free from righteousness, is so far from being in such a deplorable condition, that all the life and goodness there are in believing, repenting and obeying, all the merit and righteousness there are in these three things, is of the exercise of the alien sinner's free will and power. But do dead sinners believe? Do dead sinners repent? Do dead sinners obey? Do dead sinners yield themselves to God? They would be strange *dead sinners* that would do these things. What higher, holier or purer life has God ever revealed to man than appears in the doing of these things?

Faith is that sublime grace in man that distinguishes him as a child of God in all dispensations of time. Gal. iii. 26: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." 1 John v. 1: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is *born of God.*" This grace is of God, and being of him, every one in whom it dwells is of God, is born of God. Therefore it is by grace we are saved through faith; and that not of ourselves, *it is the gift of God.* What is the gift of God? I answer, *eternal life.* This eternal life God gives us. Rom. vi. 23: "The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." It is this life into which God quickens us, and it is this quickening that saves us from death in sins. Eph. ii. 1-5. The fruit of this life is faith. John v. 24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, *hath everlasting life,* and shall not come into condemnation; *but is passed from death unto life.*" John vi. 47: "He that believeth on me *hath everlasting life.*" John viii. 47: "He that is *of God* heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." Have alien sinners eternal life? Have

they passed from death to life? Do they hear God's words? Are they of God? They are not; they are dead in sins. Who, then, is it that yield themselves to God? The quick, and not the dead. It is the living, in whom dwells the Spirit of God, who are made spiritual by the indwelling Spirit, and being raised up to heavenly things in Christ, are new creatures in Christ; the workmanship of God. No more aliens, but fellow-saints with the family of God, and by one Spirit having access unto the Father. What were they before they yielded themselves servants to God? At first in their fallen state, they were dead in sins, and free from righteousness. Rom. vi. 20. Afterward they were made alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Rom. vi. 11. And were thus made free from sin, being now under grace (eternal life, Rom. v. 21), and not under the law. Then they yielded themselves to God. Not aliens, putting on a form of godliness, not knowing the power; not going about to set up their own righteousness by calling gospel ordinances conditions in order to salvation, and thus making themselves the authors of their salvation, just as much as the finally lost are of their damnation. But they yield themselves to God, as those who are alive to God through Jesus Christ, who are of God; born of God. "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." We here have the fruits of that Spirit, in the service of God: "Ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." Rom. vi. 22.

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S CLOSING ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—I rise to close my argument on this question. I need not spend time in replying again to the same things repeated and emphasized by my worthy friend. He has his circle of ideas, and when he gets round it, he starts round again.

You have heard what he has thus far had to say in response. Our question really has three questions in it. Set in their proper order, they would be: 1. Is the sinner free to decide or determine what he will do; to choose whom he will serve? 2. Is salvation from sin or pardon, as proposed to the sinner, conditional? 3. Can the sinner perform the conditions? I am to prove that the sinner is thus free; that salvation is conditional; and that the sinner can perform the conditions.

Please now notice what is to be proved, and what is not to be proved. There is no question about salvation being by grace. This I have never doubted, and could prove as clearly as my worthy opponent, if I thought it any part of this debate. That salvation is by the blood of Christ, I never entertained a doubt. This needs no proof. That salvation is through the name of Christ, there is no doubt. But is man free to accept or reject this salvation which is by grace, by the blood of Christ, and through his name? That is, has he the power to accept or reject it? This is equivalent to inquiring whether he is an accountable being. For it is self-evident that if man is not free, has no power and can not determine whether he will accept this salvation by grace, he has no accountability in the matter. He is a mere machine acting as he is acted upon. Do the Scriptures treat him in this light, or as an agent free to act; with power to accept or reject this great salvation? I claim that he is thus free, but my friend virtually denies it. In his view of it the sinner is not free; can do anything; that he can not turn to God, accept salvation by grace, and I defy him to give any reason for the sinner not being a Christian only that the Lord would not make him one. If he dies in unbelief, it is because the Lord would not make him a believer. If he dies in impenitence, it is because the Lord will not give him repentance. The sinner has no agency in the matter, and, with his view of it, is no more.

responsible for not being a Christian than my friend is for not weighing two hundred and ninety pounds. He is the apologist for the sinner and excuses him for not being a Christian.

The Lord said to the Jews, "If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." See John xv. 22. Again, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now had they both seen and hated both me and my Father." See John xv. 24. What is the meaning of this? The Lord had come and spoken and done wonderful works, confirming his divine mission, and they had no cloak for their sin. He has done his part of the work, opening the way for men to believe and left them without excuse.

Paul lays down the same broad and clear ground. Rom. ii. 8: "But to them that are contentious and *do not obey the truth*, but *obey unrighteousness*, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor and peace to every man that *worketh good*; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." This language recognizes man as free; an accountable being; capable of doing good and evil, and responsible for his actions. This accords perfectly with the Scripture I started out with in my first speech on this proposition. "Know you not that to whom you *yield yourselves* servants to obey; his servants you are to whom you obey, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness." Rom. vi. 16. This Scripture I have introduced to establish the general principle that *man is free*; that he *yields himself* either to be a servant of righteousness or sin; he is not taken by necessity and forced to be a servant. This my friend has never answered and never will. It refutes his entire theory of *necessity* and *irresistible power*. To establish the same sentiment I have

quoted 2 Peter iii. 9; where he asserts the general principle that God "is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." In this passage we have the will of God both affirmatively and negatively. What is his will negatively? It is not that any should perish. What is his will affirmatively? That all should come to repentance. Why do any perish? They will not; come to the Lord that they might have life. They interpose their will against the will of God, and as they are free the Lord lets them have their will. If it is the Lord's will that all should come to repentance, why do not all come? Because *their will* is opposed to the will of God. *They will not*. They are free and determine their own course. When the Lord invites, they refuse. When he stretches forth his hand, they regard not.

But are there any conditions? There are. When the Lord speaks, man must *hear*. Faith comes by *hearing*. A man can hear, or refuse to hear. He has control of his ears, and can keep them where they will never hear the truth, or where they will hear lies. Being free he can do all this, and many men do this and never believe. The *hearing* itself or *seeing* the truth is a condition. A man can not believe without the truth, and he must *hear it* or *read it*, or he can never believe. But seeking is a condition. "They who seek shall find," says the Lord. "They that seek me early shall find me," says the wise man. This seeking is a condition on which men find the Lord. Can this condition be set aside? Will a man who never seeks find the Lord? Will my friend tell us? Does any man find God without seeking? "He has made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should *seek* the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and *find him*, though he be not far from every one of us." See Acts xvii. 26, 27.

Will my friend tell us if the Lord made all men that dwell on all the face of the earth that they *should seek* the Lord, that they might feel after him and *find him*; will they find him without *seeking* the Lord? Let him answer, or give it up.

But I have other matters still more serious for his meditation. Faith is a condition. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii. 36. Paul says, "Without faith it is impossible to please him" (God); "for he that comes to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. xi. 6. Here we have two conditions together: 1. Believing. 2. *Diligently seeking*. Is faith a condition? Is diligently seeking a condition; or is a man pardoned without faith? Will he give us a case where a man came to God without faith? or a case where a man came without diligently seeking. Will he tell us, plainly, will any man be saved *without faith*? The Lord says, "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved." See Mark xvi. 16. Is faith a condition here? Is the belief in order to salvation, or only a "delightful service of the believer?" Paul said to the inquiring jailer, when he said: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." This was one thing he was to do to be saved—one condition on which he was to be saved. Would he have been saved if he had not done it; if he had *not believed*? But is faith a condition of salvation? Let us hear Paul: "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." See Rom. x. 9. The Lord says, "If you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sins." See

John viii. 24. Again, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." John iii. 14, 15. These Scriptures are sufficient on this point, showing that without faith it is *impossible* to please him; that he who comes to God *must believe*; that when a man inquired, "What must I do to be saved," he was commanded to *believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ;" that man believes to salvation; that he believes that he may not *perish*, that he may not *die in his sins*, that he may be *saved*. If all this does not show that faith is a condition of salvation, no proposition can be shown from Scripture.

But repentance is a condition of salvation. "Repentance and remission of sins were to be preached in his name among all nations, beginning in Jerusalem." See Luke xxiv. 47. God "granted repentance to the Gentiles to life." See Acts xi. 18. Repentance is a commandment to be obeyed in view of remission, or in order to the obtaining of remission of sins. When the Jews cried out, "What shall we do?" the apostle commanded them to "*Repent*, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Repentance here is a commandment—a thing to be done by man, in order to obtain the salvation by grace, through his name and by the blood of Christ. See Acts ii. 28. Again, Peter commanded the Jews to "Repent and be converted, that their sins might be blotted out." See Acts iii. 19. In this case any one can see that repentance is a condition. In Paul's opening speech in Athens, he says: "God commands all men everywhere to repent, because he has appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." It, then, is a command to *all men everywhere*, that they may be saved, or may not perish. Repentance is commanded; it is something to

be *done by man*, and a condition of remission of sins, and without it man can not be saved ; a man can not be pardoned in impenitence.

Confession with the mouth is a condition. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy 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." Rom. x. 9, 10.

Baptism is also a condition incorporated in the commission, and preached by the apostles under that commission. "He who believes and is immersed," says the Lord, "shall be saved." Here faith and baptism are joined together by the Lord, both in order to the same thing—salvation, or pardon—two things to be done by man, that he may come to the promise—*salvation*. They are both in the same sentence for the same thing—salvation. In the words of Peter, on Pentecost, we have two things to be done set forth in the same sentence ; to repent and be baptized, in order to, or, which is the same, "for the remission of sins." These things that God has thus joined together man may not put asunder.

We have now seen beyond a doubt that salvation, or remission of sins, is proposed to the alien sinner on conditions, and that this salvation or remission is "by grace, through faith," by the blood of Christ and "through his name." These conditions are to be complied with on the part of man. They are things to be done by him. The divine part is already provided : the grace of God, the blood of Christ, and his name ; but the human part, in accepting this salvation, or pardon, is to be performed by man. Can he perform it? One would think there could be no use in discussing such a question, were it not that my worthy friend requires me to prove it. Can an alien sinner *seek* God? He is required to do this, and is promised that in

seeking he shall find. The three thousand on Pentecost did *seek* God when they inquired, "What shall we do?" In doing so they did what was required in *seeking*. They were answered ; told what to do ; what the conditions were, and *they did* what they were commanded to do ; performed the conditions on their part, and were pardoned. This is demonstration that man *can* perform the conditions. The sinner is required to *hear*. They did hear, and when they heard, they were pierced in their hearts. They believed what they heard, and were led to inquire what they should do, and learning what was commanded, they performed it, and the Lord, by his grace, through his blood and through his name, according to promise, pardoned them.

The same was true in Solomon's porch ; the people heard the word, believed it, sought the Lord, were told what to do, did it and were saved. So also the Samaritans heard the word, believed the things spoken, sought the Lord, were told what to do, did what they were commanded and were saved. In the case of Saul, he heard the words, "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom you persecute," believed what he heard, and when told what he *must do*, arose and *did it*. He sought the Lord when he inquired, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" and if my friend had been there to answer him, he would have remained *seeking*, for he would have told him that *he could not do anything* ; but Ananias was sent to tell him what *he must do*. He told him as commanded. Saul *did it*, and though the chief of sinners, he was saved, or pardoned.

In the same way we find, when Peter saw, what my worthy friend has never seen yet, "that in every nation he who fears God and works righteousness is accepted with him," and preached the word to the Gentiles, they heard the word spoken, and did what was commanded and God accepted them. So also Lydia and the jailer, in Philippi, heard the word, sought the Lord, and when told what to

do they did it. Paul did not tell the jailer, when he inquired, "What must I do to be saved?" that he could do nothing, but told him to do what he had not yet done, to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." He did what he was commanded and was saved. This was the order of things wherever the apostles went. They preached the word. The people demonstrated that they could *do something by hearing, seeking, believing, repenting and being baptized*. It is useless to attempt to rise up against all this and undertake to prove a system of eternal *necessity* that makes man no more an accountable being in becoming a Christian than a block of wood, a system that excuses the sinner in being just what he is, on the ground that he can be nothing else. A system that declares that man can not believe till irresistible power is sent to make him a believer, and then condemns him for not believing; that declares that a man can not repent till irresistible power is sent to enable him to repent, and then condemns him for not repenting, certainly has nothing in it to commend it to the human race. Such a system God has not given.

The grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men "*teaching us*;" yes, "TEACHING US that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world," and not a system not *teaching us* anything; this grace of God brought us Christ, the gospel, the blood of Christ, the Holy Spirit and every good and perfect gift. To it we are indebted for the entire system of salvation from first to last. It is a system of grace, of mercy and truth and righteousness for man, with terms, divine terms, on which man is to receive the blessings it brings to him. The idea that remission of sins can not be conditional, and yet of grace, by the blood of Christ and through his name, belongs to a theory of fatality, of necessity and inability that nullifies the gospel, ties the hands of men in their disobedience and excuses them

in not turning to God. It sets at naught the command to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," and the commandment of the everlasting God to all men everywhere to repent, in view of the fact that God will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, of which he has given assurance to all men in that he has raised him from the dead.

This audience can see clearly that my worthy friend has no gospel for sinners. He has nothing for them that they can believe; nothing that they can do; no salvation to offer; no remission of sins that they can seek or obtain. Nor can he do anything for them. I believe he is favorable to missionaries, and is not willing to be put down on the list as *anti missionary*; but he is handcuffed and can do no more for sinners than he can for saints. In his view of it sinners can not come to God, and he can not bring them. They can not turn to the Lord, and he can not turn them. Saints can not turn away from the Lord, and he need not labor for them. I see no use for his preaching either for saint or sinner. Not one soul more or less can be saved or lost by his preaching, according to his own view of it. None will ever turn to God only those turned by irresistible power, and that will turn all to whom it is sent. Those to whom it is not sent never can turn, and he can not turn them. They will be lost, not because they were worse than those whom the irresistible power turned, nor because my friend did not do his work, for he could not turn them, but because *God would not send the irresistible power and turn them*. It is the same old theory that "the number of the elect is so definite that it can neither be increased nor diminished." I defy him to show to this audience any good that his preaching can do to any sinner, or any gospel that he has for any sinner. He will not preach "repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ" as it is in the commission; that "he that believeth and is baptized *shall be*

saved," and "baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." He will not follow Peter and the rest of the apostles and tell sinners, when they hear the word and are pierced to the heart, to "repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," for that is not his doctrine. He will not, like Paul told the jailer, tell an unbelieving man to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house," for he does not believe such a man *can* believe. He will not quote such expressions as, "He is not willing that any should perish, but that *all should come to repentance*," for he does not believe such language. He will not quote, "All the day long have I stretched out my hand and no man regarded"—"The Spirit says, Come, and the bride says, Come, and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life." He will not quote the language of the prophet: "Turn you, turn you, why will you die?" "What more could I have done?" etc. These and all similar Scriptures are a nullity with him. With his view he could not, as Jesus did, have wept over Jerusalem, saying, "How often would I have gathered your children as a hen gathers her brood, but *you would not*."

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S CLOSING ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators: Respected Audience:—I rise to close the argument on the proposition before us. We have brought before you all the proofs on either side deemed essential to sustain our theories. So far as the proof on either side is concerned, you now have it all before you. How does the case stand? Has Mr. Franklin proven his proposition? I do not wish to appear egotistical, but I feel

confident there is not a person in the large audience before me that believes he has. Mr. Franklin himself does not believe that he has proven his proposition. He has failed to prove it just because there is no proof of it in the word of God. He has sought proof from the most favorable expressions to be found in the Old Testament and the New; whether in national or municipal law, or in the government of the Church of God; and wherever he could find a word that could be twisted so as to sound like his proposition, he seized it with a death grip and put his sonorous *emphasis* upon it. The words of Joshua to the Israelites; or of the prophets to the same people in their national relation to the law of Moses; or the words of Jesus to the same people in the same relation have been paraded before you, and *emphasized* again and again. Not to prove his proposition he admits, but to prove *man's freedom*. To prove that man is *free* from the *grace of God, the Spirit of Christ, and divine life, in believing, repenting and obeying*. These are the three conditions on which he rests his whole theory, unless the seeking, etc., brought forward in his closing speech, is not included in the three. We take it that these three as numbered by himself are the three things which the alien sinner does, *free from the grace of God, the Spirit of Christ, and a divine life*. And more yet; *free from any sanctifying power, or cleansing virtue of the blood of Jesus Christ*. But the proposition contemplates but one subject, and that is, "the remission of sins as set forth in the gospel." You see at once the *irrelevancy* of all that proof derived from expressions used with reference to law, whether national, municipal, or church. It is gospel, not law, that we are to consider. What does the gospel set forth as the principle upon which sinners are pardoned? Is it a principle of law, or is it a principle of grace? The whole issue lies right here in the principle set forth in the gospel. Mr. Franklin knew the issue was here, and arranged his proof

accordingly, deriving it from law. I knew the issue was here, and arranged my proof accordingly, deriving it from the grace of God. As to the result of our investigation, it has been shown that gospel is just what I have claimed it to be, "*the gospel of the grace of God.*" But while I have proven the principle set forth in the gospel to be grace, I have also proven that it is not of law. These negative proofs have occasioned Mr. Franklin great perplexity, and much *dodging* and *changing base*. I brought forward the plain words of God, right on the point as he was bound to admit, definitely and emphatically proving that it is "Not of works." Eph. ii. 9. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done." Titus iii. 5. "Not according to our works." 2 Tim. i. 9. "Not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth." Rom. ix. 16. "Not of works." Rom. ix. 11. "Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man." John i. 13. "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be." "So, then, they that are in the flesh can not please God." Rom. viii. 7, 8. "Not of yourselves." Eph. ii. 8. "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt." Rom. iv. 4. "But if it be of works, then is it no more of grace." Rom. ix. 6. In reply to these passages, and others of similar import, his first position was that it was not of the works of Moses' law. But when the fact was pressed upon him that these words were spoken with reference to the salvation set forth in the gospel, and the helpless condition of alien sinners, the gentleman suddenly discovers that the principle of works does not belong to the gospel scheme at all. But the conditions upon which God proposes to remit the sins of aliens consist of acts and not of works! The dead sinner must *act* of himself, *free from the grace of God, and the Spirit of Christ, and divine life, and the cleansing virtue of the blood of Christ; in believing, repenting, turning, seeking, and obeying;* but in all

this he does no *work*, he only *acts!* And these *acts* are not of himself, because God gave him the privilege to do them. The idea may be illustrated thus: Mr. Franklin never did an act in his life that God gave him the privilege of doing. Although the act be of himself free from any other power, yet the privilege of doing being given, the act is not of himself; it is the gift of God. Not because grace was given to change his relation or ability to the thing done, save in the privilege to do it of himself free from any other power. The whole theory of the gentleman, therefore, is, that all the grace God ever gave to man was to propose terms for man to do. The doing the terms is independent (*free*) of the *blood of Christ, or the Spirit of Christ.* It is true Mr. Franklin indignantly disclaims saying any such thing. But it is in his proposition, and he can not escape from it. How does God offer remission of sins to alien sinners according to the proposition by him affirmed? On conditions in which they exercise free will, and have power to perform. What is his proof taken from law for? To prove that man is *free*. Free from what? From everything but the privilege of doing the conditions, and his own free will and power. There is not another principle belonging to the proposition. The blood of Christ and the Spirit of Christ, if they ever benefit the sinner in the least, or exercise a direct influence upon his life, only do so after he has believed, repented and obeyed. I asked the gentleman to tell us what benefit the blood of Christ or the Spirit of Christ could be to a man that believed, repented and obeyed without them. He stood before you stolid and dumb upon the point, and answered not a word. Why did he not answer my question? Simply because his theory has no place for either. When I quoted from Heb. ix. 14: "The blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself to God, shall purge your conscience from *dead works* to serve the living God," what notice did he give it? None at all. Had he said that faith, re-

penitance and obedience were *dead works*, he would have had the blood of Christ purging us from faith, repentance and obedience. Had he said that faith, repentance and obedience were *service of the living God*, then he would have the blood of Christ purging our conscience to that service, and his free will and power of alien sinners swept away. So to make the best of a bad case, he says nothing. But ignoring my proof of the purging of the conscience by the blood of Christ he rushes on through the Acts of the Apostles, naming cases where they were "cut in their hearts." "Their persons prostrated before Christ and his apostles, and they inquiring, What shall they do? and their hearts opened to attend to what was spoken;" and without heeding the necessity of any purging or preparation of heart, or conscience, or anything else, by the blood of Christ, to such a state as they now occupy, or to the service about which they inquire, he says they were *alien sinners*, and were told what to do, and did it *as such*. Has he given us a proof in God's word that alien sinners believe in Christ? Not one. I quoted from Christ's words, John vi. 44: "No man can come to me except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him." And again, John vi. 65: "Therefore said I unto you that no man can come to me except it were given unto him of my Father." And again, John viii. 43, 47: "Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye can not hear my word." "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." I also quoted from the apostles, 1 Cor. xii. 3: "And that no one can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." Phil. i. 9: "It is given in behalf of Christ, to believe on him." Eph. ii. 8: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." Gal. v. 22: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." What answer has he given to these quotations? None

at all. He treats these proofs as better to be let alone, and passed by in silence. He therefore calls faith the act of an alien sinner performed of his own free will and power, and, therefore, the fruit of an alien sinner's free will and power, instead of being the gift of God or a fruit of the Spirit. The proofs, however, establish the point beyond a question, that faith is the gift of God, the fruit of the Spirit, the service of a circumcised heart in the Spirit, and a conscience purged by the blood of Christ from dead works. I have shown that "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." 1 John v. 1. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." John iii. 36. "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 into life." John v. 24. If language means anything, these proofs establish faith or believing, as a fruit of eternal life, and as belonging not to an alien state but to a state of life and freedom from condemnation. It is a living grace of the children of God, the heirs of life eternal. Jesus says, "He that liveth and believeth on me shall never die."

The gentleman, being pressed on all points by these plain, pointed proofs presented, seeks to rid himself of his proposition by dropping the terms "alien," and "free will" and "power," and get the discussion limited to the question, "Can the sinner believe?" He fails to state an issue by this question, by having no terms to define the state and relation of the sinner. If he means the sinner dead in sin, and alien to Christ; if he means can believe of his own free will and power, then he can not drop these terms. The effort to do so proved his own conviction of his failure to prove either the terms or sense of the proposition. But the statement of the Apostle Paul that the alien sinners walk according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of dis-

obedience and are children of wrath, till God quickens them with Christ, by whose grace they are saved; and the faith through which this salvation is received is joined with the grace, or life derived from God, and declared to be not of ourselves, but the gift of God. That we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, settles the whole controversy on the subject of any sinners believing till they are quickened of God into eternal life.

How contrary to God's word is the idea of Mr. Franklin that a believer in Jesus Christ is a sinner dead in sins! *A dead believer!* Who ever before conceived of such a thought? The idea is preposterous. Jesus says, "They are of God;" "Have passed from death to life;" "Have everlasting life." No, says Mr. Franklin, they are dead, they are aliens. The Pentecostians who were cut in their heart, and cried out, what shall we do? were dead sinners, aliens. It is true, they were believers, or Peter would not have told them to be baptized. But they were dead believers, alien believers! Were they dead to Christ? They were not. They were alive to him, and therefore believed in him. The idea of a believer in Christ being at the same time alien to Christ in spirit is too absurd to merit criticism. And yet the proposition of the gentleman fails if it be not true. He knows this, and, in his struggles to cover up his defeat, labors in his closing speech to divide the proposition into three questions, leaving out the terms "alien," and "free will and power."

My dear sir, your frantic efforts to get away are of no avail. You wrote the proposition yourself; you found no fault with it till after you had spent two speeches in trying to prove it; you can not get away now, and it is useless to try it. Your speeches are before the people, asserting over and over, that the believer was a sinner in the sense of your proposition, that is, an alien sinner. That as such he was free in his act of believing. Therefore free from the blood

of Christ as a cleansing power; free from the life of Christ as a quickening power; free from the grace of Christ as a saving power. You have this alien thus free to be a believer in Christ. Do you not wonder at yourself when you reflect on the position you occupy before this people? I know your friends wonder at you for defeating your cause so completely, by such extravagant assertions. But he argues that alien sinners, as such, can believe in Christ of their free will and power, or they would not be responsible to God. In order to make man responsible in a relation that will damn millions of the race, he makes it to be the purpose of Christ's mission to establish that relation. No; Jesus came not to condemn, but to save. He did just what he came to do, and all the hosts in heaven glorify him for what he has done. Man is accountable for being a sinner, and all the depravity of that fallen, ruined state. The apologist for the sinner is he who says he is not responsible for what he is, and tries to saddle the blame on God, if he does not save him by his grace. But John xv. 22 is quoted to prove accountability: "If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin," etc. And, again, John xv. 24: "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin," etc. What is the subject of Christ's discourse? Is it man's accountability? No; nothing of the kind; but the sin of the Jews in hating Christ without a cause. See the connection. Why, then, is it dragged into the closing speech, to prove a point foreign to the connection? Simply to hear the jingle of words, and fill up the time.

He also quotes Rem. ii. 8: "But to them who are contentious, and *do not obey the truth*, but *obey unrighteousness*, indignation, wrath," etc. Well, the sinner is responsible for all this, is he not? Oh, yes; but Paul goes on to say that God will render glory, honor, peace, to every man that *worketh good*. And the gentleman says: "This language recognizes man as *free*—capable of *doing good or evil*," etc. What

is his doing called? **WORKS.** The gentleman emphasized the words *worketh good*; yet in his speech just preceding his last, when pressed by the texts, "Not of works," "Not by works," "Not according to our works," etc., he says: "We are not discussing the question of *works* or *good works*." In the name of truth, what are you quoting this text for? Why quote Scripture that is talking about *working good*, as proof, and emphasize the very words, *worketh good*, in a discussion where you are not discussing the question of *works*, or *good works*? It looks very much like somebody, in trying to play on words, and to dodge the antithesis set up in God's word between grace and works, had completely stultified himself before this people. "This accords," says Mr. Franklin, "with the Scripture I started out with," etc. Just so I thought. And it sounded very strange when he said he was not discussing the question of *works* or *good works*.

But now, as he says the principle of *working good*, and *yielding themselves* as servants of righteousness, is in perfect accord, we will understand this *yielding themselves* to be *working good*. But he says: "This my friend has never answered, and never will. It refutes his entire theory of *necessity* and *irresistible power*." I reply, if the application made by the gentleman of the text has not been answered, and never will be; if it be true, then it does refute the entire theory of *necessity* and *irresistible power* (which means God's effectual grace), and dispenses with the whole remedial scheme. Paul settled that long ago, when he said, Gal. ii. 21: "I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."

If there was a *necessity* for the death of Christ to bring sinners to God, then the gentleman is answered, and his theory refuted. If the grace of God is *necessary* to the salvation of sinners from their sins, then the gentleman is answered, and his theory refuted. To deny the necessity of

the blood of Christ to purge from sins; to deny the necessity of the Spirit of grace to give to us eternal life, is surely to tread under foot the Son of God, and count the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and do despite to the Spirit of grace. (Heb. x. 29.) It is because this *necessity* has been graciously supplied, through the mercies of God, and effectually carried forth to a most glorious issue, that the glorified to-day with immortal powers sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, saying: "Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty. Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." We are told that 2 Peter iii. 9 teaches this same principle of works on the part of alien sinners to obtain remission of sins. But instead of this being true, the text discloses the address to be made to the elect of God, stating God's will concerning them. What is it? "God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Will any of them perish? Our Lord will answer. John x. 28: "And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." But Mr. Franklin argues that the Lord lets them have their own will, and they interpose their will, and prevent his will from being done. And yet he says God worketh all things according to his *own will*. Therefore the will of God is that man being free shall have his *own will*, and prevent the *will of God* from being done. I will state this profound logic once more. The will of God is, that the will of God shall not be done; the freedom of man's will preventing God's will: therefore God worketh all things according to his own will. But we are again told *hearing* is a condition, or *seeing* is a condition, or *seeking* is a condition. Who is it that *hears*? "He that is of God." John viii. 47. Who is it that has *seeing*? John ix. 39: "I am come into this world that they which see not might see, and they which see might be made blind." Who seek after God and find him? The alien in spirit? No; but sons, and children. See Matt.

vii. 7. Also Gal. iv. 9: "But now, after ye have known God, or rather are *known of God*." The gentleman would turn every grace of the Spirit into a *dead work* performed by alien sinners of their free will and power, and thus dispense with the *necessity* of the grace of God in our hearts. This grace he emphasizes in derision.

But Mr. Franklin says he has other matters still more *serious*. I am glad he has, for I prefer serious truth to the play upon words which has taken up his speech thus far. What is your *serious* matter for my reflection? *Faith is a condition!* You have uttered that over every speech that you have made since we began this debate. Why do you not prove it? Do you think the people have forgotten the arguments and proofs as to where faith belongs? No, sir; this people have not quite so short memories as it suits you to have, when my proofs are to be considered. You have no notes, or no memory either, when the word of God declares that faith is the gift of God, the fruit of the Spirit; and that Christ is the author and finisher of faith. You do not remember that "they that are in the flesh can not please God." That the carnal mind is enmity against God; it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. That if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. That it is of faith that it might be by grace. That it is not of *ourselves*. That it is not of the *will of man, but of God*. You can forget all these proofs against your proposition, and give us your assertions with as much assurance as though they were more *serious* matters to reflect on than the word of God. Where has he found a text that says alien sinners believe? Nowhere in all the word of God. The whole proposition centers here. Faith in Jesus, believing in God, hearing God's word. The decision of this point by the word of God decides the issue between us.

Is believing the act of an alien sinner, in the exercise of his own free will and power? Has the gentleman found

any such language in the Scriptures? He has not. He abandoned the sentiment of his proposition, ignoring the defining terms of it, and has run through the commission of Christ to the apostles, and the Acts of the Apostles, to prove that persons believed, repented, and were baptized. But these are not matters of discussion between us. The point to be settled is, Were these believers, these penitents, these servants of righteousness *alien sinners, exercising their own free will and power?* I have shown from the most pointed proofs from the Scriptures that they were not; that they were born of God; that they were passed from death to life; that they had eternal life; that the Spirit of God dwelt in them; that faith was the fruit of that Spirit; that it was the gift of God.

I have proven that the remission of sins is in the blood of Christ; that it is according to the riches of his grace; that Christ gives it as Lord and Savior. I have proven, by the antithesis set up in the Scriptures, that remission of sins is not obtained on the principle of part grace and part works. That if it be of grace, it is not of works; but if it be of works, it is not of grace. I have proven that it is of grace, through faith, and not of ourselves, but the gift of God, not of works. That it is according to God's mercy, shed on us abundantly, through Christ Jesus our Savior; and that we are justified by his grace, and not by works of righteousness which we have done. That we are saved according to his purpose and grace, given us in Christ Jesus before the world began; and not according to our works. That it is of God which showeth mercy, and not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth. That it is of God, and not of the will of man. This is God's word upon the proposition affirmatively and negatively.

The issue is made up, the word of God has decided it; and prophets, angels, the apostles, and the saved in every nation, kindred and people, ascribe the kingdom, the power

and the glory to God and the Lamb forever and forever. Amen. The prophets prophesied of Jesus; and all their services pointed to his precious blood that cleanses from all sin, and to his precious life that raises the dead from death to life eternal, and makes the alien one in spirit with Christ; for we are saved by his life. John the Baptist, and all the holy apostles, in their preaching and in their services, knew nothing but "Jesus and him crucified;" "The Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world;" "The Jesus, that saves his people from their sins." The glorified in the Paradise of God, saved through Christ, and filled with the divine sentiment of his grace, only emphasize the negative, *not unto us*, but unto thy name be the glory. Thou wast slain, and hath redeemed us unto God by thy blood. There is not a jar in all that exalted sentiment coming to us from the family of God on earth and in heaven; they are all one in Christ Jesus. There is no human part in their purified sentiment; it is all divine; all of God. For he is above all, through all, and in them all. Blessed Source of all good, be thou glorified, adored, praised and worshiped, forever more. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen.

[Time expired.]

SECOND PROPOSITION.

The quickening of the sinner by the Spirit of God into new life, or eternal life, is independent of the written word or Scriptures.

THOMPSON'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Brother Moderators:—My first duty, in discussing the proposition before us, is to derive from the Scriptures the relation that the sinner sustains to God's spiritual government. I therefore call attention to the following quotations from the words of inspiration: Rom. iii. 9, 19, inclusive: "What then, are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." "As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one." "There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God." "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." "Their throat is an open sepulcher: with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips." "Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness." "Their feet are swift to shed blood." "Destruction and misery are in their ways." "And the way of peace have they not known." "There is no fear of God before their eyes." "Now, we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." The ground of this guilty, condemned state is given in the fol-

lowing words: Rom. v. 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "For if through the offense of one many be dead." "For the judgment was by one to condemnation." "For if by one man's offense death reigned by one." "Therefore, as by the offense of one the judgment came upon all men to condemnation." "That as sin hath reigned unto death." Also Eph. ii 1, 5, inclusive. The relation of the sinner to the spiritual government of God, as derived from the words of inspiration, is a state of "condemnation," "under sin," "dead in trespasses and sins," "a child of wrath." We are now ready to explain the terms of the proposition before us. 1. The quickening of the sinner. By the term quicken is meant to give life to the dead; to make the dead alive. In the relation of the term to this proposition, it means to quicken the dead sinner into a life in union with the spiritual government of God, and free from sin and condemnation. 2. Independent means, not relying on; not dependent upon.

My first argument is founded on Eph. ii. 1, 5, inclusive: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." "Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." "Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past, in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." "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)."

1. The sinner is declared to be dead in sins. 2. God hath quickened them. "You hath he quickened." 3. Christ is the medium through which they are quickened: "Hath

quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved)," or, by whose grace ye are saved, as we read in the margin. Turn to John xvii. 2: "As thou hast given him" (Jesus) "power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." Also Rom. vi. 23: "The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." 4. This quickening into eternal life is independent of the written word or Scriptures. Had God been dependent on the written word or Scriptures, in this work of quickening dead sinners, the statement of that fact would have been required in the statement of the doctrine of the quickening of sinners, unless it had been stated in some other part of the argument by the apostle, and could not have been entirely left out, if true, without criminal neglect. But, in no part of his argument, nor in any part of the Scriptures, is it stated that God is dependent on the written word or Scriptures to quicken dead sinners, or that he uses the written word or Scriptures to quicken dead sinners. Therefore, the quickening of the sinner into eternal life by the Spirit of God is independent of the written word or Scriptures.

My second argument is founded on John v. 20, 25, inclusive: "For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth: and he will show him greater works than these, that ye may marvel." "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;" "That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent him." "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." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is,

when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live."

1. The power to quicken the dead into life, and which is in God, and by which he quickens the dead, is also in the Son, and by which he (the Son) quickens whom he will. 2. Our Lord states this as the power by which they had passed from death unto life, who hear his word, and believe on him which sent him. 3. But Jesus, in stating the doctrine of quickening the dead into life, makes no mention of the written word or Scripture as that upon which God depends to quicken them. But if God depends upon the written word or Scriptures to quicken the dead sinner, Jesus must have stated that fact, either at this time, or some other time, in the statement of the doctrine of quickening the dead sinner. But Jesus at no time stated that God was dependent on the written word or Scriptures, to quicken the dead sinner. Therefore, God quickens the dead sinner into eternal life independent of the written word or Scripture. Is the written word or Scripture the voice of the Son of God, which the dead hear, and live? No. The proof of his Messiahship, as stated by himself, was that divine power by which he cured leprosy, opened the eyes of the blind, made the deaf to hear, *raised the dead*, and preached the gospel to the poor.

My third argument is founded on John vi. 62, 63: "What and if ye should see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" "It is the Spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

1. Jesus declares that he is from heaven, has power to quicken the dead, or is the quickening Spirit. 1 Cor. xv. 45, 47: "The last Adam was made a quickening spirit." "The second man is the Lord from heaven." 2. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." The Lord contrasts this Spirit power with the flesh, or power of the flesh; the flesh

profiteth nothing. No power, therefore, operates in giving life, or quickening the dead, but the Spirit of God. 3. Those to whom Jesus was then speaking had been quickened by the Spirit, and had passed from death unto life. John v. 24. Therefore his words were to them spirit and life. John viii. 47: "He that is of God heareth God's words, ye, therefore, hear them not because ye are not of God."

My fourth argument is founded on Gal. iv. 4, 7, inclusive: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law," "to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." "And because ye are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." "Wherefore, thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ."

1. The Son of God was made under the law, and bore the curse of the law, to redeem those who were under the law, whom God had chosen in his covenant or will to a sonship and heirship in Christ. And having taken away their sins by the sacrifice of himself and redeemed them to God by his own blood, they are free to receive the new relation to the spiritual government. 2. Because they are sons in the divine economy, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into their hearts by which they are quickened into the new relation, and cry Abba, Father. Rom. viii. 15: "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God." 3. It is the Spirit of his Son, and not the written Scriptures, that quickens the sinner into this new relation to the spiritual government of God. God nowhere attributes this quickening power to the written word or Scriptures. Neither does he at any time state any dependence of his upon his written word or Scriptures. But God gives us, in his written word,

all the doctrine of quickening the dead. Therefore God quickens the sinner into eternal life by his Spirit, independent of the written word or Scripture.

My fifth argument is founded on Rom. viii. 9, 11, inclusive: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." "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."

1. The Spirit of God quickens the sinner into eternal life: therefore it dwells in them. If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, *i. e.*, is not quickened by it into new life, he is none of his; he is dead in sins. But if Christ is in him, he is quickened into eternal life. The body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life.

My sixth argument is founded on 2 Cor. v. 4, 5: "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." "Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing, is God, who also hath given to us the earnest of the Spirit."

1. Those whom God hath quickened from a state of death in sins into new life groan for the resurrection of their mortal bodies, of which the quickening into new life is the first-fruit. Rom. viii. 23: "We who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." He that hath wrought them for that thing is God. It is God's work. But it is the earnest of the resurrection—the first-fruit of the Spirit—and the resurrection of the bodies of the saints is by the Spirit of God, independent of the written word. Therefore the earnest or

first-fruit of the Spirit is independent of the written word.

2. That which is the earnest, or first-fruits, is eternal life. But the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. Rom. vi. 23. And not through the written word. Therefore the gift of eternal life is independent of the written word.

Jesus says: "I give unto them eternal life." John x. 28. But he says nothing about dependence on the written word. If he was dependent on the written word to give eternal life, he should have stated that fact in giving the statement of the gift of eternal life. But he nowhere states any such dependence. Therefore there is no such dependence. But the gift of eternal life is independent of the written word.

My seventh argument is founded on 2 Cor. i. 21, 22: "Now he which establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."

1. To be established in Christ and anointed of God to spiritual obedience is the new life. It is eternal life. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God before hath ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. ii. 10. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 2 Cor. v. 17. The work is *God's work*. "He hath quickened us together with Christ." "He hath given us eternal life in his Son." "He that hath the Son, hath life." "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Eph. ii. 5. John v. 11, 12. Rom. viii. 9.

2. He hath sealed us and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. The new life is the seal of God. It is the mark of circumcision. "He is not a Jew, which is one *outwardly*; neither is that circumcision, which is *outwardly* in the flesh." But he is a Jew which is one *inwardly*; and circumcision is that of the *heart, in the spirit, and not in*

the letter; whose praise is *not of men, but of God*. The point is clear as to the power which worketh. *It is God*. It is also clear as to what the work is. It is eternal life. It is the earnest of the Spirit, and therefore is the first-fruit of eternal life to be given to our bodies in the resurrection. But it is of the *heart, in the Spirit*. I hope Mr. Franklin will bear in mind that God does a work *in man*, as well as *for man*, in heaven. "This is the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, that makes us free from the law of sin and death." "Therefore the law is fulfilled *in us*, for Christ is in us, except we be reprobates." Rom. viii. 2, 4. 2 Cor. xiii. 5. We therefore derive much comfort from the words of Jesus to his disciples: "Greater is he that is *in you* than he that is *in the world*." But in all this sublime teaching on the subject of giving eternal life to those who were dead in sins not one word is said about the *written word*. And why not? Because God was not talking of a work in which he uses the written word. When we come to notice the use made of the written word (as we shall presently) we shall see a great worth in the written word. But it is not named on this point of giving life to the dead. Therefore God does this work independent of the written word.

My eighth argument is derived from Gal. ii. 19, 20: "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but *Christ liveth in me*; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."

1. Christ *in him* was the life-giving, living power by which he was made alive, quickened into new life, and lived by the faith of the Son of God. He declares that he is dead to the law. The law was God's *written word* or Scripture, but could impart no life to the dead, and was no means which God used to give life. Therefore, so far as

the written law is the written word, God does not depend on it nor use it in giving life to the dead sinner.

2. You will notice that Paul discards self, with all his natural free-will power, by putting in the negative, "Yet not I." It is not of man, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father. "Because I live ye shall live also." John xiv. 19. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, than shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. iii. 4. "This is the record that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life *is in his Son*" (not in the written word). "He that hath the Son hath life." John v. 11, 12. To the Lord our God be the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever and ever, amen.

My ninth argument is founded on 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

1. We have the use of the Scripture given here by an inspired man. What does he say of God's dependence on them to quicken the dead sinner? Not one single word. But in a statement of the use and purpose of the Scripture, by an inspired apostle, could the dependence of God upon them to quicken the dead sinner be left out of the statement without neglect, unless it had been so often stated in another part of the statement that it is dropped here to avoid frequent repetition, if such dependence existed? But no such dependence existed, as stated in any place in the statement of the use of the Scriptures by Paul or any other inspired man. Therefore no such dependence exists in fact, or it would have been stated here where the use of the Scriptures is given. The conclusion is clear: God quickens the sinner into new life, or eternal life, independent of the written word or Scripture.

2. It is the man of God that is profited by the Scripture,

in doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness. It makes him wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus.

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:—My worthy brother has asserted and even proved some propositions that are not in debate, and that I never heard any one deny; propositions that I no more deny than he does, but the proposition in debate he has not discussed, much less proved. That man in an unconverted state is sinful, condemned, guilty, lost; or, figuratively, that he is dead in sins, I have never entertained any doubt. That God includes all, in an unregenerated state, "under sin," "in unbelief," "that he might have mercy upon all," I believe as firmly as he does, and I can quote and approve all the Scriptures he has quoted in proof of this as heartily as he does. Man is so dead in sins, so lost, that without the favor of God, without the Savior and the gospel, he can not recover, there is no dispute. On all this he needs no proof. This is not in debate.

That God quickens the sinner into new life I never entertained any doubt, and certainly am not here to dispute. Had my worthy friend simply proposed to prove that God does this work he would have had no debate with me. This is not what he is here to prove nor what I deny; nor need he quote Scripture to prove that he does this by Christ, for I do not deny this, nor that he does it by the Holy Spirit. All this I hold as confidently as he, and all the Scriptures that prove this I receive at their full value. There is no issue between us at all here. I believe that

God quickens the sinner into new life—that he does it by Christ, by the Spirit and by his grace. On this he need expend no more labor. But the precise point for him to prove is that he does it *without the word, the written word, the Scripture*. This I do not believe. This is what is not asserted nor implied in a single proof adduced by him. His proof covers not this main point in debate.

The gospel of Christ is included in "the written word," the "Scripture." When he affirms that it is independent of the "written word" he affirms that it is independent of the gospel. Rom. i. 16, Paul says: "The gospel is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Is the sinner quickened into new life independent of the gospel, or, which is the same, *the power of God?* Yes, and not only *the power of God*, but the power of God to *every one that believes*. The apostle also affirms that the gospel is "the wisdom of God and the power of God," or "the preaching of the cross," which is the same as the preaching of the gospel. Is the sinner quickened into new life independent of *the power of God?* No, sir. This quickening into new life that is independent of the gospel, *the power of God* to salvation, is a new system invented long since the apostolic day, another gospel, a side system, and not the gospel of Christ. But it is not only independent of the power of God, but the wisdom of God. His system of quickening is not only independent of the Scripture which contains the gospel, which is the power of God, but independent of the preaching of the cross of Christ, which is the wisdom of God. His position requires the quickening to be done independent of the wisdom of God and the power of God. From this absurd predicament he will never escape.

But before I proceed further I must comment a few words on the term that my brother has settled down on. What is the sense of "quickened into new life?" He has

quoted Eph. ii. 1, and applied it to the proposition. It is a figurative term, and certainly has its equivalent in literal terms somewhere. To quicken is to *make alive*, literally. It is something in the process of making a Christian, in turning the sinner to God. There is one thing significant in the speech we have just heard. I allude to the circumstance that my friend has not referred us to a single case of conversion where a sinner was quickened, or made alive to God, independent of the word. The reason is obvious: there is no such case to which he can refer. His logic is also a little amusing. He quotes a Scripture where he thinks the clause, "by the written word," could not have been omitted if the quickening is by the word. According to this logic "independent of the written word" could not have been omitted if the quickening is independent of the word; yet this very phrase, "independent of the written word," is not only wanting in each of the proofs he has quoted, but in every Scripture he can produce. Yet his logic requires that he shall produce, in his proof, the terms of his proposition or their equivalent. Quoting a Scripture that simply asserts that God *quickens*, but does not *tell how* he does it, is no proof at all. He needs the words all the time, "independent of the written word," or their equivalent. But when I produce the clear Scripture that asserts that "the gospel is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes," I show him that to quicken without the gospel or independent of it is to quicken without or independent of the *power of God*. This he does not believe.

The figurative expression, "begotten of God," is the same as "made believer." The man who is begotten of God is made a believer. The man who is quickened is made a believer. No one is born of God, or begotten of God, or made alive, or made a new creature, who is not made a believer. This all comes from the *seed* of the king-

dom. What is the seed of the kingdom? Matt. xii., we have the parable of the sower, as set forth by our Lord. In that parable, what is the seed? In the clearest words he explains it: "The seed is the word of God." That is, in this parable, the seed stands for or represents the word of God. There is no growing of any product without the seed, nor before sowing the seed. The sowing of the seed in the parable stands for preaching the word. This is the starting point. Before this there is no quickening into new life. There is life in literal seed, or it would not grow when sown. So is the life in this figurative seed, the word of God, or it would not grow when sown in a good and honest heart. The heart of an honest man is the soil in which it will grow.

But, now, what is "the wayside ground" in this parable? It is a very unfavorable hearer, who gives but a slight hearing, who is indisposed to hear, and in whom there is little or no room for the seed of the kingdom, the word of God. When such a hearer gives a slight hearing to the word and it is likely to gain a small place in his heart, what occurs? The Lord says: "Then straightway cometh the devil." What does he come for? To defeat the work of God. How does he do this? The Lord proceeds: "And catcheth away the word of God out of his heart." Why does he catch away the word of God out of his heart? The Lord explains: "Lest he should believe and be saved." The devil does not catch away the *irresistible power* out of his heart, lest he should believe and be saved, but the *word of God*, the *seed of the kingdom*, in which is the life and from which springs the fruits of the kingdom. The devil understands how the Lord quickens men into new life, and how to defeat that work, and in order to do it he "catches away the word of God out of his heart, lest he should believe and be saved." The word of God, the gospel, is preached to men that they may hear it,

believe it and be saved. This is not "independent of the written word or Scripture."

Let us inquire what is meant by the stony ground. The stony ground represents a hearer not so unfavorable, a man that hears with a degree of pleasure, and who is about to receive the word; but he discovers that he will suffer persecution, and straightway becomes offended because of the word. This ends the matter with him. No irresistible power comes and quickens him into new life after he becomes offended because of the word. Here again the reason of failure is not that the irresistible power did not come, but that he became *offended because of the word*. The failure was on account of what *he did himself*, and not that the Lord *withheld the power*.

What does the thorny ground represent in this parable? It stands for a hearer more favorable than either of the other cases; a man who receives the word joyfully, and who appears in a fair way to do well; but he enlists in worldly enterprises, speculations and the like, and his whole head, and heart, and hands are filled with worldly matters, and to let the Lord express it in his own inimitable style: "The cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke out the word of God out of his heart." This ends the matter and explains the cause of failure in his case. The failure is not that the Lord would not perform his work in sending the irresistible power, but that the man assumed cares of this world, which, with riches, choked out the word out of his heart. The word of God being *choked out of his heart*, is the ground of failure, and not that the Lord *would not send the irresistible power*. The cause of failure was *in the man* and not *on the part of the Lord*.

What does the good ground stand for in this parable? It stands for the man who receives the word of God into a good and honest heart, understands it, and brings forth much fruit. This is the good ground, in the good soil, in

which the seed of the kingdom will grow and bring forth much fruit: a *good* and an *honest heart*. This is the beginning of the work: *sowing the seed* in the good and honest heart. The life that grows and produces fruit is in the seed. The heart is the soil. There is no life in the heart till the seed of the kingdom is sown in it. This seed has life in it, and when sown in a good honest heart will grow and bring forth much fruit.

Instead of the Lord teaching the doctrine of my friend, in reference to a quickening power *independent of the written word*, he gives the word a conspicuous place, all the time representing it by the seed. But the Lord classifies the soil, giving us six kinds of soil: bad, worse and worst; good, better and best. The thorny ground is bad, the stony ground worse, and the wayside worst. The good ground brings, some of it, thirty-fold, some sixty and some a hundred-fold. Thirty-fold is good, sixty-fold is better, and a hundred-fold best. The seed is the same in all cases, *the word of God*, but *the ground* is not the same in all cases. The cause of failure is in the *soil* and not in the *seed*, nor in the *sowing*. Paul has the same classification. 1 Cor. iii. He has gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble. Wood is bad material to be put into a house to be tried by fire. Hay is worse, and stubble worst. Precious stones are good material, silver better, and gold best. This does not represent men in an unregenerated state, all alike, or totally depraved, but, when classified, there are good, better and best; bad, worse and worst. This is not absolute goodness or badness; but goodness or badness of soil in which for the seed of the kingdom, the word of God, to grow and bring forth fruit. But in every class we find the seed of the kingdom; the *same seed*, and the *same sowing*, but not the *same results*, because the ground is *not the same*. The difference is not that the Lord sent the power in one case and withheld it in the other, but he put forth the same

power in both cases, but the material operated on was not the same in both cases.

I will now produce some direct Scriptures, showing how men are begotten of God, or made believers, which is the same, and evidently every one made a believer is quickened into new life.

The Lord says, in his great intercessory, or that which is really the Lord's prayer, John xviii. 20, 21: "I pray not for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word." How were they to be made believers? Independent of the word? Not a bit of it, but *through their word*. No language can be clearer than this.

Again, John xx. 30, 31, we read: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written; that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, you might have life through his name." What did John write for? That you might believe. That you might believe what? "That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Why believe that? "That you may have life through his name." The life is not given that you *might believe*; but you believe that you *might have life*. This is not giving life independent of the word, but giving the word: the *written word*, that you might believe; and that, believing, *you might have life*.

Acts, chapter xv., Peter says: "God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe." This is the Lord's way of making believers, not independent of the word, but by "hearing the word of the gospel and believing." This is God's method of making believers.

Paul says, Rom., chapter x.: "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God." This settles the question as to how faith comes, showing that it is not independent of the word, but by the word. If the apostle had said

faith comes by *feeling*, I would have preached it that way, but he says it comes by *hearing*, and hearing by the word of God.

But as my intention is to get as many and as full considerations as possible in my first reply, that my worthy friend may have the fullest and fairest opportunity to refute my arguments, I hasten to bring other Scriptures. Let us hear the Apostle James: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures." James i. 18. This is precisely the same, as "Of his own will he *made us believers* with the word of truth." We are not begotten or made believers *independent of* the word of truth, but *with the word of truth*. How is a man "born again?" Let Peter answer: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which lives and abides forever." 1 Peter i. 23. If a man is born again, to say the least of it, he is quickened into new life. How is he born again? "Not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which lives and abides forever." The word of God is what, in the proposition, is called "the written word," and by this we are born again, and not independent of it. Here we have the *seed* which has the *new life in it*, and the life that "abides forever." This seed is the word of God, as the Lord explains, in the parable of the sower. From this seed germinates the new life, and the sowing of this seed is the starting point. The life is not in the *soil*, but in the *seed*, and there is no germinating into new life, or any life, till the sowing of the seed. This is preaching of the gospel. After the preaching and the hearing, the good seed planted in the heart germinates, springs forth into the new life. This is not *independent* of the word, but comes from the word.

When we are "born again" we are sons of God, and, as Paul has it, "Because you are sons God has sent forth the

Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Gal. iv. 6. The Spirit is not sent forth into the hearts of sinners to *make them sons*, but *because they are sons* it is sent forth into their hearts, crying, Father, Father. This agrees with the language of Paul, Eph. i. 13: "In whom you also trusted, after that you heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that you believed, you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." They were not sealed with the Holy Spirit to enable them to believe or to give them faith, but *after they believed* they were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise. The Lord said to the apostles, "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive." The Spirit does not enter the hearts of the people of the world to give them faith, for the *world can not receive the Spirit*. See John xiv. 17. This is an end to all idea of the Spirit entering the hearts of the people of the world at all for any purpose. But *because men are sons* he enters them and enables them to cry, "Father, Father," as it is when translated in English, and after they believe they are sealed with the Holy Spirit.

Let us hear Paul tell how the Corinthians were begotten. "Though you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have you not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the gospel." 1 Cor. iv. 15. The same thing is not always ascribed to the same cause. Paul here ascribes the begetting to himself. James ascribes it to God. "Of his own will *begat he us* by the word of truth." This is the same thing. Why is it ascribed to the preacher in one case and to God in the other? It is *of God*, and in that sense it is ascribed to him. It emanates from him, and is by his authority. In the other case the instrumentality of the preacher is had in view, and in that view of it they are begotten *by him*. But "the word of truth"

is mentioned in one case and "the gospel" in the other. It is not "independent of the written word," or "the word of truth," or "the gospel," which is included in "the written word," but "*with* the word of truth," as James has it, or "*through* the gospel," as Paul has it. It is of God, through Christ, by the Spirit, by the apostle and by the word, and not independent of either. God puts forth his power to save us through Christ, the Spirit that dwelt in the apostles and inspired them, through the apostles and through the word and saves the sinner. It is, therefore, of God, of Christ, of the Spirit, of the apostles and of the word. The Lord said to the apostles, "It shall not be you that speak, but the Holy Spirit shall speak in you." In *this way* God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the apostles and the word were all co-operating in quickening the sinner into new life and saving him. In this view of it the gospel is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes. God puts forth his power through Christ, the Holy Spirit, the apostles and the word, which they preached, and when it thus reached the sinner it was the *power of God* as much as if he had put it forth in any other way, or as much as if he had put it forth *immediately* from heaven, and certainly no less efficacious to save.

But what of this *immediate* converting power? Where does it leave the Mediator in quickening the sinner? An *immediate* power is not a power put forth through a *Mediator*, or a *medium* of any sort; a power put forth *directly* from God to the heart of the sinner. This leaves the Mediator out in quickening the sinner; leaves out the atonement, the sin-offering, the apostles, the gospel, the Church, and all human agency and instrumentality, and declares it all null and void. If the converting power is *immediate* it is not through the *Mediator*, for that would not be *immediate*. There is no such converting power as that. No man cometh to the Father but *by me*, says the Lord.

There is no way to God now except by the Mediator, and there is no coming by him only as they did in the time of the apostles, by hearing the gospel and believing it to the saving of the soul. Hence where the apostles or others went and preached the word people heard it, believed it, obeyed it and were saved. Where they did not go and preach, or some one else, not a convert was made.

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Brother Moderators: Respected Audience:—Having shown in my last proof the use and design of the Scriptures, namely, "doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17; and that no such use or power as the quickening of the sinner dead in sin is, here or elsewhere, attributed to them; and therefore the quickening is of God, without dependence on them, I now proceed to my next proof, which is founded on 1 Cor. i. 23, 24: "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." The preaching of the apostles had no power to quicken either Jew or Gentile while they were dead in sin; it was a stumbling-block or foolishness to all such. But to the called of God, the gospel is the power of God. But the calling is here referred to as distinct from the preaching, and attributed to God, independent of the preaching of the apostles. Therefore Paul disclaims any power in the preaching of the gospel to quicken the sinner.

I will now notice the speech of my worthy friend to which

you have been listening. If my proofs were lurking death, to which my friend dare not approach without peril of his life, instead of the plain statements of God's word, he could not show greater seeming fear of them. Why should he cry out, Oh, I believe all that has been proven, but I don't want to come in contact with your texts? No, sir, you dare not come to them, and you know it. I do not expect you to come to them; but I feel thankful that the audience will know the reason, in spite of all your cries, "Oh, I believe that as much as the gentleman does!" You will never hide your failure by such subterfuge. But I propose to follow the gentleman, though he does show so little desire for my company. I only ask you to remember that he dare not travel over my line of argument.

First, then, let us take his admissions, and, although he denies them in the first argument which follows them, let us hold them as his belief. First. God quickens the sinner dead in sins. Second. God does this work by Christ. Third. God quickens sinners by the Holy Ghost. All this, says the gentleman, I hold as confidently as he, and all the Scriptures that prove this I receive at their full value. All right, my dear sir. I am glad to see you so liberal. But the next assertion which he makes he fails to prove, namely, "The gospel of Christ is included in the *written word*, the *Scriptures*." Let the gentleman please prove this in his next speech. The term *gospel* sometimes applies to Christ, the second man, or quickening Spirit, and, when thus applied, is God's medium of quickening the dead, as already proven in my first address. The gentleman's next argument is that the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to the *believer*. Rom. i. 16. And the preaching of Christ is to the *called* the wisdom of God and the power of God. 1 Cor. i. 23, 24. And therefore the God of salvation depends on the written Scriptures to quicken the dead. Now, if any person can see any relation between his prem-

ise and conclusion, their perception is more acute than mine. The proposition embraces the *quickening* of the sinner into *eternal life* by the *Spirit of God*, and not the power of the gospel to *believers*, who are *called of God*. My dear sir, do not get beside yourself again, and say, "*he will never escape*," till you have something that at least looks like an argument.

But Mr. Franklin gravely informs us that the term quicken. used in Ephesians ii. 1-5, is used in a figurative sense. Therefore, his position being true, Christ was only raised up from the dead in a figurative sense; and we are only saved by the grace of God in a figurative sense. What absurdities does he aver, in order to avoid the force of the simple truth! Paul was not instructing the Ephesians about figures, but of the power of God, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and by which he hath quickened us from death in sin into eternal life. But Mr. Franklin says I quote a passage that says God quickens the sinner, but that it does not tell how he does it. The gentleman forgets that he has just admitted the *how* to have been proven that it was by Christ the quickening was done. But, says he, it is by the *written word*. Will he please prove it? No, he never will. It is not in the doctrine of the quickening of the sinner into eternal life, as given in God's word. If it is not given in the statement of the doctrine, as it is taught in God's word, does it belong to that doctrine? If it does, will you please tell me what there is in all the universe that does not belong to it?

Does God's word prove a doctrine on any subject when the doctrine is fully given, or must his word go on and state all the particulars that do not belong to it? Mr. Franklin is not so ignorant as to believe such an absurdity. The statement of a doctrine by the entire word of God, devoted to that object, excludes from the doctrine every proposition not given in the statement by the word of God. Hence,

Mr. Franklin, knowing that the *written word* is nowhere used in God's word as that upon which God depends in quickening the sinner, is pleased to resort to a mere dodge to hide his failure. But his own effort to get some term that may be construed to mean quicken reveals the fact wherein his trouble lies. And, in order to do this, he turns to Matt. xiii.; and without telling us what part of the chapter he is quoting from, he garbles the Scripture, taking part of one parable and part of another, and mixing them together to suit his fancy. In thus doing, he makes the children of the kingdom, which the Son of God sows, identical with the word sown by the *written word* or *Scripture*, or the *written word* as preached by men. This is clearly contrary to the design of Christ in these parables.

But the starting point of the gentleman is that the life is in the seed sown. But there is another fact just here. It is this: the seed sown imparts no life to anything. Neither is the life-giving power dependent on the seed, either to give life, or prepare the ground. Who prepares the ground? or, rather, who prepares the heart to receive the written word? Prov. xvi. 1: "The preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord." John viii. 47: "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." But to show the conclusion of the whole subject of the life-giving power, I quote again, 1 John v. 11, 12: "And this is the record, that God hath given to 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 word sown does not prepare the ground, but is fruitful in good, prepared ground. See Acts xvi. 14. Luke informs us of Lydia "whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." Now let us hear the Savior's explanation of the good ground. Luke viii. 15: "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." Is a *heart good and honest* in the sight of God, till it is purged by the Redeemer's blood, and quickened by the Holy Spirit? If so, can the blood of the Redeemer benefit it, or the Holy Spirit give it a purer life? Can that which is honest and good in the sight of God be improved upon in his sight?

But Mr. Franklin gives us another doctrine taught by this parable. It is this: That the "*Devil defeats the work of God.*" But, Mr. Franklin, God is in the heavens, and hath done whatsoever he pleased; and works all things according to the counsel of his *own will*; and therefore it pleased him, and was his *own will*, that the devil should defeat his work. And our Lord, in order to show up God's defeat and the devil's triumph, uses this parable! The doctrine, therefore, is that eternal life is at the mercy of the devil! But there is no such doctrine in God's word. Jesus, the great Teacher, instructs us, John x. 28: "I give unto them eternal life, and they *shall never perish*, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." We are told that the fault is in the ground, and that there are six classes of soil, namely: bad, worse, worst; good, better, best. Let us see. The wayside yields no fruit; the stony ground ditto; and the thorny ground ditto. You may take choice, sir. I count them all valueless. And so where wood, hay and stubble are exposed to fire, they all prove to be worthless. But what of the good ground? 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6: "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same *Spirit*. And there are differences of administrations, but the same *Lord*. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same *God, which worketh all in all.*" I agree, therefore, that the fruit depends on the character of the ground, or heart, and not on the seed sown, it being the same in each case. The seed does not, therefore, prepare the heart, or quicken it from death, but produces fruit only where the heart is good.

"Every good gift is from the Lord." "The preparations of the heart is from the Lord." "The different gifts are of the same Spirit," and it is the same God that worketh all in all. My proposition is clearly proven, my friend being the witness.

He says he will now produce some direct Scriptures, showing how we are begotten of God, or made believers. It is surely time for him to produce something to the point, if he has anything to produce. But you see he has nothing; for, instead of coming to the point, to-wit: the quickening of the sinner by the Spirit of God, he brings before us the believer again. I am not here, sir, to deny that the believer may be begotten by the word of truth. My argument and proof go to show that he is the one to whom it comes in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance. The Lord prayed for all that should believe on him *through their word*. But the Lord did not pray that God would quicken sinners into *eternal life through their word*. But his prayer is: "As thou hast given *him power* over all flesh, that he should give *eternal life* to as many as thou hast given him." John xvii. 2.

Let us now look at John xx. 30, 31: "But these are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." Who were those to whom John was writing? Did Mr. Franklin take time to tell us? No. Let us, then, inquire of John. 1 John v. 12, 13: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written to 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." There is not one word in all this to favor the doctrine of the quickening of the dead sinner by the written word, but quite the contrary. The life-giving power is in the *Son of God*, and not in the *written word*.

Mr. Franklin is anxious to get his proof before me, but goes on quoting how believing comes by hearing the word of God, just as if he thought he could make some one believe that I did not hold that doctrine as firm as he. If you wish to prove the point at issue between us, give us the text that says man gives himself eternal life by believing the written word; or that the *written word gives the sinner dead in sins eternal life*. Will you give us that proof? No, sir, you never will.

But we are called to consider the language of the Apostle Peter, i. 23: "Being *born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of *incorruptible*, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." Yesterday Mr. Franklin had being *born again*, the active turning of an alien sinner; to-day he has it the quickening power of the written word giving eternal life to the dead sinner; and to-morrow he will have it baptism that borns the man. Yes, the sinner must pass from death to life; and, as I told you in my first speech, Mr. Franklin's theory requires that the work of producing a holy, eternal, incorruptible life in man *must be of man*. He tells us God has originated the plan, and put it in his written word, and then, I suppose, retired from the scene. The devil steps in, and defeats the work of God, and, if it were not for man's work, God's having been defeated, the whole scheme would be a failure.

What is the living, abiding, incorruptible Word of God? John i. 1, 4: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." 1 John v. 20: "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." The record of God is that eternal life is in his Son, the Word that was made flesh, and dwelt among men. "Of his fullness have all we

received, and grace for grace." John i. 16. "I give unto them eternal life." "That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." John xvii. 23.

These quotations, together with the list given in my first speech, and which remain unnoticed by the gentleman, prove the source of eternal life to be in God with us, and that birth by which we are put forth into new being is *of God*, and not the Scriptures. Is Mr. Franklin's God the written Scriptures? Is the eternal Word the written Scriptures? Is the Holy Spirit the written Scriptures? If your answer be affirmative, I know not how your God is in the heavens; and your Word is taken away by the devil, according to your argument on the parable, Matt. xiii. And your Holy Spirit fails on every heart that is not either good, better or best before it falls there. But the true God and eternal life, of whom the Scriptures testify, is not a written word, nor contained in the written word, and consists of motives and arguments, but a living, quickening Spirit. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

But Mr. Franklin has just learned that the Spirit of God does not enter people's hearts to quicken them into eternal life. His proof is: "Even the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive." Now, if the world can not receive it, then it *can not* quicken the sinner into new life, or eternal life. Respected audience, do you not see the point? It is one of the gentleman's clear, deep, logical conclusions! What a pity he did not see it sooner, so as not to have said a few moments before, "Nor that he (God) does it (quicken the sinner into new life) *by the Holy Spirit* All this I hold as confidently as he" Again, "I believe God quickens the sinner into new life *by the Spirit*," etc. I feel sorry for him that his logic came to him so late in his speech. And I am sorry it departed so abruptly. Had it remained, we

must have had wonders soon! but in almost his next sentence he says: "It is, therefore, of God, of Christ, of the Spirit," etc. If that is not a sample of logical tumbling, turning and twisting, I fail to know what it would take to make it up.

But what does our Lord say? John xiv. 17. "Even the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Now turn to the 20th verse: "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you;" 19th verse, "Because I live, ye shall live also." "When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. iii. 4. Who is it the world can not receive? The Spirit of truth. Whom did the world reject? Jesus. It is he who dwells in them. Rom. viii. 9: "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Can a man be a son in spirit before he has the Spirit of God in him? Can a man be Christ's in spirit, and the Spirit of Christ not in him? What spirit were the Galatians of before God sent the Spirit of his Son into their hearts, crying, Father, Father? What spirit were the Ephesians of before God quickened them with Christ? Those who read their Bible can readily answer these questions. Will my worthy friend do it? We shall see.

But my friend has got around to the often-told theme of the Corinthians being begotten by Paul through the gospel. And James says: "God hath of his own will begotten us with the word of truth." But what does James or Paul say about the written word quickening the dead sinner into new life, or eternal life? And note how Christians are begotten with the word of truth, or through the gospel. Paul did not claim to be their father in the sense of giving them spiritual being; but in the gathering of them into the visible Church he was a father to them. Through the gospel

he begat them to many precious privileges; but He who quickened them into eternal life was far above Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas—even the Lord from heaven, a quickening Spirit. But if this quickening is immediate, says he, the Mediator is left out in quickening the sinner. But Jesus says he has power to quicken whom he will; therefore he is not left out. But will Mr. Franklin please tell us in his co-operating powers which he presents as quickening the sinner jointly, five in number, how much his Mediator does in quickening the sinner? His new idea excuses the Spirit of truth from the work, and I shall not be surprised if all but the written word is dropped off the list before we get through. I had nigh forgotten his closing remark; he has reached that point now. Hear him: "Where they did not go and preach, or some one else, not a convert was made." None quickened; and therefore all the race is eternally damned where the written word has not gone!

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—My worthy friend labors hard on the affirmative. He has fine ability, but no proof, and it requires more than the strength of Samson to bring something out of nothing. He talks of my fearing his arguments, and of the clear statements of God's word, produced by him. He did quote some very clear statements from Scripture, but not one that I might not as well claim as he. The clear statements of Scripture quoted by him are not the statements of his proposition, nor of the same import. I can receive every Scripture he has quoted at its face, and take pleasure in doing so; but not one of them, nor all of them together, contains the terms of his proposition, or their equivalent. I have heard of a

rule of logic that requires that the proof contain the terms of the proposition, or their equivalent. Which one of his proofs contains the terms of his proposition? "The quickening of the sinner by the Spirit of God into new or eternal life is independent of the written word, or Scriptures," he affirms. Which one of his proofs, in whole or in part, says this? Many of them lack the term "quickening," and nearly all of them lack the term "sinner." Some of them lack the term "new," or "eternal life." Some lack the term "Spirit," and all of them lack the clause, "independent of the written word, or Scripture." Where, then, is his proof? It is not in a Scripture quoted. It is not to be assumed that a Scripture proves his proposition simply because he quotes it; it must contain, in substance, what he affirms in his proposition. He is bound not only to quote Scripture, but to show how it applies to his proposition and proves it.

One thing is specially significant on the part of my friend, and that is that he finds his proofs in portions of Scripture that do not speak of conversion at all. This audience, no doubt, expected him to go to the commission the Lord gave his apostles, and follow the apostles in the execution of their work under that commission, till he found where sinners were quickened into new life, or eternal life, and show where it was done, or said to be done, independent of the written word, or Scripture, or without the written word. Did he do this? By no means. Did he go to the Scripture that gives us an account of the descent of the Holy Spirit, and his quickening three thousand into new or eternal life, independent of the written word, on Pentecost? Not a word of it. On the contrary, the history says, "When they *heard this*"—the word just spoken—"they were pierced in their heart." How were they pierced in their heart, by the words which they heard, or without them? Luke ascribes it to the word; the word he had just written, as follows: "When they *heard this*, they were pierced in their

hearts, and said to Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" They were quickened into new life by the Spirit of God, not independent of the word, nor without the word, but when they *heard this*; this word now *written*.

Why did he not follow the apostles to their preaching in Solomon's porch, and show that the five thousand there turned to the Lord were quickened independent of, or without the word? See Acts iii. 19-21. He had the best reason in the world for not following them there. His doctrine is not there. Instead of that, we find an account of what was preached, and the people being commanded to "repent and turn, that their sins might be blotted out." Why did he not follow Philip down to Samaria, and show where the Samaritans were quickened into new life, independent of the written word? Because there is no account of any such doctrine there. The work was not done in that way. Acts viii. 5, we are informed that Philip "preached Christ to them." The next verse, we read that "the people with one accord gave heed to the things spoken by Philip, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did." In the same chapter, verse 35, we are informed that Philip preached Jesus to the Ethiopian officer, but no account of this quickening into new life independent of the word. The word was present. He "preached Jesus to him." In Acts ix., Acts xxii., and Acts xxvi. we find accounts of the conversion of Saul, and find explicit reference to the words uttered to him: "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest;" but no account of his being "quickened into new life independent of the word." That doctrine is spurious; we find it in no case as we follow the work of the Lord in the time of the apostles. Acts x. 34-48, we have an account of the Gentiles turning to God; of the preaching of Peter, of their hearing the word, and the Spirit falling on them who *heard the word*; but not a syllable about any one quickened into new, or

eternal life, independent of, or without the word. In the same way the jailer and Lydia heard the word of the Lord, as we learn, Acts xvi., but no account of their being quickened into new life independent of the word. It is not found in the holy record, in the account of the conversion of any one, but is an outside doctrine, wholly without authority. Instead of his doctrine of "quickening into new life by the Spirit of God, independent of the written word," his doctrine is not from the Spirit of God at all, nor his quickening into new life. Surely, if he had any authority for his doctrine, we could find some trace of it in some case of conversion in the New Testament, but it is not found in any case.

He finds the words, "You has he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and in sins," Eph. ii. 1; but this I receive at its full value, as fully as my opponent. God quickens the sinner, and does it by his Spirit. This is not in dispute, but the proof he needs, and has not produced, is that he does it *independent of the word*. This is not in the passage. Instead of this, in Acts xix. 1-6, we have an account of Paul coming to Ephesus, and finding certain disciples, and inquiring of them, "Have you received the Holy Spirit since you believed?" They replied, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit." These belonged to that old Baptist Church which my friend thinks John established, where he gets his name, "Baptist," and where they had not heard there was any Holy Spirit; and when they heard Paul, "they were immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus." "When Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied." They were quickened into new life, not by the Spirit independent of the word, but by the Spirit, who spoke the word to them through Paul, and quickened them *by the word*.

My friend can not see the relevancy of my argument from Rom i. 16: "The gospel is the power of God to salvation

to every one that believes." He says: "The proposition embraces the quickening of the sinner into eternal life by the Spirit of God, and not the power of the gospel to believers," and shouts, "Do not get beside yourself again." If he will be a little more calm and look at the language quoted, he will find that it does not say, "the power of the gospel," as he has it, but "the power of God," and not only the power of God, but *the power of God to salvation*. This is the power we are talking about; the power that quickens into new life; that *saves* the sinner; every one that believes; *the power of God*. We are not talking of *the power of the gospel*; but what Paul says the gospel is—the *power of God to salvation*. There is no escaping from this language. It is the power of God that quickens into new life; that is to salvation, and the *gospel is the power of God to salvation*. The preaching of the cross is the wisdom of God and the power of God. Are persons quickened into new life independent of the gospel, the power of God; and the preaching of the cross, the wisdom of God and the power of God? This is a new kind of quickening into new life, that is independent of the wisdom of God and the power of God!

The worthy gentleman says the preaching of the cross is the wisdom of God and the power of God to those who *are called*. But how are they called? To the Thessalonians Paul says, "He called you by our gospel." They were not only *called by the gospel*, the *power of God to salvation*, but quickened into new life by this same power of God. It is not simply "power of God," or "a power of God," but "the power of God to every one that believes, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Has he any method of quickening sinners into new life, or eternal life, except *by the power of God*? If he has, let him point it out. We know of no means of quickening the sinner into new life except the power of God, and the gospel is, the power of God to salvation to every one that believes; and the preaching of the

cross is the wisdom of God and the power of God ; and the man quickened into new life by any other means than the gospel, the power of God to salvation, "the preaching of the cross, the wisdom of God and the power of God," is quickened into new life independent of the wisdom of God and the power of God. I put it to my worthy friend to say, whether he believes the apostle. Does he believe the words, "The gospel is the power of God to salvation," "the preaching of the cross is the wisdom of God and the power of God?" If he does, will he tell this assembly that the sinner can be quickened into new life independent of the gospel, the power of God? The question is not whether God *is dependent* on his word, or whether *he can* quicken a sinner into new life without his word, but simply whether *he does* quicken the sinner into new life independent of the gospel, the power of God to salvation? Will he tell us?

It is God that quickens the sinner; he does it by Christ and by the Holy Spirit, but not without the word that was preached by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, or the gospel, the power of God to salvation. It is all of God, and of his grace which brought the Lord from heaven and the whole system to the world through him; and by the Mediator and the Spirit whom he sent to guide the apostles into all truth; by the apostles, to whom he spoke, and the word, or the gospel, the power of God. From this there is no escape, and this ruins his proposition.

We need no subtleties about "the written word," or "the Scriptures." This embraces the entire revelation from God to man, and *independent of it is without it*. He would be doing much more for his cause to find his quickening power that is independent of what is contained in that revelation, than kicking up a dust about the "written word." He talks about my *proving* certain doctrines. It turns out just now not to be my province to *prove*, but to examine *his proof*. Finding that he has none I have very

little to do, but will try and edify the audience as I pass along, showing the barrenness of his argument.

I see that my worthy friend is so excited that he can not take notes so that he can understand them. I did not mix two parables together in my reference to the parable of the sower, found in Matt. xiii.; it is in *his mind* they are mixed, and not in my speech. I referred to the parable of the sower and not to the tares and the wheat. He has got his mind muddled in thinking of the two-seed doctrine, held by some of his brethren—that the human race has two origins—one of the Lord and the other of the devil; one part the children of God and the other part the children of the devil; the one part always in grace, the other never in grace; the one part can not be saved and the other can not be lost. But I was not discussing that subject. The parable of the sower, the seed of the kingdom, the different kinds of soil, were the matters to which I was trying to call his attention, and which, judging from his speech, I did not get him to understand.

It is useless to start subtleties about preparing the ground or the life-giving principle. The life is from God, in Christ, and he imparts it. The seed of the kingdom, the word of God, is from him and sown in the heart. This appears in the wayside ground, the stony ground, the thorny ground and the good ground. The same seed of the kingdom, the word of God, was sown in all these different kinds of ground. The same life was in it all the time, and the reason it did not grow in the wayside, the stony and thorny ground, was not that the seed had no life in it, nor that it was not sown right, nor that the Holy Spirit did not do his work. The fault was in the ground. It was not good ground. The same seed, sown in the good ground, brought some thirty, some sixty and some an hundred fold. My friend appears determined to excuse the sinner in his sins, and find the reason of his remaining in his sins, in the

omission of the Holy Spirit to prepare the ground, to open the heart. Will men be condemned because the Holy Spirit did not do his work? Not a word of it. This fustian about *preparing* the ground is not in the parable at all, but in his lively imagination. In this parable "the seed is the word of God." The life is in the seed. The first thing is the sowing of the seed in the heart. In the good ground, when the seed began to grow or take effect in the heart, the new life began to appear in bringing forth much fruit. It is true, as quoted by my friend, that God gave to his Son life, and this life was in the Son, but that does not show *how* that life was imparted to men. The Lord says, John xvii. 14, "I have given them thy word," and, John xvii. 8, "I have given them the words that thou gavest me." This word which the living Father gave him was *spirit* and *life*. "The words that I speak to you they are *spirit* and they are *life*." This word is the seed of the kingdom of God, to be sown in the heart of the sinner. This is the first thing done in turning the sinner to God. It was the first thing on Pentecost in turning the men to the Lord who had taken him by wicked hands, crucified and slain him. When they heard this word, which was *spirit* and *life*; this gospel, which was the *power* of God to salvation; this preaching of the cross, the *wisdom* of God and the *power* of God, they were *pierced in the heart*. This was the first impression made on their heart, not by an *immediate* influence of the Spirit, but by the words uttered by the Spirit, which were *spirit* and *life*, the *wisdom* of God and the *power* of God.

Not a word about preparing their hearts by any process before the gospel was preached. There is not an intimation about their hearts being in any way impressed till they heard the word, nor does the expression that the "Lord opened the heart of Lydia" give the least countenance to the foreign doctrine of my friend of quickening the sinner

into new life independent of the word of God. Nor is there a more baseless figment in the long catalogue of errors advocated in our times, nor a more mischievous one. Many poor souls, as honest and sincere as the world contains, who have "received the word into good and honest hearts" and believe it, are prevented from enjoying it by the theory that they must wait for some other power to move their hearts. They wait for some other power than "the gospel, the power of God;" the preaching of the cross, "the wisdom of God and the power of God;" the preaching of the word of God, which is *spirit* and *life*, and many of these are thus driven into utter unbelief and ruined.

My worthy friend criticises the Savior. He says: "Is a *heart good and honest* in the sight of God till it is purified by the Redeemer's blood?" This is no criticism of my language, but of the Lord's. He says: "The good ground are they who, in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience." See Luke viii. 15. This is the Lord's own explanation of what he meant by the "good ground," in the parable of the sower, and I hardly think he will confound the Savior in his explanation of the good ground. He knew whether a man could have in him a "*good and honest heart*," into which to receive the word of God. But, not content with this criticism of the Lord's own explanation, he holds up his hands in holy horror at the idea of "the devil defeating the work of God," and informs us that "God is in the heavens." We ought certainly to acknowledge our obligations for this information. But does this prove that sowing the seed in the heart, the word of God, is not the work of God, and that the devil coming and catching away the word of God out of his heart, lest he should believe and be saved, is not defeating the work of God? It is not my language, but the language of Jesus. Hear him: "Then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart."

Matt. xiii. 19. "Satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts." Mark iv. 15. "Then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved." This is the language he criticises, undertakes to render ridiculous and set aside. But this language of the Lord refutes his proposition, and ruins his entire theory of giving the new life independent of the word.

My friend goes to 1 John v. 12, 13, to learn to whom he wrote in giving his history of our Lord, and finds that he wrote his letter to them that *believe*. This was not new to us, but the passage to which I called his attention was not in John's letter, but in his report concerning Christ, John xx. 30, 31: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you might have life through his name." Was that written to *believers*? I put it to the intelligence of Mr. Thompson, in the presence of this audience, to say was it written to *believers*, that they *might believe* that Jesus is the Christ? They were singular believers, that did not believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that needed the signs recorded by John that they *might believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God! This is proving that the sinner is quickened into new life by the Spirit, independent of the word, with a vengeance. Men are not "quickened into new life" that they *might believe*, but that they believe that they *might have life*. The apostle adds: "And that believing you might have life through his name." I defy human ingenuity to escape from this Scripture. These things were written that they *might believe*, and the believing was that they *might have life*. His ridiculous theory of giving an unbeliever life that he might believe is not in the book of God.

I do not want any text to prove "that man gives himself life," but that man believes God; believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, he *might have life*. This I have in the clear language of Scripture.

My friend is borrowing trouble. He is telling what will be to-morrow—that it will be baptism that "borns the man," if the audience will pardon me for repeating such a phrase. "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." I hope to keep him busy to-morrow; but he would do well to attend to the things of to-day. He has forgotten that he is in the affirmative, and has worked himself around into a negative position, and is calling for proof. He would be meeting the expectations of his friends much better if he would furnish a little proof; but, of course, he can not furnish what does not exist.

It was terrible to see my friend flounder over the clear language of our Lord in reference to the Spirit, "whom the world can not receive." He ranted and fulminated, but did not show how the Spirit enters the unbeliever and quickens him into new life, when the world can not receive him. In his extremity he not only assails my language, but the clear language of Scripture. "Because you are sons he has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Father, Father." He can not see how they could be sons before the Spirit of his Son was sent forth into their hearts. What if he can not see *how* it can be? He can certainly believe the clear language of Scripture. The Scripture is true whether he can see how it is or not. The Spirit of his Son is sent forth into their heart *because* they are sons, and not to *make them sons*.

My worthy brother wants to know what James or Paul says about quickening the sinner into new life, in the words, "I have begotten you by the gospel," and "begotten us with the word of truth." What has any proof text produced by him in it about "quickening the sinner into new

or eternal life, by the Spirit of God, independent of the written word?" This is what ought to concern him, and what will concern him till the close, for this fundamental part of his proof is lacking. But James says we are begotten *with the word* of truth, and not without it, and Paul says, "I have begotten you *by the gospel*," and not without it. This is the first thing in the divine process. There is no quickening before begetting. The begetting is by the word of truth, by the gospel, in the clear language of Scripture. This is only figurative language for *making believers*. The sum of it is that he has made us believers "with the word of truth," as James has it, or made us believers "by the gospel," as Paul has it. I defy my friend to find any quickening into new life before begetting; or any quickening into new life before believing. As I have shown, the believing is that "you might have life through his name."

My friend quotes of our Lord that "he has power to quicken whom he will," in reply to what I said about the Mediator being left out. I know the Mediator is not left out; but the theory of the sinner being quickened into new life by an *immediate* power of the Spirit leaves out the Mediator. An *immediate* influence of the Spirit is not by a *medium*, but without a Mediator. It is not *immediate*, but through Christ, the apostles and the word.

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S THIRD ADDRESS.

Bro. Moderators: Respected Audience:—The doctrine of the quickening of the sinner by the Spirit of God into eternal life is found to be conspicuously set forth in the Scriptures by the numerous passages already quoted in my preceding speeches. You have noted that the language of

these Scriptures correspond with the terms used in the proposition. The proofs, every one of them, taken as to the terms employed in the quotations, or as to the subject treated upon in the connection, apply directly to the doctrine of the quickening of sinners by the Spirit of God. So clear and pointed are these quotations that Mr. Franklin has almost passed them all by without notice. He has not attempted to explain but a very few of them, and, as if disgusted with his failure, he leaves them unanswered, and runs away to the parables, and tries to hide his discomfiture by kindly requesting me to drop the subject of quickening, and go to the historical part of the Scripture, and investigate the subject of conversion, or turning, or the begetting of Christians through the word, or some other point equally foreign to the proposition before us. But why should we go to the parables, or the commission, or the history of the Acts of the Apostles to prove a doctrine fully taught in the Epistles written to the churches by inspired men, and also fully taught by our Lord himself in his discourses upon the gift of eternal life in the quickening of sinners? What profit can there be in the discussion of points not before us in the proposition just read? Why this effort on the part of Mr. Franklin to get up points not in the proposition? The reason he labors so zealously for that end is obvious to all present. *It is because there is not one text in the entire Bible that attributes the quickening of sinners, directly or remotely, to the written word.* He knows this full well; and realizing the position he occupies before you without one text in the Bible to sustain his negative, and with no explanation that he can give of the numerous proofs that I have quoted from the Bible, proving my proposition, he knows of no better course out of his trouble than to get up the subject of conversion, or a parable, or the Parkerite Baptist, or anything but this vexed subject to him, of the quickening of sinners by the Spirit of God,

which has spoiled all his fine prospects in this debate, and left him without a text to prop up his man-made theory. Not one text has he quoted from his list on the negative having the term quicken in it, or in the connection where it stands.

As to the Spirit of God quickening sinners into eternal life, in one part of his speech he says he does; and in another part he says he does not. He says he can receive my texts at their full face, but he does not dare to give us an explanation of what they mean. Does he take the Scripture at its full face when he treats them to no notice at all? Two of his speeches are now before us, and not a reference made to many of the texts presented in my first speech. He speaks of having little to do. He has nothing to do, it seems, when my proofs come forward for his notice. If there was little for him to do, it would certainly be great help to him in this debate, for I think he has as great a gift to do but little in answering, proof and argument, as any man living. But he must do a little: so he states what he had not the least ground for stating, as to my views of a church organized by John the Baptist, and makes an ungenerous fling at John that he did not have any Holy Ghost in his preaching. Does he think any one ever heard John preach, and had not heard there was a Holy Ghost? John preached the kingdom of heaven is at hand in the spiritual power of Jesus Christ, the King of saints, who had come to give eternal life to as many as the Father had given him. And he testified to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, not many days from the time of his preaching. There had certainly been some Campbellite about Ephesus who knew of no Holy Ghost *but the written word*, and who believed that many honest ignorant people were lost eternally because they believed in the Holy Spirit working effectually in quickening the dead. The same people oppose and deny the power of the Holy Ghost still.

But why this talk about the Ephesians? Because Paul says God had quickened them from a state of death in sins; and that he had quickened them together with Christ by whose grace they were saved. Paul, in introducing this subject of quickening, informs them that they believe according to the working of his (God's) mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. Eph. i. 19, 20. In a word, Paul proves the proposition before us in the clearest manner, and as Mr. Franklin wishes to get us away from what Paul says on the subject of quickening the dead sinner, he goes to where not a word is said on the subject of quickening, Acts xix. 1-6, and after some misstatements as to my views, and a fling at John the Baptist, he makes a bit of Scripture just to try his hand. He need not have emphasized the words, "*and quickened them by his word.*" We all know that to be his own manufacture without his emphasizing it. The deception is too thin to deceive any one! Neither Luke nor Paul ever used any such words, and we all know the voice of Mr. Franklin as the speaker of the profound sentence, "*and quickened them by the word.*" I hope he will now be able to take a deep inspiration while he ponders over these words of his own that he emphasizes to give them great weight. But he now gives us another sample of his logic on Rom. i. 16. The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation, to the believer, and therefore it is the quickening power of God to the sinner dead in sins. If Paul says it is the power of God unto salvation *in a specified case*, he means that it is the power of God in all cases, and especially in giving eternal life to the dead sinner. Let us take another quotation, which he takes up but does not tell us where it is, lest we reprove his folly. 1 Cor. i. 18: "But unto us which are *saved*, it is the power of God." The preaching of the cross of Christ unto us which are saved is the power of God; therefore it is the power of God in all cases; and

especially in quickening dead sinners into eternal life. There is no escape from this he says. Well, let us see. The preaching of the cross of Christ is to them that perish, *foolishness*; therefore it is foolishness in all cases, and especially in quickening sinners. Again, "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greek foolishness." 1 Cor. i. 23. Therefore, according to my friend's logic, the preaching of Christ crucified is a stumbling-block and foolishness in all cases. But the cases here are specified, and the terms applied to those specified cases will apply to no other: therefore the preaching of Christ crucified, or the preaching of the cross, is a stumbling-block, or foolishness to them that *perish only*. And it is the power of God and the wisdom of God to them who are *saved only*. But sinners in a state of death in sins are not saved, but lost: therefore the preaching of the cross of Christ is not the power of God to them. The calling here referred to is distinct from the preaching, and instead of being dependent on the preaching, the effect of the preaching depends on their being saved and called. This salvation or calling is from death to life, and is emphatically attributed to the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus, our Lord, from the dead. Rom. viii. 11. Eph. ii. 5. Col. ii. 13. It is just as distinct from preaching or the written Scriptures as the resurrection of the dead. We are told by Mr. Franklin that when they heard Peter's word on the day of Pentecost they were pierced in their hearts. Very true: and when the Jews heard Stephen's word they were pierced in their hearts. Acts vii. 54. But a very different effect followed one case from what followed the other. On the day of Pentecost the Spirit of God prepared them to receive the word in good and honest hearts. Hearts the preparations of which were of the Lord. But in the other case their hearts and ears were uncircumcised, and full of murder and wrath.

Does God make no revelation save by the written Scripture? The question I know is absurd. But Mr. Franklin, after talking about subtleties, and kicking up dust, etc., says the term "written word or Scripture" in the proposition means all revelation from God. In this he is much mistaken. The written Scripture means the Bible, and nothing more. I should be pleased to know just who authorized him to define my proposition? If there is any dust or dirt kicked up, and there looks very much like some in this assumption of his, the gentleman's foot will be found at the place where it comes from. Let us see. 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11: "But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." "Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." The prophets and apostles have written what God revealed to them for the edification of the church in all ages of the world. But every member of the church is dependent on the Spirit for spirituality, and understanding in spiritual things. Paul says, 1 Cor. xii. 3: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit."

This doctrine of Mr. Franklin condemns to endless death and misery all the race of man, except where the written Scriptures have gone. And even where they have gone, but few have believed them, and all the unbelievers are damned. Then there are none of all those who die in infancy that can receive eternal life; for God, being dependent on the Scriptures, can do nothing only just what the written Scripture does for him.

I was once debating on this proposition with one of Mr. Franklin's brothers. At the close of the session, another one came to me and said: "I have been praying to God all day that he would convert you." "Well, sir," said I, "you have acted very foolish in doing so, if you believe the doctrine your brother advocates. According to your theory, God does no such thing as convert a man; it is the man that

converts himself. There is no room for prayer to God in the whole scheme, there being no God, no Jesus, no Holy Spirit, save what is found in the written Scripture." It is very much like Mr. Franklin's will of man destroying God's will. If the devil can successfully snatch this power from men, this written word, the only power that God has, according to the logic of the gentleman, will be gone. Instead of Jesus having the keys of death and hell, the devil has the keys of heaven, and uses them at his pleasure. But will Mr. Franklin tell us which parable the terms "good seed of the kingdom" belong to? He will, perhaps, see by looking over his argument, that the mixing was done by his own hand. But he is disturbed because I proved the good heart was one which God had prepared. It seems to cross his feelings very much, and he talks very short when I prove that "God works that which is good in us by Jesus Christ." Heb. xiii. 21. He says: "This *fustian* about preparing the ground is not in the parable." And therefore, I suppose, you would wish it excluded from a good heart, and have the heart good without it.

There has been a people long on earth who would rather speak their own praise than give the praise of a good heart to God. But there never was a good heart that God did not make good. And though it make the gentleman gnash his teeth, and shout tenfold louder than before, "*irresistible power*," yet I will not cease to point him to these sayings of God. What does he call a baseless figment? That God opened Lydia's heart. I take God's word in preference to his, and I say to him the baseless figment is yours. And know, sir, that when you charge the ruin of innocent persons to God's truth, you will never get a case to sustain your assertion, nor a sensible people to believe it.

Who is it that criticises the Savior? Who is it that construes the words of Christ so as to make him say that the dead sinner has a *good* and *honest* heart in the sight of God?

Mr. Franklin is the man who does this, for no purpose that I can conceive of, but to deny to the Holy Spirit the work of preparing the heart to bear good fruit, by making it good. He can see no good, save in the alien sinner, notwithstanding Paul says: "They walk according to the course of *this world*, according to the *prince of the power of the air*, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience, and are by nature children of wrath." But Mr. Franklin sets Paul aside; and by misapplying the words of Christ, attempts to prove that these children of wrath have good and honest hearts in the sight of God; that neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost does anything for the heart, in preparing it to bear good fruit. What the Lord did for Lydia he intimates is a baseless figment. And I am not sure, if Solomon were here to-day, just what he would charge on him for saying that the preparations of the heart were from the Lord.

But that the devil may come out ahead, my friend now makes some more Scripture to suit this end; he says, it is not my language, it is the language of Jesus. What is the language of Jesus? *That the devil defeats the work of God!* Poor man! I pity him! To charge on Jesus Christ the doctrine of the devil's triumph over God. But he not only acknowledges in his second address that God was in the heavens, which he now quotes so sneeringly, but that he works all things according to *his own will*. It was, therefore, the will of God that the devil should defeat his work. Jesus says, Heb. x. 9: "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." What does my friend's logic say the will of God is? *That the devil should defeat his work!* What, then, did Jesus do? Let Mr. Franklin answer. But John wrote his Gospel to unbelievers! Is not this a beautiful idea? No declaration could be more foreign to the truth. The language in John xx. 30, 31, and in 1 John v. 13, is addressed to the same people, and given in the same form. Notice the lan-

guage, John xx. 31: "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.*" 1 John v. 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.*" John says that he had written to believers, that they might know they had eternal life, *and that they might believe on the name of the Son of God.* Now let Mr. Franklin point to these words of the apostle, and say derisively, they were singular believers that did not believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God! They did believe it, and these things were written that they might believe it, being confirmed in believing by the record of truth. Hence they had life in believing; for the record is that God hath given to us eternal life, not in the record, but in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and the record testifies to this life; he that believes the record is alive in Christ, and Christ liveth in him. It is not the record that gives us eternal life, but it is Christ. John vi. 47: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." John v. 24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; *but is passed from death unto life.*" John x. 28, Jesus says: "I give unto them eternal life." John viii. 47: "He that is of God heareth God's word." 1 Cor. xii. 3, 4: "No man can say Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost. Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." Phil. i. 29: "For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, to believe on his name." 2 Pet. i. 3: "According as his divine power hath given to us all things that pertain to life and godliness." John xvii. 2: "As thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him."

These declarations trace the stream of life to the throne

of God and the Lamb (Rev. xxii. 1), and set forth the King of kings and Lord of lords, as exercising *divine power* in the gift of eternal life, and from it, the living source, rise up all those fruits of the Spirit, three of which are ever-abiding, faith, hope, charity. Neither of these ever existed in the absence of eternal life. The Spirit of Christ is that life. Says John, 1 John iv. 13: "Hereby know we that we dwell in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit." This unity to Christ is in spirit. If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is not his.

It will not do for Mr. Franklin to say that the Galatians were the sons of God in spirit before the Spirit of Christ was sent into their hearts, crying, "Father, Father." But does not Paul say, because you are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, etc.? He does. But he does not stultify himself by saying that they are sons of God in spirit without the Spirit of Christ. See Gal. iv. 7: "Wherefore thou art *no more* a servant, but a son." On what ground? Because Christ hath redeemed you from the curse of the law, and God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, "Father, Father." No other ground is stated for that relation in spirit, as sons to God, but the Spirit of Christ, which is the Spirit of life and the Spirit of adoption.

To be destitute of the Spirit of Christ, therefore, is to be destitute of eternal life. It is to be none of his, and therefore not a son, either in spirit or life; for the Spirit creates both these relations. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." John iii. 6. "He that hath the Son hath life." 1 John v. 12. Has any one life that *has not the Son*? Is any one Christ's that *has not his Spirit*? Do dead men spiritually believe in Christ in order to get alive? Is believing the fruit of death? Mr. Franklin answers all these questions substantially in his last speech in the affirmative, and thus stands

in direct conflict with Christ and Paul and John. And what is it all for, but to deny to the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which makes us free from death, the glory of the work of saving us from death? But he would give that work to the use alien sinners make of the written Scripture. They are the ones, in his view, that all the goodness and honesty come from, and unless they defeat the devil by their own free will and power (he having defeated God's work, according to Mr. Franklin), the whole scheme of life and salvation becomes a failure.

No one can fail to see that the labor of the gentleman is to make God a dependent Being, his power through Christ ineffectual and deficient. With what sneer does the gentleman speak of *irresistible power*! What kind of power does he want? Oh, the irresistible kind, to be sure, which the devil defeats, and leaves the salvation of the sinner to depend on his own free will and power. He tells us, again, that the sinner has to believe and become a son of God before the Spirit comes into his heart. I wish he would tell us what it comes there for? Not to make it good and honest; not to give life; not to make them sons; not to give them faith, or repentance, or love, or hope, or charity. He will not allow any Spirit of God's Son in any of these graces. But God does allow that blessed Spirit to be the source of them all. "Of his fullness have all we received, and grace for grace." John i. 16. "Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." "Hath quickened us together with Christ, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ." Eph. i. 3; ii. 5, 6. And harshly as it may grate upon his ear, I must here reiterate the substance of my arguments, and what is the substance of all God's revelation concerning our salvation and eternal life. It is Christ Jesus, all and in all. Christ in us, the hope of glory, is the revealed mystery of God. Angels worship him, saints adore him, and crown him Lord of all.

He is Alpha and Omega; he was dead and is alive forevermore, and has the keys of death and hell. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

But this life, says Mr. Franklin, is not given immediately from God, but through Christ, the apostles and the word. God says this life is in his Son. And he that hath the Son hath life. But God does not say this life is in the apostles, nor does he say this life is in the Scripture. Therefore the life is neither in, nor through, the apostles or their writings, but in Christ Jesus our Lord. When Christ, who is our *life*, shall appear, then shall ye also appear *with him in glory*. We are in him, that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ; this is the true God and eternal life. Living, believing, hearing, seeing, loving, obeying, praying, rejoicing, are but the fruits of that indwelling power, which worketh in us that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory forever. This is our God which doeth his will by Christ Jesus, defeating devils, destroying death, putting away sins, quickening and raising up the dead, and accomplishing salvation and eternal glory for all his people. Crown him with glory forever.

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—My worthy friend is trying to narrow our investigation down till it will amount to nothing. No one thought of our investigation being narrowed down on this question merely to the meaning of a single phrase, such as "quickened into new life." The work of the Spirit in *conversion*, or *turning sinners to God*, was the subject intended to be discussed, no

matter what figure of speech may be used, or literal language, in reference to it. *What* is the work performed by the Spirit of God in turning sinners to the Lord, and *how* is that work performed? There is no question between us about the Spirit of God exercising a power or influence in turning or converting the sinner, or about his performing a work in bringing the sinner to God. We agree that men are quickened into new life by the Spirit; that they are begotten, or literally made believers by the Spirit; that there is a sense in which they are turned to the Lord by the Spirit. About this we have no controversy. Any Scripture asserting merely this, and no more, proves nothing one way or the other of the matter in debate. Any Scripture asserting that the Spirit does this before hearing the truth, without the truth, or independent of the truth, or, which is the same, of the "written word," is proof for my friend. I need not say to any man who has paid any attention to our argument, that he has not produced one Scripture of this kind. He has given us neither a precept nor example of the kind. The principal terms of his proposition have been lacking in every Scripture he has introduced. Not one Scripture produced by him says, "independent of the written word." Not one says, "without the written word." Not one says, "before they heard the written word." He need not, then, make a display of enumerating arguments. He simply has no argument, either firstly, secondly, or any other. His doctrine of quickening the sinner into new life by the Spirit of God, independent of the gospel, is not in the Bible, and has not a single divine support anywhere.

On the other hand, I open the Scriptures and show that the gospel is now *written*, and is included in the phrase in the proposition, "the written word," sometimes simply called in Scripture, "the word," "the truth," "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," and show that the sinner is "begotten by the word

of truth," "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, the word of God;" "begotten by the gospel;" quickened by the word; that the word was written that men might believe; that they believe through the word; that faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God. What response has he made to all this? Not a man in the assembly can recollect an explanation he has made, a clear issue he has met on any of these points. Was the last commission intended for any man preaching his doctrine? "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He who believes and is immersed shall be saved." "Go, therefore, disciple all nations; immerse them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you." My friend is not under this commission, and does not follow the apostles under it. His gospel of "quickening sinners into new life by the Spirit of God independent of the written word," is not in the commission nor in the practice of the apostles under the commission, nor can he produce an example of "quickening into new life by the Spirit independent of the written word" in the Bible. He has neither a precept nor example for his doctrine. Nothing that any man ever set out to prove before an audience was more manifestly without a proof than his proposition is to-day.

The statement of my friend in his first speech on this proposition, that I make a God of the word, was coming a little lower down, and was a little nearer gratuitous than I had reason to expect at his hand. I knew he was pressed, and that he was sensible of it, but did not expect he would be driven to such desperation. When I respect the word of a man and take it at its face, do I make it the man himself? Surely not; but as I honor his word I honor him. When I honor the word of God and take it at its face, I honor God. As I honor the word I honor him who gave

it, but I do not make the word of truth God, but the word uttered by him. To receive it and ascribe to it, what he ascribes to it, is to honor both him and his word. But to refuse to ascribe to it what he ascribes to it, and ascribe it to something else independent of his word, is neither to honor God nor his word.

That God puts forth his power or influence to quicken sinners into new life, make them believers, turn them from darkness to life and save them, through Christ, the apostles and the Holy Spirit that spoke in them, and through the word thus spoken, and now written, no intelligent man can deny. And that this work, thus accomplished, is of God, of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, no man of God can deny. But that this work is done independent of the word, now written, is another gospel, an outside theory, and no matter how much it claimed to be of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, is not of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit; is not of the mediation of Christ, of the gospel, nor of the apostles. It is simply an empty, unsupported and impracticable theory, having nothing in it for any man, only the idea that the Lord picks up one man here and another there, and, without the word of truth, or the gospel, quickens him into new life and saves him; while it leaves another as good in all respects, not only not quickened, but without the power to be quickened or to be saved! This *immediate* quickening power is *direct*. It comes through no *medium* or *mediator*; as through Christ, the apostles, the inspiration of the Spirit in them, but *immediately* from God to the heart of the sinner. At one sweep this side theory sets aside the mission of Christ, his mediation, his apostles, the inspiration in them, the word spoken by them, with all the means and instrumentalities ever used in turning sinners to the Lord, so far as bringing sinners to God is concerned, and assumes and affirms that God converts and saves sinners without them. So far as quickening sinners into new life is con-

cerned, turning them to God and saving them, with his theory before him, my friend might as well go out into the forest and preach to the trees to be turned into lumber, to the rock to be turned into a foundation, the clay into brick, and the limestone into plaster, and thus become a house, as to preach to sinners. He simply appears before you, a preacher, without any gospel for the world. He need not trouble himself about the ancients, the heathen, infants or idiots, for he has no gospel for anybody. Inquirers came to the apostles inquiring what they should believe and what they should do to be saved. The apostles told them what to believe and what to do. They believed and did as commanded and were saved.

My friend will not deign to follow the apostle, and preach to sinners, so that when they hear they may be pierced in their hearts, and cry out, "What shall we do?" Nor will he give the answer of the inspired apostles, when they do thus cry out. You have seen how he evades all such Scriptures as this. He will not command, as in the case of the jailer, a man simply roused by a miracle, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. That would be going by the "written word," and not "independent of it."

My worthy friend says, "There is not one text in the entire Bible that attributes the quickening of sinners, either *directly* or *indirectly* or *remotely*, to the *written word*." This was easily asserted and *emphasized*. But is he in the *negative*, merely to make *assertions* and *denials*? How many such assertions and denials would it take to prove his affirmative proposition? He is not here to prove that the sinner is *not* quickened into new life in this way or that, but to prove that the sinner is quickened into new or eternal life by the Spirit of God, independent of the written word. This proposition is not to be proved by *denials* of any sort, or denying the existence of any Scriptures, or denying that God does this or that. Which one

of his texts has the important terms "independent of the written word?" Not one of them. If he will produce one with these important words in it, or their equivalent, I will give up the dispute. But there is no such passage. He does not want to go to the commission. Of course he does not; for his doctrine is not in it. He does not want to go to the history, or to the Lord's own account, of the quickening of sinners into new life, turning them to God and saving them, for his doctrine is not there. He does not like the accounts given in Scripture of the quickening into new or eternal life, but prefers going to the letters written to saints, who are already quickened into new life! But why? His doctrine is not there. It is not in the Bible anywhere.

But now in the absence of a Scripture that asserts that any one is quickened *without the word*, David says, "Thy word hath quickened me." Ps. cxix. 50. Paul says, "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. ii. 1. Again, he says, "Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ." Eph. ii. 5. Again, Paul says, "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." Col. ii. 13. These several expressions connect the quickening with conversion and remission of sins, and the one from David ascribes the quickening to the *word*: "Thy word hath quickened me," thus showing that the quickening is *with the word*, and not *without it*. The quickening without the word, or independent of it, is not in the Bible. Quickening by the word is in the Bible.

My worthy friend says: "As to the Spirit of God quickening sinners into new life, in one part of his speech he says he does; and in another part he says he does not." I do not know that I understand this confused statement. If he intended to say that I said, in one part of my speech, that

I believed that the Spirit of God quickens sinners into new life, and in another part of my speech said that I did not believe this, the statement is not correct. I did not say that I did not believe this, nor anything equivalent. This is not debating; it is only making misstatements. This may go down in the same list with charging me with "a fling at John the Baptist," and that "he did not have any Holy Ghost in his preaching." There is no excuse for such misstatements, only that he is so excited that he can not take notes that he can read. His ridiculous caricature on these matters is lower down than I expected him to go. What I said, in a former speech, of the twelve whom Paul found at Ephesus, who had only heard of the immersion of John, he tortures to be said of the church in Ephesus, who were quickened, as set forth in a former part of this speech.

My friend says: "And even where they" (the Scriptures) "have gone, but few believed them, and all the unbelievers are damned." This he styles my doctrine. Has he a doctrine that will not damn unbelievers? The Lord says, "He who believes not shall be damned," and, "He who believes not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." See John iii. 46. God holds men responsible for their *unbelief*, and will punish them for it.

You remember his language to the brother who said he had been praying for his conversion—that he thought he "acted very foolishly," and that he says, "With your theory, God does no such thing as convert a man." I was wondering, while he was talking on this, if it could be possible that he was so mystified with his theory of *immediate* converting power that he could not see the absurdity of his course. A few minutes before he was trying to make the audience believe that I was straying from the subject when quoting Scripture in reference to *conversion*; but now he finds that *conversion* is involved in our debate, and he thinks that, with our view of it, we act foolishly when we pray for

conversion. The truth is, he is so muddled in his mind that he does not know what the point in debate is, much of his time. I have been surprised at the narrowness of the view some men take, who become mystified on this subject. They limit the Lord himself to their narrow theory of *immediate* converting power, and if the Lord does not do the work in *their way*, or according to *their theory*, they do not believe he does it at all. They can not see that the work is of God; that he as actually *does it*, when he puts forth his power through Christ, the apostles, the Spirit of God that spoke in them, and the word spoken, as if he had done it without words. They can not see that the gospel is the *power of God*, and what is done *by the gospel*, *God does*, as actually as if he had done it in some other way. The truth is, my friend has the old anti-means Baptist doctrine so imprinted on his innermost soul, that he will not admit that God *does anything at all*, unless he does it *without means*. I shall expect to hear him deny that God gives him bread, unless he gives it *without means*. If he has to work for it, he will not pray for it, nor admit that God gives it at all.

It all matters nothing with him, if the grace of God brought Jesus to this world; if he performed an earthly mission; called, commissioned and sent the apostles; sent the Spirit of all truth and all revelation to inspire them, to guide them into all truth, and, through them, preached the gospel, and declared it to be *his power* to salvation; no difference to him, if God did make choice that by the mouth of Peter the Gentiles should "hear the word of the gospel and believe;" nor if the Lord did pray for those who should "believe on him through their word;" nor if Paul did say, "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" nor if John did say, "These are written that you might believe;" my friend's theory of an *immediate* converting power, though not found in the Bible, is the only converting power, and if God does not convert men by an *immedi-*

ate power, he does not convert them at all, or, to use his slyle, "does no such thing as convert a man." This is what becomes of the gospel, preached to all nations for the obedience of faith; "to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Thus it turns out that this theory of *immediate* converting power sets aside the entire mission of Christ, his mediation and atonement; the apostles and the language of the Spirit of God, uttered through them; the Bible itself; all tracts, books and publications of every kind; the church, ministry, Sunday-school and individual and personal influence and instrumentalities, so far as converting sinners is concerned, and makes all this nothing, and what is done by these means, he denies that God does at all; and he thinks it is foolish to pray for anything to be done at all, unless we will set all these means aside, and pray for their accomplishment *without them*. It is as important that we should pray for the accomplishment of the work, believing that God does it through the Mediator, and through the gospel, as it is if he does it without the Mediator and the gospel. We know not how God answers prayer in either case. The man of faith prays, knowing that he has a God that can answer prayer, no matter whether he can see *how* or not, and that will. It is easy to say that God quickens men into new, or eternal life, by the Spirit; but what does any man understand about it when it is said? It is just as easy to say it is independent of the written word, but *how*? You understand nothing about it, and there is not a practical idea in it. According to this theory, the preacher has nothing to do with it. His preaching is perfectly useless, so far as converting the sinner is concerned.

But there is a sense in which *God converts*, or, which is the same, *turns* the sinner, and there is a sense in which he *turns himself*. When we are looking at the gospel, the power

of God to salvation, laid before the sinner, and think of it as the means of convincing, enlightening and turning him in mind and heart, we ascribe it to God. The word of God quickens him. "Thy word hath quickened me." He is "begotten with the word of truth." When "begotten with the word," not independent of it, and when the "word has quickened him," or, literally, when he is convinced by the word, or, figuratively, "begotten by the gospel," he obeys the command of the prophet: "Turn you; turn you," and turns his course; turns the other way, and the Lord heals, or pardons him. God turns his mind by the gospel, and he turns his course.

The trouble with my worthy friend is, that he has become so carried away with his empty theory of *immediate* converting power, that he can not understand the clearest Scriptures. He is now alarmed at my ascribing so much power to the devil. If he will overcome his excitement a little, and cool down to a sober mind, he will see that I quoted from the Lord the words, "Then cometh the devil, and catcheth away the word of God out of his heart, lest he should believe and be saved." This "word of God" is the "seed," as set forth in the parable of the sower. What has he done with this parable? Has he showed that the word of God is not the "seed?" He has not. Can you have the products of the ground without seed? Certainly not. Did not the Lord say, "Then cometh the devil and catcheth away the word?" He knows he did. This seed, then, was the word of God, and he caught it away out of his heart, lest he should believe and be saved. This shows that the seed was sown that the hearer might "believe and be saved," and the devil catches away the word of God out of his heart, "lest he should believe and be saved." This is consistent with all the other Scriptures, showing that the gospel is preached that men may believe it and be saved.

The question is not between the gentleman and myself,

whether "the gospel is the only power that God has," as he puts it; but between him and Paul, whether "the gospel is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes," or not. Paul says *it is*. I believe Paul, or the eternal Spirit, who spoke in him. He need start no subtleties about "every one that believes." There is no power that will save him who *believes not*. The clear declaration is, that "he shall be condemned."

I did not call it "a baseless figment" that the Lord opened the heart of Lydia; but his *assumption* I called a "baseless figment," that he did it by *immediate power*.

[Time expired]

THOMPSON'S CLOSING ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators: Respected Audience:—I come before you to deliver my closing address on this proposition. Let us look, in the first place, at the terms of the proposition: "The quickening of the sinner by the Spirit of God into new life, or eternal life, is independent of the written word or Scriptures." What is the point to be proven? The quickening of the sinner into new life, or eternal life. That is the point, without narrowing down or enlarging. Is this quickening of the sinner into new life or eternal life by the Spirit of God independent of the written word or Scripture? This is the only question to be considered in the proposition. If Mr. Franklin had any negative proof in God's written word to present, he would bring it forward, and not complain of the proposition being narrowed down to nothing of any amount. Is eternal life of no amount? But because he has no negative proof in the entire volume of inspiration on this point, he is very desirous just now that I should leave the proposition, and discuss the subject of faith, or conversion, or turning to

God. These points are all very interesting, and profitable to be considered in their proper places; but as they are not in the proposition, they do not come before us now, unless it be to show, as I have done, the power they have upon those who have eternal life.

In the second place, if I have misstated the gentleman at any time, I am not aware of it, and must have misunderstood him, if I did so. He has misrepresented me repeatedly in his last speech, but I attribute it to his great confusion at his own failure, and the emotion manifest in the tone of his last speech. I regret to see so much feeling exhibited by my friend, and yet believe he is entitled to much sympathy; for he truly has a very trying place to fill. But I sincerely hope he will feel in a happier mood when he heeds the sober second thought, and decides that it is better to be beaten than to have continued in his error. But, after a very diligent and lengthy search, he has found a text in the Psalms of David that says: "Thy word hath quickened me." Ps. cxix. 50. *What word was this?* Did Mr. Franklin tell us? No; he just wanted to make us believe that God never had but one word, and that was the *written word or Scriptures!* Were the written Scriptures, save the books of the law, then in existence? Did the books of the law quicken David as a sinner dead in sins into new life or eternal life? If Mr. Franklin answers this question affirmatively, he is opposed by the testimony of inspiration. If negatively, he shows his purpose in introducing it here, and at this late point in the debate, when I will have no opportunity of answering his comment, to be deceptive. I quote, as settling this point, Gal. iii. 21: "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law."

Let us next consider the good seed that is sown, as given in Mark iv. 14, Luke viii. 11. We have the phrases, "The

sower soweth the word," and, "The seed is the word of God." Also, Matt. xiii. 19, it is called, "The word of the kingdom." In the first place, I ask, Who is to receive this seed, "the word of God?" Answer: there are two conditions of ground, the one unproductive, the other good. The unproductive is represented as divided into three classes: wayside, stony places, and thorny ground. Neither of these produced fruit or seed. The good ground was the children of the kingdom, and the seed which fell in it produced seed, thirty, sixty, and an hundred fold. But this *good ground*, who made it good to receive and multiply seed? Look at Matt. xiii. 37: "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man;" "The good seed are the children of the kingdom." We have from these two parables, these two points established: first, that which is good in man as a principle of life, making the heart good, is sown there by Christ; and, second, that which falls into this good heart is the word of God, which is also fruitful to God. Mr. Franklin misstates me entirely when he says, "He will not admit that God *docs anything* at all, unless he does it *without means*." Have I not, from the opening of this debate till now, in every speech admitted and urged that God used his *written word* to teach and instruct the quickened in doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness? I am sorry the gentleman is so confused that he does not know my argument, repeated again, to show the use and purpose of the Scripture to the man of God.

But the trouble with him is, the Bible does not state that the *written word* is a means of quickening the sinner into new life or eternal life, and he feels very much like he would find relief in calling me some hard names. If that will relieve his mind, he has my consent that he should do so; but I hope he will not say that I oppose God's appointed means, in any gracious use attributed to them in his *written word*; with no ground to make such a statement, save that

I deny that God is dependent on the written word to quicken sinners into eternal life. But if he should so far forget my argument, I wish you to impute it to his confusion, and not to premeditated design.

Again, he says: "If he intended to say that I said in one part of my speech that I believed that the Spirit of God quickens sinners into new life, and in another part of my speech said I did not believe this, *the statement is not correct. I did not say that I did not believe this, nor anything equivalent.*" Now I ask you to call to mind his comment on the words, "Even the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him." John xiv. 17. And also his comment on Gal. iv. 6: "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

I submit the case to this audience, whether he said nothing equivalent to a denial that the Spirit quickens sinners into new life. If he did not, I fail to understand his use of these texts. To my understanding his denial was positive. Again, he complains that I do not like the commission, "Go ye into all the world and *preach the gospel* to every creature." "Go *teach* all nations." Have I not been proving from God's word that this is just what the apostles did? They taught the people, or nations, and baptized them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and taught them to observe all things that Christ had commanded them. Here we have the commission to the apostles, but not one word about their being commissioned to quicken sinners into eternal life. Why this neglect, if their preaching is God's medium for quickening sinners into eternal life? Did Jesus regard the work of quickening the sinner into eternal life of *no amount*, and therefore left it out? No; he states that work fully in its own connection, but not in the commission, because it does not belong there. It belongs to the mission of Christ, and not the mission of

apostles. Christ gives eternal life to as many as the Father gave him; he is come that they might have life; the Son quickens whom he will. The record is that the *eternal life is in his Son, not in the written Scriptures.*

Why does my friend say that I do not like the commission to the apostles? Simply because I do not attribute to them the quickening of sinners into eternal life. This is the point between us. But did Christ commission the apostles to quicken the dead? No. Did the apostles claim to be mediums to give eternal life to sinners dead in sins? No. Did they teach *how* sinners were quickened into eternal life? They did, fully, forcibly, and definitely. How did they teach it was done? My answer is the language of the Bible: "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 whose grace ye are saved.*" Eph. ii. 4, 5. "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." Rom. viii. 11. "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." John v. 21. It is thus that God explains *how* the sinner is quickened. What does Mr. Franklin reply to this? Hear him: "It is simply an empty, unsupported and impracticable theory, having nothing in it for any man, only the idea that the Lord picks up one man here and another there, and without the word of truth, or the gospel, quickens him into new life, and saves him." That is my friend's opinion of the doctrine of the quickening of the sinner into new life or eternal life by the Spirit of God. It sounds very much like my friend had become provoked, because God had not said that he put forth his quickening power through the *written word*. But though God does not say so, my friend is so anxious to have it so that he says it is so. While he says he is willing to

take God's word at its face, he adds to its face the words, "puts forth his power to quicken sinners into new life"—through the word thus spoken; and he closes the sentence by saying, "no intelligent man can deny." Then no intelligent man governs his denial of a doctrine by the plain word of God.

All Christians have held that it is sufficient ground upon which to deny a doctrine, if it be not clearly taught in God's word. But here is a doctrine on the subject of the quickening of the sinner into new life, that finds no support in God's word, and yet my friend says, prove that it is not true. It is proven not to be true by its not being taught in the word of God. How can any false doctrine be proven false but by its want of support by the word of God? We have in God's word the doctrine of the quickening of sinners by the Spirit of God into new life or eternal life fully given in plain language, "God quickens us together with Christ by the Spirit." That is all of it. But my friend says it is through the *written word*. He may guess that it is so if he wishes, but if he does, he builds his guess upon the words of men, and not the words of God.

But as the proposition before us is to be decided by God's word, we do not have to depend upon the vague sayings of uninspired men. But Mr. Franklin misrepresents me when he says I do not believe that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes. I do believe this with all my heart, because God's word declares it is true. The preaching of the cross is to them who perish foolishness. This I believe also, because God's word declares it as truth. I therefore believe that the quickening of the sinner by the Spirit of God into new life, or eternal life, is independent of the written word or Scripture, because the word of God declares it as the truth. "Hold!" says Mr. Franklin, "you have not found the words, 'independent of the written word, or Scripture!'" No; neither have I

found the words, "independent of anything else under the heavens!" But does it follow that God is dependent on everything under the heavens to quicken the sinner into new life, because his word does not use the words, "independent of these things?" Such a mode of interpretation as this has been the foundation of all the heresies known among men.

The true interpretation of the teaching of the Bible is that all the doctrine of God our Savior is taught in his word. And whatever is not taught in God's word is not of God, and is not true. By this rule all that is not stated as belonging to a doctrine, where the doctrine is fully given, does not belong to the doctrine; and therefore the doctrine is independent of what is not thus stated. But my friend says I must not assert a negative to prove an affirmative. True. But if I affirm a doctrine to be independent of any principle or means named, and by the statement in full of the doctrine affirmed as given in the source of proof, show that no mention whatever is made of the principle or means named, do I not prove that the doctrine is independent of the principle or means named? I certainly do, beyond dispute, unless it may be shown that the principle or means named has been named in some statement of the doctrine. Mr. Franklin understands this rule of language, and has searched in vain to find some favoring term to connect the written word or Scripture with the quickening of the sinner into new life or eternal life; but he has found no such term in the word of God, for which reason he fails in his negative on this proposition. The nearest terms he has found are "begotten," "convert," "power of God unto salvation to the believer," and like expressions applied to the word preached to living subjects, which I believe just as much as he does, notwithstanding he says that I do not. I love to believe God's written word is a means in every connection stated in God's word. But when I am asked to believe that it is

a means used to quicken sinners into new life or eternal life, I must decline doing so till some proof from the word of God is adduced, declaring such doctrine to be true. I ask Mr. Franklin, as a gentleman, to take back the unkind remark that I do not believe God does anything by means. God uses means and mediums in all his gracious works, and the means used in quickening sinners into eternal life is the Son of God, by the Spirit.

The brother of Mr. Franklin, in Indiana, to whom I referred as acting foolishly, held that the converting power of God was contained in the written Scriptures, and consisted of motives and arguments. That there was no Divine or Spirit power, beside the written Scriptures, put forth in conversion. I say, therefore, emphatically that a prayer to God to convert is inconsistent with the sentiment, and foolish on the part of one holding such a sentiment. That God uses the written word in conversion in many senses of that term, I believe. But that no power but that contained in the written Scriptures is employed in conversion, I do not believe. Neither would conversion be a subject of prayer if such sentiment was true. I will notice one more of the gentleman's misrepresentations before I sum up my proof: it is this, that I hold the immediate power of God in quickening the sinner, independent of the Lord Jesus Christ. Who has used words equivalent to these in the debate? I have not. The whole statement is gratuitous, and without the least ground in truth. I do not say the gentleman willfully misstates me. He is so confused and embarrassed that he mistakes what he wishes me to say, for what I do say. His fevered imagination is full of fancies of terrible things; and he fights them with a courage and perseverance worthy a real object. Every argument and proof which I have brought forward recognizes Christ as the medium of eternal life, and the Holy Spirit as the instrument. Mr. Franklin himself is the one who introduced the term *im-*

mediate, and then fought the creature of his own fancy.

I will now proceed to recapitulate my argument. 1. The state of the sinner in relation to the divine government of God. Rom. iii. 9: "What then? Are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." Eph. ii. 2, 3: "Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as other." This relation of the sinner to the government of God is called "death in sins," "alienation," "enmity." The point to be proven is, how God, by his Spirit, changes the sinner's relation in spirit, to his spiritual government in quickening him into new life, or eternal life. My first proof declares, "You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. ii. 1. Here we have their state and relation given, till they were quickened of God. They were dead in sins. See the fifth verse. But how were they quickened from this state? "For his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, *hath quickened us together with Christ* (by whose grace ye are saved)" This is God's method of quickening, if his word states the truth. "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, *hath he quickened together with him*, having forgiven you all trespasses." Col. ii. 13. "For as the Father *raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them*; even so the Son *quickeneth whom he will*" John v. 21. How does the Father raise the dead? "He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also *quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*" Rom. viii. 11. Therefore God quickens the dead by his Spirit." "It is the Spirit that *quickeneth*" John

vi. 63. Thus in the simplest form of language God has stated the whole doctrine of quickening into eternal life: 1. It is God that quickens. 2. It is the sinner dead in sins that is quickened. 3. It is with Christ they are quickened. 4. It is by the Spirit. Does not this forever establish my proposition? It does, beyond a question. But does it prove the quickening independent of the written word or Scripture? It does. By leaving the written word out of the doctrine proves it to be independent of the written word, just as plain as words can prove any proposition.

God has stated his independence of all other mediums, by giving all the medium employed in the quickening of the sinner into eternal life. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." "Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through Christ." Notice, that it is not said ye *were* sons, before ye received the Spirit of adoption, but because ye *are* sons "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Wherefore, or because of this *thou art no more a servant, but a son*. It is the Spirit of his Son, therefore, that adopts us, or quickens us into the relation of sons to God. The same Spirit shall finally quicken our mortal bodies into the same relation to God. Therefore, the same terms "adoption" and "quicken" are used in both cases. When the sinner is delivered from sin and death, he is said to be "quickened with Christ;" "the Spirit is sent into their hearts, crying, Abba, Father;" they "receive the Spirit of adoption," "the first-fruits of the Spirit;" "they are risen with Christ," "they have everlasting life." When our dead bodies shall be delivered from sin and death, they shall be brought into the glorious liberty of the "sons of God." This is called the "adoption," to-wit, "the redemption of our body," "raised up at the last day," "quickening of our mortal body by his Spirit that dwelleth in us." The words

of God by Paul confirm this view fully. Rom. viii. 9-11: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." It is useless to say that they were sons before that Spirit was sent forth into their hearts. Without his Spirit they are none of his. They are dead in sins. "But if Christ be in you, the body is dead, because of sin, *but the Spirit is life because of righteousness.*" And the same Spirit, which raised up, or quickened Christ and lived in him, and has quickened us and made us alive unto God in Spirit, will also quicken our mortal bodies into life eternal. Rom. v. 21: "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. vi. 23: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Thus I prove the author and medium by which sinners are quickened into eternal life. But my proof goes on to show the use of the written word or Scriptures as set forth in God's word. 2 Tim. iii. 16: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the *man of God* may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." "He that is of God heareth God's words." John viii. 47. We have in these texts not only the use of the Scriptures, but the persons to whom they are profitable. They are not a medium through which life eternal is communicated to dead sinners, but a medium through which God teaches those *who are of him*. To them "who are of God," "quickened with Christ," "who have the Spirit of Christ," "it is the power of God unto salvation;" "they are begotten by it" to many precious privileges; "it is the word of the kingdom" (not the good seed as taken from the parable of the wheat and tares by Mr. Franklin), "the power of God and the wisdom of God." They are

spirit (not the Spirit) and they are life (but not the life). Jesus declares, John xiv. 6: "I am the way, and the truth, and the *life*." Again, John x. 28: "I give unto them *eternal life*." John xiv. 19: "Because I *live* ye shall live also." Gal. ii. 20: "*Christ liveth in me*." John v. 11, 12: "And this is the record that God hath given to 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*." John xvii. 2: "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give *eternal life* to as many as thou hast given him."

As to quicken, is to give life, or make alive, I feel satisfied that the proofs before you will put to rest any doubt as to the truth of my proposition. All the Scriptures where the terms "quicken" and "eternal life" are used in the relation of giving life to the dead in sins, or the dead in the graces, name the medium to be Christ, by Spirit power, or by the Spirit. To state that the written word or Scripture is a medium through which God puts forth his power to quicken sinners dead in sins into eternal life is to say what God has not said. We are forbidden to add to what God has spoken in his word. When he says God quickens sinners with Christ, and by his Spirit, let us say so. But when he does not say he quickens them through the written word or Scriptures, let us not say so. What is given as the mission of Christ belongs to him. What he gave in commission to the apostles belongs to them and their ministry. The quickening of the dead belongs to his mission, and was never committed to them. Hence they pointed to Jesus the resurrection and the life. We by faith live, looking to him, and for him. "And when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we appear with him in glory. Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S CLOSING ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—You have now heard what my worthy friend could say in proof of his affirmative proposition. I am not disappointed. There was no proof to bring, and, of course, he could bring none. He says,—"What is the point to be proven?" and justly answers, "the quickening of the sinner into new life or eternal life by the Spirit of God, independent of the written word or Scripture." That is precisely the point to be proved, and the one not proved by any Scripture produced by him or that can be produced. Never did a man close an argument on any question more completely without proof. But he turns *negatively* and shouts, "If Mr. Franklin had any negative proof in God's written word to present he would bring it forward and not complain of the proposition being narrowed down to nothing of amount." "Negative proof" is not what is wanting. In the negative a man has nothing to prove. The proof is demanded in the affirmative, and in default of any the case is lost. According to the rules of logic, as I am in the negative, I have nothing to prove on this question. My friend had something to prove—that "sinners are quickened into new or eternal life by the Spirit of God, independent of the written word or Scripture." That was what he was bound, by the rules of argument, to prove, and what I denied. That is precisely what he has utterly failed to prove, and what I have successfully denied. Nothing remains now for me only to restate the case, sum up the argument and leave the matter for the public. The question is not whether the sinner "is quickened into new life." This we all admit. Nor is it whether *God quickens* the sinner. All agree that he does. Nor is it whether he does it *by the Spirit*. No one doubts that he does. It is also *by Christ*. God quickens the sinner by Christ, by the Spirit. There is no dispute between us on this. This I have stated again

and again. The question is not whether the sinner is quickened into new life, whether God quickens him, whether he does it through Christ or by the Spirit, but whether he does it *without the word or the gospel*. "Independent of the word" or the gospel is *without it*. He affirms that God does quicken the sinner into new or eternal life, independent of, which is the same, without the word or the gospel. This is what I deny, and what he knew was the issue at the start.

Any Scripture that only asserts that the sinner is quickened, that God quickens him, or Christ does it, or that it is done by the Spirit, only proves what is not in dispute, or not denied, and not the precise point in dispute—that God does it, or Christ, or the Spirit without the word or the gospel. The words "independent of," which mean "without," are not in one text produced by him. This he virtually admitted in the speech you have just heard. But he wants you to take it for granted that where the quickening of the sinner is ascribed to God, Christ or the Spirit, without telling us *how* it is done, we are to understand that it is *without the word*. But that would be to take for granted, without proof, the very thing to be proved.

Let us review the ground gone over. Did he produce a case where any one was quickened into new life without the word or the gospel? He had the Bible before him. Did he produce an account from it of God ever quickening any one into new life without the word, no matter whether the word was "written" at the time or not? We use the word "written" now, in the proposition, to limit it to the word found in the Bible and now "written." Not a case of the kind did he produce. There is no account of any such case in the Bible.

Did he find a reference in the Epistles to a case where any one is said to have been quickened into new life without the gospel? Not a reference to such a case did he pro-

duce. There is no such reference in all the letters written by the apostles to the saints. The saints had all been quickened into new life, and it was God that quickened them, and it was through Christ and by the Spirit, but never said to be independent of, or without the word.

Did he find an instance in all the teaching of Jesus where he said any one should be quickened into new life without the gospel? Not a bit of it. There is nothing of the kind in all the teaching of our Lord.

Did he take up the cases of which we have an account in Scripture of the quickening into new life and undertake to show that in any case persons were quickened into new life without the word? Not one; nothing was more foreign from his course than to do such a thing. But he rambles through the Bible and finds the word "quickened," and no matter to him whether it is the *quickening* in the resurrection literally from the dead, or what, he goes by the mere jingle of *sound* and not by the *sense*, and assumes that it is *without the word* and claims that it is *proof*. Then he quotes some dark Scripture that may be a little difficult to understand and claims it as *proof*. But no one can see the proof.

As to his reference to my "confusion" I have no concern. This audience can see when we know what we are talking about, and when it is all gas. They can see who has kept to the point and who has made false issues, muddled and confused the point in debate. The proof of a proposition must contain the terms of the proposition or others of the same import. He has referred to a sufficient number of Scriptures, and more than a sufficient number, if they contained the terms of his proposition, or others of the same meaning, to prove his proposition. If he had produced *one Scripture* containing the terms of his proposition, or others of the same import, it would have been entirely sufficient, but not *one* such Scripture has been pro-

duced. Some of the Scriptures did not contain the term "sinner;" others did not contain the term "quicken," or the words, "into new life," or "eternal life," and none of them contained the words, or the ideas in the words, "independent of the written word or Scripture." How could the proof be there without these important terms or their equivalent? It is simply *not there at all*. Now that his entire ground depends upon it he can not think of a single Scripture containing the words, or the idea that the quickening is independent of the word. Even in raising the dead, to which he has referred, we read that "all that are in the graves shall *hear his voice* and shall come forth." His failure is most complete.

I must notice a point or two in his closing address. Speaking of my argument on the sower, he says: "The good ground was the children of the kingdom." Not exactly. That is not the Lord's explanation of the good ground in the parable of the sower. The Lord says, "The good ground is the man who receives the word into a good and honest heart; understands it and brings forth much fruit." The seed sown in the good ground—a good and honest heart—is "the word of God." Is there any "quickening into new life" there—in a good and honest heart—before the seed, "the word of God," is sown there? Not a bit of it. The new life is in the seed, and before it is sown in the heart there is no *quickening* nor *growing*. This is not an isolated case, but the *rule*—the way it is in *every case*. This is the same as the language produced in my first speech on this question, and which has received no attention: that we are born again, not of corruptible *seed*, but of incorruptible, by *the word of God*, and *not without the word*, as my friend tries to make it appear. It was not me that jumbled the parable of the tares and wheat and the parable of the sower together. I did not introduce the parable of the tares and wheat at all. That parable has a

different point in view, and has not the same meaning as the parable of the sower, and if my friend was so confused that he mistook the explanation of the one for the explanation of the other, I do not wonder that he talked about *confusion*. If he undertook to palm off the Lord's interpretation of the parable of the tares and the wheat for his interpretation of the parable of the sower, knowing what he was doing, I do not see how to reconcile it with integrity. In the parable of the sower there is no fault found with the *seed* or the *sower*. In the parable of the *tares* and *wheat*, the fault is all in the *seed* and *sower*. It is bad seed and a bad sower.

In the discussion on this question, I have done more than was required of me. I have done a work of supererogation. It was only required of me by the rules of argument to deny his proof and show that it did not meet the issue; that it did not cover the ground; that it was inconclusive. This part of the work I have done as effectually as work was ever done. This was all that I was bound, in logic, to do to defeat my opponent. This I have done and left him without one particle of argument. But I have done much more than this: I have gone on, for the edification of the audience, to show, from clear and conclusive Scriptures, how sinners are quickened into new life, how they are begotten of God, begotten of the Spirit, made believers, turned to God, or converted. I have not done this rambling from side to side through the Scriptures, referring to isolated expressions, or dark passages that were not clear, or had no reference to the matters in hand; but to clear and conclusive Scriptures that can not be misunderstood.

I showed that the whole work, not the isolated matter of quickening the sinner into new life, but the entire process of conversion, salvation here and hereafter, is through the Mediator—that no man comes to the Father *but by him*. I showed that this theory of a quickening by an *immediate*

power is without Christ—the Mediator. It can not be by the Mediator, and immediate. The power is of God, by Christ and by the Spirit, but by the gospel. It is not without the gospel. In doing this, I showed that in the commission the Lord commanded the gospel to be preached that it might be believed, and that the believing was that they might have life. I showed in the clear, definite and literal language of the apostle, that the gospel is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes. He does not say "power of God," or "a power of God," but "the power of God," and not to some, but to every one that believes. Sinners are certainly quickened into new life by the power of God to salvation. The gospel is the power of God, and they are quickened into new life by the gospel, the power of God, and not independent of it, or without it. From this there is no escape. This is not an exceptional case, but the rule—the law of the kingdom.

Paul says, "I have begotten you by the gospel." This begetting, though ascribed to Paul, is of God, of Christ, the Spirit and the gospel. It is of God, by Christ, the Spirit, by Paul and through the gospel. It is not an isolated case, but the rule, and shows how they were begotten. This was before they were quickened. It was the first thing in the process of turning them to God, and declares that they were begotten by the gospel, and not, as in my friend's unmeaning theory, without the gospel. This he has never answered, and no man ever did, or ever can, and stand on his ground. James says, "Of his own will begot he us with the word of truth." It was with the word of truth, and not independent of it, and James adds "that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures." This, too, was not of the will of man, nor of the flesh, nor blood, "but of his own will begot he us with the word of truth." I defy any man to show that men are begotten without the word of truth. Begotten with the word of truth is the same as begotten by the gospel, and

amounts to the same as made you believers by the word of truth or by the gospel. There is no quickening into new life before this. This quickening into new or eternal life, that my friend advocates, before men believe, or in unbelief, is not only absurd, but not in the Bible.

"Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book, but these are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name." This gives you the case in full. He did not quicken them into new life that they might believe, but recorded the truth that they might believe, and that believing they might have life. The believing is in order to the life, and not the life in order to believing. "He came to his own, and his own received him not, but to as many as received him to them gave he the power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name." He did not quicken them into new or eternal life, to enable them to believe; but those who received him—even those who believed on his name, he gave power to become sons of God. This accords with the words: "He gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believes on him should not perish, but have eternal life." Man is not quickened into eternal life that he might believe, but he believes that he might have life. This believing is in order to the life, and not the life in order to the believing.

This accords with the declaration of the Lord that disconcerted my friend so in his closing speech in reference to the Spirit, "whom the world can not receive." This language is a refutation of his entire theory of quickening by the Spirit, while in unbelief. This accords with the language of Paul: "In whom you also trusted, after you heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom also, after that you believed, you were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." They were not sealed with the Spirit

to make them believers, but believed before they were sealed. This agrees with the words, "Because you are sons, he has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Father, Father." The Lord gives "the Holy Spirit to them that obey him," as Peter has it.

But I have not stopped with these clear Scriptures, showing that God quickens into new life, by Christ, by the Spirit by the apostles, and by the word. It is all of God, but through Christ and by the apostles whom he sent, and by the Spirit that was in them and spoke the word through them, and by the word spoken. God was in every case of quickening a sinner into new life. It was by Christ in every case. It was through the apostles in every case. The word was employed in every case. No one was ever quickened into new life since the reign of Christ commenced without God, Christ, the apostles, the Spirit and the word. This shows why the gospel was commanded to be preached to every creature in the commission. This commission was of God, and of Christ, and that which was done under it was of God and of Christ. As the Spirit was sent to guide the apostles into all truth, as they went out under this commission, and spoke through the apostles, it was also of the Holy Spirit; and as the apostles were employed it was by them, as the word was employed it was *by the word, and not without the word.*

I have followed the divine history and showed that the work was done *by the word* and not *without the word*—that the word was preached—that "when they (the people) heard this, they were *pierced in their hearts*"—pierced by what *they heard* and not *without it*. This was the first thing that took effect on them. They had not been quickened into new life before this; nor did they before this inquire what to do. It was God that pierced their hearts, through Christ, the apostles, the Spirit that was in the apostles, and the word preached, with the Holy Spirit sent

down from heaven, which the angels desire to look into. I followed on to Solomon's porch, and found that the word was preached; that God quickened sinners into new life by Christ, the apostles, the Spirit that was in them and the *word preached*. I followed Philip to Samaria, and showed that the people gave heed to the things spoken, "concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," believed and were turned to God. We found the word present, and that the work was done by it, and not *without it*. I followed on to the conversion of Saul, and found no account of his being quickened into new life without the word, but found the word uttered to him: "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom you persecute." This word he believed, and many years afterward said: "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." This is the way faith comes; it is by hearing of the word of God, and not without the word of God. I followed on to the case of Cornelius, and found that the first utterance was that of an angel of God—that "when he" (Peter) "is come he shall tell you *words* whereby you and your house shall be saved." This is not my friend's unscriptural theory of salvation without words. But when Peter comes to the house of Cornelius, we hear him start out: "That word you know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how that God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power, who went about doing good, for God was with him." He was turned to God *by the preaching of the word and not without it.*

I have referred to the clear language of Scripture that teaches that the preaching of the cross is the wisdom of God and the power of God to them that are saved, and if any are quickened into new life without the preaching of the cross, it is without the wisdom of God, and the power of God to them that are saved. This is in accordance with

the clear and lucid utterances of Scripture : "To me who am less than the least of all saints is the grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of time has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." "According to the commandment of the everlasting God the gospel was preached among all nations for the obedience of faith." "In the times of this ignorance God winked at ; but now he commands all men everywhere to repent ; because he has appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he has ordained ; whereof he has given assurance to all men in that he has raised him from the dead." This is addressed to man's reason, to his intelligence, "assurance to all men everywhere," and that assurance was that he had raised Christ from the dead. With this same principle in view in Paul's commission, the Lord sent him to these people and to the Gentiles to "turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God." God, however, turned them, through Christ, the apostles, the Spirit that was in him and the gospel, the power of God to salvation, which he preached. The work is the Lord's though he does it by agencies and instrumentalities, as much as if he had done it without them. To his name be the honor, the glory and the eternal renown.

As all the Scriptures in this my closing reply have been referred to, the chapter and verse given in my previous replies, I have not occupied the time with repeating the references in this speech.

[Time expired.]

THIRD PROPOSITION.

Baptism, as commanded in the Commission, is in order to the remission of past sins. Franklin affirms.

FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS.

*Gentlemen Moderators : Ladies and Gentlemen :—*The proposition before us relates to what Dr. Conant, of the Bible Union, calls "the Initiatory Rite of the New Institution ;" an ordinance of our Lord, required by him in the last commission, and in the law relating to induction into the kingdom of God ; into the body of Christ, or, which is the same in substance, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Several things give this law prominence, and show that it should not be treated with indifference. The circumstance that it came from the Lord, the Head of the Church, is sufficient to command respect for it ; the example of the Lord in bowing to it should command attention, and, at least, prevent men from trifling with it ; the approval of the Almighty Father as the Lord emerged from baptism, in the parting heavens, the descent of the Holy Spirit in visible form, and the oracle from the Father, "Thou art my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased," ought to shield the institution from all contempt, on the part of all who have any regard for the New Institution, or Him who gave it. The circumstance that it is incorporated in the great commission, in connection with faith and repentance for those who turn to God, one would think would command respect for it on the

part of all who fear God and work righteousness everywhere. We hope, then, that it will receive the grave attention and candid consideration in this discussion which its important place in the New Institution and its adorable Author demand.

Without further preliminary, I will proceed to define the terms of the proposition. My worthy friend and myself have no controversy about what baptism is. We agree that it is *immersion*. When we say, baptize, we both mean *immerse*. The words, "as commanded in the commission," are intended to limit the debate to the ordinance, or the rite commanded, and cut off all debate about the baptism in sufferings, in the Spirit, or in fire, which are *never commanded*. Remission of *past sins* means the remission of the sins of the past life; the "old sins," as the apostle calls them, and not any sins committed after turning to the Lord. As defined in a previous part of this debate, remission of sins, or pardon, is an *act of God*, done in heaven for man, and not an act done *in man*. Our proposition does not mean that baptism takes away sins, or that water takes away sins. To my mind, and with my Bible in hand, there is nothing clearer than that baptism can not take away sins, or that water can not take away sins. It is equally true that faith does not take away sins, nor does repentance. After all the faith, repentance and baptism required in the law of God, the same *pardonning act* of God is required to take away sins, as if man had done nothing. *Man's act* can not take away sins. Sins can not be washed away except by the blood of Christ. Yet the blood of Christ will wash away no man's sins while he is in unbelief, or impenitent. The pardonning act will be performed for no man in unbelief, in impenitence, or who makes an issue with God on baptism, or refuses to be baptized.

I must also explain a word or two more before I proceed with the argument. I am not here to prove that baptism

is anything to any man that is not a proper subject. I only speak of it and its design, when administered to a proper subject. I mean, by a proper subject, a man whose heart has been changed by faith, so that the love of sin is destroyed and the love of God established in him; and whose life has been changed by repentance, so as to be fully determined to live a good life in time to come. To such a man baptism is in order to the remission of sins. It is the last step in the divine process of turning to God; the last act required on his part, in coming to God to receive the *pardonning power*, the *executive power*, which alone can take away sins. It is the consummating act in the process in coming to the Lord. It is the last step in coming into the kingdom. The last step can not be taken without the previous steps. The step that passes the man in at the door can not be taken without the previous steps that bring him to the door. Baptism is nothing without the previous steps, the divinely required antecedents; the faith that changes the heart, and the repentance that changes the life. These antecedents do not transfer the man into Christ, but bring him to the entrance, prepare him for entrance. Baptism changes no man's heart or character, but simply changes the relation, or state; transfers him into the new state, or relation.

One more word yet, by way of explanation: we are treating of the legitimate administration of the gospel, and not some exceptional case that some fruitful and curious imagination might conceive. What is the design of baptism, in a *legitimate administration of the gospel*? I affirm that it is *in order to remission of sins*.

The first thing I inquire into, in regard to baptism, is in reference to its being administered *but once*. Why is this? This indicates at the outset that it is not an item of worship or of practice *in the Church*, for all such items are continued, or repeated, at the proper periods. We continue to

practice the prayers, singing, thanksgiving, communion, etc., during life. Why is this? Why not continue to practice baptism? It is not an item of practice *in the Church*, but the initiation into the Church. As we enter *but once*, we are baptized *but once*. This is all there is of baptism. One person—a proper subject—is baptized *once*, and this is all for all time and eternity. The reason of this is, that one person enters into the kingdom but once, into the body, into Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

But now, to the commission. What salvation is meant in the words: "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved?" Be *saved* from what? From *sins* undoubtedly. I give two reasons for saying this. In the first place, as Luke has the commission, he uses the words, "remission of sins," in the place of the word *saved*, showing that the salvation of the commission is salvation, or deliverance from sins. This is the sense in which Peter took the commission, or the Divine Spirit that inspired him, when he uttered the words, Acts ii. 38. He does not say, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for" *salvation*, but "for the remission of sins." This is the salvation meant in the commission—salvation from sins, or remission of sins. In the second place, the final salvation, or salvation in heaven, is never *directly* connected with baptism. This is, therefore, not the salvation meant in the commission. It means pardon, or remission of sins. This is promised to him who believes and is immersed, but certainly not final salvation in heaven. This latter depends on the life that shall follow, as I shall show abundantly, when we come to discuss the last proposition.

Let us look at the commission, a part at a time. What, then, is the faith, or the belief, in order to? Leave the word "baptized" out, and inquire what they were to believe for. Leaving the baptism out, we shall have "He who

believes shall be saved." Who can fail to see that believing is in order to salvation? To this all of any considerable note agree. The same words, in this sentence, from which we learn what faith is for, or in order to, tell us what the baptism is for, or in order to. The precise same words, in the same sentence, make both the faith and the baptism in order to the same thing. From this there is no escape. "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved," says the Lord. Here are two things to be done with the same object in view; that object is *pardon*. It may be shown that something else may be included, in order to the same end; but there is no getting rid of either one of these *two things*. There they stand in the organic law, the fundamental law of induction, and no evasion can set either of them aside. They are joined by the Lord, by the conjunction "and," and the same words that describe what the faith is for describe what baptism is for, in the same sentence. There is no escaping the force of these words. They explain how the inquirer is to come. He is to come by faith and baptism. These two things are required by the supreme authority of the great King.

As Matthew records the commission, we have the words, "Go, therefore, and teach all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you." Matt. xxviii. 19. "Into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," does not mean literally the same as "saved," in Mark's report of the commission. But it involves the same, for no one can be in "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," and not be pardoned or saved from sin. It involves the same as "into Christ," or "into one body," or "into the kingdom," and consequently involves the remission of sins.

Luke reports the words, "Repentance and remission of

sins" as included in the commission, showing that repentance has some connection with remission. Peter connects repentance and baptism in the following words: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Acts ii. 38. Here two things are connected together in the same sentence, in order to the same end or object. That end or object is *remission of sins*. The repentance and baptism both look to the same object, and that object is remission of sins. There is no separating the repentance and baptism, as commanded here. They are joined together by the conjunction "and;" man can not put them asunder and remain guiltless. When you ascertain what the repentance is for, or in order to, you ascertain what the baptism is in order to. The precise same words in the same sentence tell us what the repentance is for, and what the baptism is for, as both are for the same. The Lord joins faith and baptism together by the conjunction "and" in the commission, and requires both to be done for the same thing, or in order to the same end, and Peter, or the Spirit of God that inspired him, joins repentance and baptism together by the same conjunction "and," for the same thing, or in order to the same end. From this there is no escape.

This accounts for one thing that appears throughout the New Testament history, and that is that we find no account of baptizing a man who is in the body, the kingdom, the Church, or in Christ; and no account of a man in the kingdom, the Church, the body, or in Christ, who has not been baptized. Let my worthy friend try his hand on it. We read of persons in Christ, in the body, the Church, the kingdom, but in no instance where such persons had not been baptized. We read of no person *believing* "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The reason is that the belief transfers no person "into the

name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," but simply prepares the person in heart for the transfer. We never read of believing into the kingdom, into one body, into his death, into the Church. The believing goes *before* the entrance into the kingdom, into one body, into the Church, and is preparatory to an entrance. In the same way, the repentance goes before the entrance into one body, and is preparatory to it. Not so with baptism; it is the *very act* of entering into the kingdom, or into the body, the Church. Hence we read, that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God," John iii. 5; that "as many of you as have been baptized *into* Christ have put on Christ," Gal. iii. 27; "that so many of us as have been baptized *into* Jesus Christ were baptized *into* his death;" that "we are all baptized *into* one body," 1 Cor. xii. 13; "baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Matt. xxviii.

These expressions do not contain the words, "in order to the remission of sins," as all that are "in Christ," "in the one body," "in Christ Jesus," "in his death," and in "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," have the remission of sins, and no others have the remission of sins. Here is room for my worthy friend to try his fine preaching talent. Let him produce an exception to what is here stated.

But now, more particularly to the Lord's words: John iii. 5: "Verily, verily, I say to you, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." That "born of water" is an allusion to baptism is admitted by all the principal churches in the world. I will mention three: The Church of England, referring to this language, in her ritual says, "That our Savior Christ saith that none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost." The Methodist Episcopal Church refers

to this language in the same words, as found in her ritual. The Presbyterian Church, in her Confession of Faith, quotes the precise language of the Lord and applies it to baptism. I am thus particular to show that I give the words of our Lord no peculiar application, but take them in the sense of the standard works, as found in the libraries of the preachers of this country where they have libraries.

I do not say that "enter into the kingdom of God" literally means the same as *pardon*, but the amount is the same in our argument, for every man in the kingdom of God is pardoned, and every man not in the kingdom of God is not pardoned. In this language the Lord maintains two things, without which no man can enter the kingdom of God. These two things are embraced in the words, "born of water and of the Spirit." He inserts "born of water and of the Spirit" and joins both together, and declares that without these a man can not enter into the kingdom of God. How can any man set aside either the one or the other? Can he do this and respect the authority of our Lord? He certainly can not. No man whose opinion is worth anything thinks any man can enter into the kingdom of God unless he is "born of the Spirit." In the same sentence the Lord inserts "born of water," giving it the same authority, and declaring that you can not enter the kingdom of God without it.

In Acts, ninth chapter, twenty-second chapter and twenty-sixth chapter, we gather the main body of what is known about the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. In these Scriptures we learn that, on his way to Damascus to persecute all that called on the name of Jesus, the Lord appeared to him and said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Saul responded, "Who art thou, Lord?" The Lord answered, "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." He inquired, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" The meaning of this question is, "What wilt thou have me to do" to

be saved or pardoned? The answer is, "Arise, and go to Damascus, and there it shall be told thee what *thou must do.*" See Acts ix 6. The Lord does not say, What you may do if you *feel like it*, or if it *accords with your views*, but, in the most imperative manner, what *you must do.* Do you inquire, "For what?" In order to remission of sins; salvation from sin. Could he have obtained the remission of sins if he had refused to do what the Lord said *he must do?* Let him teach that he could who dare, I dare not. When the Lord says a thing must be done in order to a certain end, it is an end of controversy. In the case in hand the end is remission of sins. That which must be done in order to that end is to "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." That is what *thou must do.* In order to what? In order to the washing away of sin, or pardon. Would the Lord have washed away his sins if he had refused to be baptized? He was not pardoned when the Lord thus commanded him or he would not have said, "and wash away thy sins."

Rom. vi. 3, we are said to be "baptized into his death"—Christ's death. In his death his blood flowed to wash away sins. This is the reason that we have the words, "wash away thy sins" in connection with baptism. It is not that the water of baptism can wash away sins, or that baptism itself can wash away sins, but when we are "baptized into the death of Christ" we come to his blood that cleanses from all sin. This also corresponds with other figures, such as "baptized into one body," which brings us to the blood of Christ. The *life* also is in the body. The Spirit of Christ is also in the body. The body is the temple of God, in which the Spirit dwells; so that when a man enters the body, or temple, he comes to the blood of sprinkling that cleanses from sin, the life of Christ and the Spirit, and is enabled to say, Father, Father.

The Apostle Peter says: "The like figure whereunto

even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." The parenthesis is to guard against an error the Jews were liable to fall into. They were liable to think baptism, like some of the Jewish washings, to take away impurities and defilements of the flesh, as, for instance, in handling a dead person. He makes a clear statement, showing that baptism has no such purpose, but relates to the *conscience*—it is the answer, or, as some translate it, the *seeking* of good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. There is no evading the clear import of the language, and the fact that it connects salvation or remission of sins in some sense with baptism. It does not wash away impurities of the flesh, nor relate to the flesh as the Jewish washings, but it is the seeking of a good conscience. It is virtually the same as Titus iii. 5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Here the salvation is ascribed to God, and at the same time it is asserted that he saved us by the *washing of regeneration* and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. "The washing of regeneration" is an allusion to baptism, as all the authorities of note admit. The Lord, then, saves us, not *without*, but *by the washing of regeneration*.

Paul has virtually the same in the following: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." See Eph. v. 25, 26. This is much the same as the expression in Titus, that he—Christ—might sanctify and cleanse it—the Church—with the washing of water by the word. The "washing of water" here is an allusion to baptism, as pretty much all the critics admit, and Christ connected it with

the sanctifying and cleansing the Church, and did not sanctify and cleanse the Church *without it*.

The Apostle Paul has the same in view, Rom. vi. 17, 18, when he says: "You have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin you become the servants of righteousness." "Made free from sin" is pardon. When were the disciples in Rome made free from sin? "Being *then* made free from sin"—that is *when* you obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine, and *then*, that is, at the *same time*, you become the servants of righteousness. That form of doctrine included baptism, and when they passed through their baptism they became servants of righteousness.

[Time expired]

THOMPSON'S FIRST ADDRESS.

*Brother Moderators: Respected Audience:—*The proposition before us is a very important one, I admit, and should receive from us all a careful and prayerful examination in the investigation of what the word of God teaches relating to it. I was pleased to see my worthy friend start out so carefully, making full and copious explanations of terms, and heading off curious inquisitive persons who might wish to intrude unwelcome questions. Too much care can not be had when we approach the commandments of our Lord Jesus Christ. He is highly exalted with the right hand of God, both Lord and Christ, angels, authorities and powers being made subject to him. All power, or authority, is in his hand. When he commands, who dare with impunity disobey? for it is the Head of all principality and power that commands. For if they escaped not who refused him that speaks on earth (Moses), much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from Him that speaketh from heaven.

The first question that demands our attention, and that which will demand our proof and argument principally, may be stated thus: "What relation does the command of Jesus, 'Be baptized,' sustain to the covenant or will of God, by the which we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ?" It is admitted by all Christians, I believe, that by the will or covenant of God the sins of his people are remitted through the blood of Christ. That Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God, was a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, in the foreknowledge and counsel of God. That his people in all ages of the world have been pardoned of their sins through his blood, according to the riches of the grace of God.

With these agreed propositions before us, all of them fully proven by numerous Scriptures recited in the preceding arguments offered before you, I announce the conclusion upon which I shall base all my arguments on this proposition, namely: "The entire scheme of redemption, as ordained in God's covenant, and executed by Jesus Christ, the Mediator of that covenant, for the pardon and remission of sins, consists alone in the merit of the blood of Christ, poured forth when he gave himself without spot unto God, and died for our sins according to the Scripture. And as King and Priest unto God, he lives in the heavens, with all authority to purge our sins, and quicken us into eternal life, and raise us up to heavenly things, or places, which he does according to his grace, and not according to our works."

I have no doubt Mr. Franklin will say he agrees with all this. But his proposition does *not* agree with it, neither do a part of his arguments, nor does his interpretation of the Scriptures, which he ran over so glibly, and which will pierce his logic through ere we dismiss this proposition. Had he been content to have stood to his explanation of his terms, we should have had no debate on this point. Here

is his explanation: "Our proposition does not mean that *baptism takes away sins*, or that *water takes away sins*." "To my mind, and with my Bible in hand, there is *nothing clearer* than that *baptism can not take away sins*, or that *water can not take away sins*." Again, "*Man's act can not take away sins*. *Sins can not be washed away except by the blood of Christ*." But now, after stating thus much, he makes one of those dodges, to which he is so often given, and which, were he disposed to stand to his position as defined by himself, would not be required to hide an absurdity. It is this: "The pardoning act will be performed for no man in unbelief, in impenitence, or who makes an issue with God on baptism, or refuses to be baptized." But what about the man that *does* believe, and is penitent, and makes *no issue* with God on baptism, and *does not* refuse to be baptized, but is not immersed in water, how does his case stand as to the pardoning act? Does the pardoning act of God reach his case? Does he enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and the Spirit? And if not, does he not die out of Christ? Does he not die in his sins? And ought not Christ to have said in the commission, he that is not baptized shall be damned? The system of Mr. Campbell lays down the principle set forth in the gentleman's speech, and I hope he will not go back on the founder of his theory. I do not think he will, from the speech he has given us this morning.

I hope the gentleman does not intend to say, by the terms, emphasized, "*legitimate administration of the gospel*," that our Lord Jesus Christ administered the gospel not legitimately. Or that God administered it not legitimately to Abraham. As to baptism being required but once for time or eternity, we have the ordinance of circumcision in the flesh under the law dispensation, analogous to baptism in this respect. We shall also see that the analogy does not stop here; but that baptism is an external sign of the right-

cousness of faith in Christ, and heirship in Christ, enjoyed by the pardoning act of God before baptism. Baptism is *not*, therefore, *in order to* the remission of sins, but follows after the remission, as a visible sign of our covenant relation to God as his people.

The commission points out these heirs, in their relation as such in spirit to God, and the fruits of life which follow that relationship or heirship, and the ordinances, by which they enter the visible congregation or Church, and the services rendered to Christ in the Church. These four particulars we propose to keep in view, while we investigate the word of God. First, then, we find the command, "Preach the gospel to every creature." What does this command embrace? *Remission of sins through Christ*. No other gospel has ever yet been preached by divine authority, either by God himself, or by angels, or by prophets, or by Christ, or by the apostles, or since that time. God's covenant, that declares "Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more," knows no blood but his, no righteousness but his, no obedience but his. The entire testimony, from Abel to the song of the redeemed in heaven, sets forth Jesus, *the Way, the Truth, the Life*. No man cometh to the Father but by *Him*.

Second. What is the spiritual grace by which the heirs of God, in spirit, are known? *Faith*. Faith, the fruit of the Divine Spirit, is that grace recognized throughout the entire Scripture as the evidence of spiritual relation to God as his children. We are all (Jew or Gentile, bond or free, if we be Christ's) the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

Third. The fruit of life which follows this gracious state—sorrow for sins, and turning to the commandments of God, and entering the visible Church, or congregation of the saints, by baptism.

Fourth. All that Christ has commanded to be observed.

But Mr. Franklin puts great stress upon the words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Is the salvation from sins? He says it is undoubtedly. What are his reasons? Because Luke puts the *remission of sins* in the place of the word *saved*. Let us see Mark xvi. 15: "Go ye into all the world, and *preach the gospel* to every creature." What were they to preach? Answer: *The gospel*. What does Luke say? "That repentance and remission of sins should be *preached* in his name, among all nations." The repentance and remission preached in the name of Christ refer to the gospel as given by Mark. The Apostle Peter preached the same gospel on the day of Pentecost. But the trouble with Mr. Franklin is, that he can see nothing in Peter's preaching, nor in the relation of those to whom Peter addressed the truth, who were in spirit the heirs of God, and inquiring their duty to the visible ordinances of Christ; but he leaps over all this to reach the acme of his whole theory, by applying the terms be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ *for the remission of sins*, to his proposition that baptism *is in order to* the remission of past sins. I will make this contrast between the Apostle Peter's command and Mr. Franklin's preaching: Peter makes it an ordinance performed in the name of Christ, in obedience to him, as both Lord and Christ, and because of the relationship as heir in the covenant of God which they sustain to Christ as their Savior, and through whose blood their sins are pardoned. See the next verse: "*For the promise is unto you,*" etc., showing that the same gospel which Abraham believed, they believed, and were therefore heirs according to the promise. But to what do the terms, "*shall be saved,*" as given in the commission, refer? Jesus, we are told, connects faith and baptism together. But we have seen that faith and baptism are not only distinct, but have entirely a different use in the commission. Faith is a spiritual grace, by which we are manifested as the sons of God

in spirit, while baptism is an external ordinance, by which we enter the visible Church. You will notice that our Lord says, he that *believeth not* shall be damned. Who is in a condemned state? The *unbeliever*. Who is in a justified state? The believer. But if the remission of sins depends on baptism, then it is the unbaptized, whether believer or unbeliever, that are damned. But the antithesis is certainly between the believer and the unbeliever; and salvation, therefore, refers to the faith, and not to baptism. If we say baptism is essential to salvation in the sense of the text, we say Abraham was not saved, and deny the gospel that God preached to him.

Mr. Franklin wishes me to try my hand to find a case where a man was in the body—the Church—before baptism, and was afterward baptized. I have no need for such a case. That has nothing to do with the proposition. I would prefer to employ my hand just now on your proofs upon which you rely to sustain your proposition. But again, he wishes my preaching talent exercised on “entering the kingdom,” “being baptized into Christ,” “baptized into his death,” etc. I shall esteem the themes as good ones, and attend to them in order at the proper time. I shall discourse first upon John iii. 3, 5, 6. First, Jesus is here discoursing upon a subject that Nicodemus did not understand. But he would have readily understood Christ had he said to him, you must be baptized and obey the Scripture. Did Christ select obscure words to mystify his mind? I answer no. Christ was talking of a *spiritual*, and not a *temporal birth*. That which is born of the *flesh* is *flesh*, and that which is born of the *Spirit* is *spirit*. *Flesh* produces the one by *generation*. *Spirit* produces the other by *regeneration*. In one there is a temporal separation, cleansing and quickening; in the other there is a spiritual separation, cleansing and quickening. In one, all is temporal and visible; in the other all is spiritual and invisible. But I will have to let this short

sermon suffice for the present, to hear what great men and churches have said. What have *they* said. That allusion is here made to baptism. Well, I suppose they know just how it is, and how to perform it. No, Mr. Franklin will reply: Their practice is most pernicious, they sprinkle it on them. Then why do you bring them forward as witnesses? To show many people believe it. I call that a very poor reason. If you could prove it by the word of God, it would save you a great deal of hunting among old musty volumes to find what uninspired man has said. But as you can not do that, it might save time if you would quote from the Christian System by A. C. But what does Mr. Franklin say that the term *water* means in the text? He does not say at all. After quoting from three church covenants, he says he was particular to show that he gave our Lord's words no peculiar construction. But he gave them no construction at all. He says afterward: “I do not say enter the kingdom of God literally means the same as pardon,” etc. If he had, it would have done his case no good, as neither refer to baptism. But then the water and Spirit are *joined together*, and one goes not without the other. What then if baptism be the water, no unbaptized person was ever born again, and never entered the kingdom of God. There is his doctrine, look at it, and know for yourselves that it is just what we claim for it. Why his long explanations at the start of his speech, that baptism *does not take away sins*, water *can not take away sins*, man's act *can not take away sins*, etc. But you enter the kingdom of God a son and heir, pardoned and justified by baptism. For no unpardoned sinner ever entered the kingdom of God. But more anon.

Saul of Tarsus is the next case in point. After giving the history of Saul up to the time of Saul's inquiry, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do, Mr. Franklin proceeds to tell us what Saul meant by this question. He says the

meaning of which is what shall *I do to be saved, or pardoned*. Do not forget that *Saul* is to do something to be pardoned. What is it? Go to Damascus, and it shall be told thee what *thou must do*. To be pardoned remember. What is it? Arise, and *be baptized and wash away your sins*, calling on the name of the Lord. Mr. Franklin asks, "Would the Lord have washed away his sins if he had refused to be baptized?" That is a strange question to ask, just as though he thought the *Lord* did the washing! Did you not prove that *Saul* did it? Is it not one of your favorite conditions that an alien sinner performs of himself? Is it not that simple turning process of which you say man has power in himself? Do not talk about the Lord washing away his sins, or the people will think you are confused! The washing was in a symbolic or figurative sense to visibly represent that precious cleansing of the conscience from dead works to serve the living God, through the blood of Christ. Heb. ix. 14. And as *Saul* had already the faith that distinguishes the believer, and was of the brotherhood, as revealed to Ananias, and as acknowledged by the address of Ananias to *Saul*, the washing as Mr. Franklin says in explanation at *another time*, but which he does not say here, "*could not put away sin*." That is, it could only represent the putting away of sin visibly. It could only be a representation of that truth to those who had received pardon through the blood of Christ through faith. "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed." Rom. iv. 16.

In Rom. vi. 13, we are said to be baptized into his death, Christ's death. We are told that Christ's blood flows in his death to wash away sins; and that we come to it by being baptized into it, and the blood, not the baptism, cleanses from all sin. We are also told that we are all baptized into one body. Who did that baptizing? Was Abraham ever baptized into that body? Did the prophets be-

long to that body? But I wish to notice Rom. vi. 3. Who were baptized into his death? Was it those who are dead to sin, or those who are alive to it? I answer, it was those who were dead to sin. If they were dead to sin they were free from it, and alive unto God, through Christ, and prepared in the Spirit to set this forth in a visible form just as Paul says they did.

But Mr. Franklin wishes to hear from Peter again; so he quotes from his writings, but does not tell us where to find it. 1 Pet. iii. 21. What does Mr. Franklin give us from this text, "There is no evading the clear import of the language and the fact that it connects salvation, or remission of sins, *in some sense with baptism*." I kindly advise him hereafter when he states his proposition on this point that he state it thus: Baptism, as commanded in the commission, is in some sense connected with the remission of sins. But he informs us the translation is at fault. Instead of the *answer* of a good conscience toward God it should read the *seeking* of a good conscience toward God. Did Noah seek a good conscience in the ark? Were eight souls all that ever sought a good conscience till the command was given to baptize? But the believer's conscience toward God is good, being purged from dead works to serve the living God. Heb. ix. 14. And that conscience is answered by obedience. Titus iii. 5. Here the gentleman commits the same mistake, as in John iii. 5 he says it alludes to baptism by the term *washing of regeneration*. "For," says he, "all the authorities of any note admit it." But there is one authority of note that does not admit it, and that is the one to which we both should appeal—the Bible. It ought to be enough to decide this point forever to state that his rendering would damn all the race that are not immersed in water. No man could be spiritually generated without it, and could not enter the kingdom of God. But look at the text, "Not by works of righteousness which we

have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Who renews us? The Holy Ghost. Who washes us? 1 Cor. vi. 11: "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God." Eph. v. 25, 26. Christ gave himself for the Church that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. Does the water of baptism cleanse the Church from sin? Mr. Franklin says *no*. But if the water in the text means baptism, it is the water that cleanses the Church from every spot or wrinkle or any such thing. But my friend thinks there is an allusion to baptism. What does he mean by allusion? that one thing is said, and another included?

But I wish to notice his last argument before my time expires. It is from Rom. vi. 17, 18: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you." Being then made free from sin ye became the servants of righteousness.

When were the saints in Rome made free from sin? When they died to sin. See 7th verse. Again: When were they dead to sin? When they believed from the heart that Jesus was the Christ. But Paul says being *then* made free, etc. He also says in the first verse, What shall we say *then*? And in the twenty-third verse he says, "But *now* being made free from sin," etc. These terms refer to conclusions, and not to time. But Paul thanked God that they had obeyed from the heart, etc. But Mr. Franklin says they obeyed of themselves, exercising their own free will as alien sinners. But Paul says they were made free and then became servants to God, and he thanks God for it, because it is the Son that makes them free indeed. John viii. 36.

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—My worthy friend found himself completely disarmed at the start on the question before us. The explanations which I made took away the very material he intended to use, and left him without ammunition. I do not know that I ever saw a man that preached *against works*, as stoutly as he, *work* as hard as he does. If he gains anything in this debate, it is of *works*, not of *grace*. He appears destined to live, if he lives at all, by the sweat of his face. He *works* the hardest to prove that salvation is without works of any man I ever saw.

He quotes my statement, "That the pardoning act will be performed for no man in unbelief, in impenitence, or who makes an issue with God on baptism, or *refuses to be baptized*," and inquires, "But what of the man that *does* believe, and *is* penitent, and makes *no issue* with God on baptism, and *does not* refuse to be baptized, but is not immersed in water; how does his case stand as to the pardoning act? Does he enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and of the Spirit? And if he does not, does he die out of Christ?" What does this language mean? What does he mean by the words, "*does not* refuse to be baptized, but is not immersed in water?" Is he turning Quaker, and finding baptism without *immersion in water*? Talking of "dodging" comes with an ill grace from his lips, after this *dodge*! Does he ever *baptize* without *immersing in water*? This is not even good sophistry. The man does not refuse to be baptized, but is not immersed. Baptize means immerse, as all Baptists admit and maintain. What, then, does he mean by the slippery expression, "*does not* refuse to be baptized, but is not immersed in water?" No matter what he meant; *his words* mean, does not refuse to be baptized, but is not baptized. This is *slippery talk*. Will he

take a man into the Baptist Church "who *does not* refuse to be baptized, but is not immersed in water?" Tell us, my dear sir; plainly and no equivocation about it, will you take a man into the Baptist Church "who *does not* refuse to be baptized, but is not immersed in water?" You dare not say you will. If you will not, why not say so, and not try to throw dust into the eyes of the people?

But he puts the question, "Does he enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and of the Spirit?" The Lord says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." I have nothing to say of *myself*; but *I believe what the Lord says*. Does he believe the language just quoted from the Lord? Let him answer this directly and no equivocation. Let him also tell us in plain words: Can the man that does not believe, is not penitent, and makes an issue with God on baptism; refuses to be baptized, enter into the kingdom of God? Will the grace of God save him? Will the blood of Christ cleanse him from sin? There is no use in *dodging*; we want some debating. Tell us plainly, my dear sir, have you any grace to preach, that will save a man in unbelief, or without faith? Do you preach grace that will save an impenitent man? Do you preach grace that will save any man who *refuses to be baptized*? Can a man who refuses to be baptized get into the Baptist Church? Can a man get Baptist communion, or Baptist fellowship without baptism? No, sir; not a bit of it. You preach baptism that is *not essential*, and that *is essential*. It is not essential to acceptance with God, but it is essential to acceptance with Baptists; it is not essential to fellowship with the Father and with the Son, but it is essential to fellowship with Baptists; it is not essential to communion with the Father and with the Son, but it is essential to communion with Baptists; it is not essential to entrance into heaven, but it is essential to entrance into the Baptist Church. If

the salvation of God is in the Baptist Church, it is essential to that salvation, for you can not get into the Baptist Church at all without it—yes, "immersion in water" at that! Let him answer to this if he please.

I am not putting any foreign construction on the words, "born of water and of the Spirit." "Born of *water*" is applied to baptism in the Episcopal Prayer-Book, the Methodist Discipline, the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and nearly all the standard works of all Christendom. The Methodist Discipline says, that "Our Savior Christ saith that none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost." It is in the same words in the Episcopal Prayer-Book, and was there before the Discipline was made. The language is so applied by all the critics, commentators, annotators and translators of any note, Baptists as well as others. There is no one thing that all Christendom is more unanimously agreed in, than in the application of the words, "born of water," John iii. 5, to baptism. Against this there is no rising up. This being indisputably correct, and it standing in connection with "born of the Spirit"—in the same sentence—"born of water and of the Spirit," there is no getting over it, or setting it aside. "Verily, verily, I say to you," or translating the Greek word *verily* into English, "Truly, truly, I say to you, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." I am here to stand to the language of our Lord and defend it. *I believe it*. My friend is here to oppose it; to maintain that a man can get into the kingdom of God without being "born of water and of the Spirit." He takes part of the language and sets aside the other part. He accepts "born of the Spirit," and admits that you can not get into the kingdom of God without it, but "born of water," in the same sentence, he tries to get over!

I do not, of course, intend to say that our Lord did not

administer the gospel legitimately; but it is put into the hands of men to be administered, and they do not always administer it *legitimately*. We are discussing the design of baptism, in a legitimate administration, and not in an extreme or exceptional case. In other words, we are discussing the design of baptism where the gospel is administered, and not where *it is not*, or *can not be* administered.

Where did my friend learn that there is an *analogy* between circumcision and baptism? Is he about to turn Pedobaptist? Will he point out the analogy between circumcision and baptism? It is useless to talk of "an outward sign of an inward grace." Where did he get that misty stuff? There is nothing of that kind in the Bible. Why does he go back to Abraham for baptism? There was no baptism then, any more than there was a Baptist Church, or a Baptist close communion. The gospel was preached to Abraham, but only in promise, and even that such a promise as my friend never preached in his life—the promise that in him "all the families of the earth shall be blessed"—blessed with the gift of the Messiah, the gospel for "all nations"—for "every creature," or, as Peter explained it at the house of Cornelius, that "in every nation he who fears God and works righteousness is accepted with him." My friend has not this gospel yet. He has no "good news of great joy for all people," no gospel for "every creature," and does not even now preach that "In every nation he who fears God and works righteousness is accepted with him." He studiously avoids all such language as this. He is handcuffed, and can not preach as required in the Lord's commission that he gave to his apostles, that "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved." This is not his doctrine. He has no gospel for sinners. It is useless for any man of the world to come to him inquiring the way to God. He has no way to set before him. It is dark as Egypt with him. He can tell him that he is dead; that he is totally

depraved; that he is lost; that he can not believe, repent, or do anything. Sinners need not inquire of him, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" for he will not follow Peter and the rest of the apostles, and tell them to "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This is not his gospel. He will not follow the commission, and tell the sinner, "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he who believes not shall be damned;" nor will he follow Ananias, in his instructions to Saul, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." And, addressing saints, you do not hear him saying to them, as Peter did, "the like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us." No, sir; he has no gospel for the poor lost sinner. His gospel goes no further than to tell him that *he is lost*, and leave him in that condition, till he can imagine that he has been miraculously changed, but he has not a clear example of the kind in the word of God.

My worthy friend talks of the ordinances by which we enter the "visible congregation." Where does he get this? There is not a word about "ordinances by which we enter the visible congregation" in the Bible. We are not on mystic and subtle questions of schoolmen about the visible and invisible, but we are inquiring about the entrance into "the kingdom of God," "the body of Christ," the "one body," and not simply a *congregation*. There is not one word about baptizing into a congregation, much less into a Baptist Church, in the Bible. We read of baptizing into Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, into *one body*, and that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," but never of baptizing into a congregation, or Baptist Church. Indeed, there is no account of any Baptist Church for many long centuries af-

ter Christ, either in the Bible or out of it. Baptism is not *the door* into the Baptist Church, or any Church. Christ the door; not of the Baptist Church, but of the sheep, or the kingdom, and *by him* all must enter who enter at all.

Where does my worthy friend find his theory touching the three thousand on Pentecost, expressed by the words, "because of their relationship as heirs in the covenant?" There is not a word of the kind. They were sinners; who had taken the Lord by *wicked hands* and slain him; but, when they heard Peter, were pierced in their hearts, and cried out "What shall we do?" What would my friend have replied? Would he have answered as Peter did? Not one word of it. He would not now, if sinners, pierced in their hearts, were to cry out "What shall we do?" He would not answer, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." He dare not answer in the precise language of the apostle and maintain that it is right. If he were to do so, he would lose his position in his church. This is the difference between him and myself. I stand squarely on the terms of the commission, and the very words of the inspired apostle, uttered on the day the Spirit came down from heaven to guide him into all truth, and follow what I find here without equivocation. He does not stand squarely on these terms, and does not give the sinner the same directions Peter did on that day.

I do not like to speak lightly of the criticisms of my friend, but I can not look on his criticism on the words of Ananias to Saul, in any other light than as a *little one*, a decidedly weak one. It will be noticed that he does not criticise *my words* or *my views*, but the words of the man whom Jesus sent to tell Saul what to do. Ananias commanded him to "Arise and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." He speaks of these words in ridicule, because he was commanded to be baptized and *wash*

away his sins. He was to do this himself! I wonder if he ever read of those who "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb?" See Rev. vii. 14. Wonder if he could not criticise this language, because it ascribes the washing of their robes to *themselves*? Is it possible he has not studied the meaning of language with sufficient care to see how this washing may be ascribed to themselves and to Christ? When the writer or speaker is looking at the act of the sinner in accepting the washing on the Lord's terms, the washing is ascribed to him, but when he is looking to the Author and Giver of it, it is ascribed to Christ; but it is the same washing in both cases, as it is washing in his blood—which is the only washing that can take away sins. I am astonished that my friend should make such a play upon the *very words* of Scripture. The trouble is that he does not understand the language he criticises. The truth is, I had taken the wind out of his sails in the explanations made at the start, and his speech which he had prepared, and written down in his little book, did not suit, but he had to "speak his piece" as he had written it.

Had the worthy gentleman come to me before he prepared his notes, I could have saved him much trouble, and from showing, as he has done in this debate, that he did not understand the issues to be debated. He has prepared to prove that salvation is *by grace*, and *through the blood* of Christ. I would have prepared to do this myself if I had supposed any one worthy of any attention would have denied it; but he understood not what was to be debated, and has prepared a long list of Scriptures to prove that salvation is *by grace* and *through faith*. All this needs no proving from him, as no one denies or doubts it in this discussion; nor does any one doubt that it is through the name of Christ. But in obtaining this salvation by *grace*, *through the blood* of Christ, and *through his name*, we find

the inquirer or seeker is required to be baptized *into Christ*. Here my friend stumbles and flounders, and strands off from his Bible. He will not walk up to baptism and let it stand in the place assigned it in Scripture, as found in the commission, and in the preaching of the apostles; but he talks about "an outward sign of an inward grace," of ordinances to introduce us into the visible congregation. But this is all outside talk, not found in the Bible; there is not a word about ordinances to introduce us into the visible congregation.

There are some things so clear that they can not be made clearer. That the Lord commanded the apostles to "teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," is in the language of Scripture. How were they to get *into the name*? The Lord says "baptizing them *into the name*." Were they pardoned before they were in the name? They are all "baptized into one body." Were they pardoned before they came into one body; to the blood in the body; to the Holy Spirit which is in the body; to the life of Christ, which is in the body? Paul says we are "baptized into Christ." Are men pardoned before they are in Christ? "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Can a man be pardoned and not be in the kingdom of God? But my friend intimates that "born of water" is not baptism! Did he tell you what it is? Not a word of it. He intimates that the "washing of regeneration" is not baptism. Did he tell you what it is? It is not the work of the Spirit, for it is "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." There are two things mentioned; one is "washing of regeneration," and the other is the "renewing of the Holy Spirit." The washing is not regeneration, but the *washing of regeneration*, and I defy him to show that it means anything but baptism.

Why does he single out baptism, and insist that a man can be saved without it? Why not start the question whether a man can not be saved without prayer? But the Lord accused certain men of "rejecting the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized by John." John was the *lesser* and Christ the greater. If a man rejected the counsel of God against himself in refusing to be baptized by John, what of the man who refuses the baptism of Christ, who is the greater? Will a man be saved who rejects the counsel of God against himself? Will my friend answer? The Lord told Saul to go to Damascus and there it would be told him what he *must do*. Would he have been saved if he had not done what the Lord told him he *must do*? The Lord says, "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved." Does my friend say, "He who believes and is *not baptized* will be saved?" Peter commanded the three thousand to "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." If they had repented and *refused to be baptized*, would they have received remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit? These are plain matters; let him answer. The Lord says, "With lies you have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad and; strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by *promising him life*." See Ezek. xiii. 22.

But why this determined effort to get round baptism, or to shuffle it out of the place appointed? It is either for the remission of sins, or it is not. My friend can make his election; take which side he pleases. If it is not for remission we should read several Scriptures differently. "He who believes and is baptized *shall be saved*," we should read, "He who believes and is baptized *shall not be saved*." "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*," we should read, "Re-

pent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, *not* for the remission of sins." "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," we should read, "Arise and be baptized and *not* wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now *save* us," we should read, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth *not* also now save us." This is the doctrine of my friend—baptism *not* for remission or anything else; baptism without a design; a baptism without which you can enter into the kingdom of, into heaven itself, or almost any other place except into the Baptist Church. Into it you can not enter without baptism. According to his doctrine you can be united with the Father and with the Son without baptism; enjoy God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, or almost every good thing without baptism, except fellowship with Baptists. That you can not enjoy without baptism. Baptists make more of baptism than the Lord does, for they maintain that the Lord will receive persons without baptism, but Baptists *will not*. They have a baptism that is essential, but *not* essential; *essential* to entrance into a Baptist Church, but *not* essential to entrance into the kingdom of God.

This is not only true of Baptists, but of all churches of any note. They will not receive you into any church without baptism, or what they call baptism. But the matter is not about their receiving us, but the Lord receiving us. What does he require in order to acceptance with him? This we can learn by going honestly to the commission and learning the terms that are clearly stated in it, and then following the apostles where they received persons under that commission and learning the terms on which they received persons.

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S SECOND ADDRESS

Brethren Moderators: Respected Audience:—The language of the Apostle Paul (Phil. ii. 12, 13): "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is *God which worketh in you* both to will and to do of his good pleasure," is to me precious language. It is wise instruction from a heavenly source to those who are addressed by it. And when my friend charges me of preaching against *such works*, he either misunderstands me or willfully misrepresents me. I love good works because God hath wrought them in us; and they are, therefore, gracious external signs of inward grace. But this *inward grace* is what annoys the gentleman, and makes him so sore that he never refers to it but with an emphasized sneer. He started out with the idea that pardon or justification was not a work of God in man, and throughout the debate he has manifested a profound contempt for inward grace. The text says, "*God worketh in you.*" Heb. xiii. 21: "*Working in you* that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Christ Jesus." Eph. i. 20: "Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all we ask or think, *according to the power that worketh in us.*" Here is the power to which is attributed all good, whether of thought or of action. When, therefore, faith, repentance, baptism, love, prayer, or any other grace of the Christian life, is attributed to this power, and commanded to be practiced, or worked out, because this power *worketh in us*, I fellowship the sentiment, and preach it, too, with all the emphasis I can command. Yes, sir, I do work, yet not I, but the grace of God. And I am right glad to see that my labor is not in vain in the Lord. Your last speech, which was largely taken up with flings at the Baptist Church, and misrepresentations of what I preach, shows, as plain as it can be made, whose ammunition is out. It shows a very weak system, a very meager proof on your part, to bring forward a false representation of the Baptist

Church and of my preaching, to sustain it. If all you say of both was true, it would not prove your proposition. But if this is all you have, go on; it will enable you to fill up your time, and make an appearance of *debating*.

Does not Mr. Franklin know what I mean by a man not refusing to be baptized, and yet never immersed in water? There are thousands over our country, honest Pedobaptists and others, who never refused to be baptized, as they understood the ordinance. Do these all reject the counsel of God against themselves? Are these all damned? Are you like the great restorer of Christianity? Do you leave them to the *tender mercy* of God? Will you tell us what that *tender mercy* is? Is it what you call *extreme cases*? Will you give us a few cases that God calls *extreme cases*? But he says the words, "do not refuse to be baptized, and yet are not immersed," is slippery talk. I will put the question thus: Do all who are not immersed *refuse to be baptized*, and consequently die out of Christ, and finally perish? This question is substantially answered in other parts of his speeches, but I wish a square answer. But he wishes to know if I would take a man into the Baptist Church who does not refuse to be baptized, but has not been immersed in water? No, sir, I would not.

I will now ask him the following: Does God's word teach that any man's sins were ever pardoned until he was immersed in water? I want no equivocation. Come up squarely to the answer. He asks again, Can the man that does not believe enter into the kingdom of God? No, sir; *he that believeth not shall be damned*. Will you give us the text that says *he that is not immersed shall be damned*? Again he asks, Have you any grace to preach that will save a man *in unbelief*, or *without faith*? No, sir, the grace of God saves him *from unbelief*, and makes him a believer in Christ, a true penitent before God, and willing to obey Jesus. Does faith save the sinner in his sins? Does repent-

ance save him in his sins? Does baptism save him in his sins? You argue, sir, that the act of pardon is after these, that baptism is the last step into the house, that the blood of Christ, and the life of Christ, and the Holy Spirit are in the body which the sinner enters by baptism; therefore, if there be any salvation by faith, it is a salvation in sins. Faith itself becomes a dead work, the act of a sinner dead in sins. Will you tell us how a man believes in that to which he is dead? Is a believer in Christ dead to Christ till after he is baptized? Has not the gentleman found a wonder to all revelation? A dead believer in Jesus! God's word tells us of *living* and *believing* in Jesus, that the believer shall never die, that they have passed from *death* to *life*, and have *eternal life* who believe on Jesus; but it remained for Mr. Franklin, in the nineteenth century, to make known the startling news that a believer in Christ is dead in sins till after he is baptized! I notified you while we were discussing the subject of the quickening of the sinner into new life, that he would eventually land where he has, and find the quickening power in the last act of an alien sinner by which he becomes a child of God. And now to prove that a believer before baptism is dead in sins, and out of Christ, and an alien to God, my friend cites the fact that the Baptist Church will not take them into the Church without immersion. His logic is wonderful indeed! Those who do not enter the Church by baptism, God will not permit to enter the spiritual kingdom. The rule given the Church by which to receive members is the same rule that God observes in receiving souls into fellowship and sonship to him in spirit.

I now come to consider the birth of water and the Spirit. On this point my friend wishes Abraham and all the prophets and saints who lived before John the Baptist to be left out of view. His theory does not embrace them; it was not born in their time. In fact, the gentleman tells us in a former speech that the keys of the kingdom of God were first

used on the day of Pentecost, and the first persons entered it on that occasion. Whose kingdom did Abraham and the prophets belong to? Why should Jesus say that certain ones should sit down with Abraham in the kingdom of God, when the key of which Mr. Franklin speaks forever locks him out? For if the birth of water and the Spirit refers to baptism, then Abraham has never entered that kingdom. I say, therefore, fearless of successful opposition, that the water and Spirit of which we are born into the spiritual kingdom of God is identical with that of which Abraham and the prophets were born into the same kingdom. This birth and this kingdom are the same in spirit and in power in all ages of the world. Represented, it is true, by different elements and different figures, in different dispensations, but the same substance was by all of them represented. It was a revelation of the blood of Christ the cleansing power, and the Spirit of Christ the life-giving power. Jesus calls this a birth of water and the Spirit; Paul calls it washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior. (Titus iii. 5, 6.) There is therefore a power that spiritually purifies us from our sins; which is called water. It is not baptism, or temporal water—1st. Because baptism is a figure of this salvation or water. Now, a figure is one thing, and that of which it is a figure is another thing. Baptism, or temporal water is not therefore the water of which it is a figure. 2d. Because the water which Jesus gives us, and which is living water, *is in us*, and not external to us. John iv. 10, 14: "Thou wouldst have asked him, and he would have given thee *living water*." "But the water that I shall give him shall be *in him* a well of water, *springing up into everlasting life*." Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within

you." Rom. ii. 29: "But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."

We know there is an inward grace, Christ in us the hope of glory; and all the external services, ordinances or forms commanded of God since the world began are but figures representing the purging away of sins, the washing away of sins, the remission of sins, through Christ. His blood is the only fountain, his Spirit the only power, by which sinners are made clean before God, and live forevermore. But Mr. Franklin says that our Lord meant baptism when he said *born of water*. How does he propose to prove what he says? By showing that baptism is called a birth? No—he can find no such showing in the word of God. But he goes to the Episcopal Prayer-Book, the Methodist Discipline and the Presbyterian Confession of Faith. How much confidence has he in these witnesses? Has he forgotten his comments, not many years since, on this same Confession of Faith? How many hard charges has he made on said Discipline! And the Prayer-Book has, perhaps, fared no better than the others. But now, just now, they have become his consulted oracles. No, my dear sir; you must prove your proposition by the word of God, or fail to prove it at all. You have tried in vain to find a proof in God's word, and therefore have to fail.

He says he does not, *of course*, intend to say that our Lord did not administer the gospel legitimately. But Jesus pardoned sins without baptism. Therefore baptism as commanded by Christ is not in order to remission of past sins. But, to leave a place to creep out at, my friend goes on to speak immediately of *extreme or exceptional* cases. Will he give us some of these cases?

I found the analogy between circumcision and baptism in several particulars. I will name one: The sign of circumcision was a seal, or visible mark, of heirship through

faith. Baptism is an external seal, or sign, of heirship by faith.

Peter said to those who were Jews inwardly, pierced in heart, the promise is unto you, and your children, and all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And again, "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." (Acts ii. 39; iii. 25.) And yet the persons thus addressed were not as yet baptized. Why were they, whom he calls children of the prophets and of the covenant, commanded to be baptized in the name of Jesus *for the remission of sins*, to be converted that their *sins might be blotted out*? Were their sins not blotted out by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, the blood of the covenant in which thy were heirs, and inherited the blessing? I answer yes. And that is just the reason why they were baptized in the name of Christ *for the remission of sins*. Not in order to the remission of past sins, thus putting their acts in the place of the blood of Christ, and rendering the blood of Jesus, dependent as to any benefit, on the act of man, but *for* or because of the remission of sins through the blood of Christ. But he asks, "Why go back to Abraham for baptism? *There was no baptism then.*" No, sir; but there was a gospel then preached unto Abraham; there was a covenant then to Abraham and his seed. The promises of that covenant are yea and amen in Christ. Remission of sins and life eternal are the blessings of that covenant which have come upon us through Christ. Abraham is set forth as the father of all them that believe, and occupies a conspicuous place throughout the Scriptures as an heir of God by faith in Christ, and not because of baptism, circumcision or any other service by him rendered. "*But there was no baptism then,*" and there is no baptism now to make us heirs of that covenant that pardoned Abraham's

sins through the blood of Jesus. But Mr. Franklin says the gospel preached to Abraham was such a gospel as I never preached in my life. Well, I have to say in reply that it is just the gospel that I preach, and love above all other systems. If I am so happy when I quit this flesh as to live among the glorified, I shall sing on to all eternity the sweet song of salvation through the blood of Christ. But as long as Mr. Franklin continues to sneer at grace, and talk about terms, conditions and alien sinners, free-will and power, you will judge that he never preaches this gospel. A man that denies that Abraham was born of water and the Spirit has no use for the gospel preached to Abraham. He says, my way to God is as dark as Egypt. I hold that Jesus is the only way. He thinks that is awful dark. Baptism suits him much better. Anything to keep Christ and his grace in the background suits him well.

But the *little criticism* that he says I made on the words of Ananias, which he says is "decidedly weak." I did not criticise Ananias at all. I simply criticised the *decidedly weak* and perverse application he made of Ananias' words. He put words in Saul's mouth not by him uttered, construes the answer of Christ so as to suit the case thus set up, and then construes the words of Ananias to Saul so as to finish up the case to order, and makes his final conclusion that *Saul* actually and spiritually washed away his sins. And then he asks the sage question, Would Jesus have washed away his sins if he had not been baptized? Is it not very *little work* to accuse me of criticising Ananias when I expose Franklin's perversions? He will certainly make but a poor support for his proposition if he has to resort to such a course as this. I did not ridicule Ananias' words, but the ridiculous application he made of them. I have read of those "who washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Rev. vii. 14. I have also read that the Lamb's wife was granted that she should

be arrayed in fine linen *clean and white*: for the fine line is the righteousness of saints. Rev. xix. 8 From which I learn that we are sanctified, justified and washed by the Spirit of God and in the name of Jesus. And thus through his blood we wash our robes, or our service to God, in the blood of the Lamb. Saul washed away his sins in this sense; his obedience was right, or righteous through the blood of the Lamb. Had he not been purged by that blood in his conscience he could not have washed away his sins ceremonially. But the idea of the water washing away his sins really and spiritually has no foundation in the word of God. The remission of sins is always attributed to the blood of Christ. The figure of that gracious work is presented in baptism. I have already observed the figure is not the remission, neither is the remission the figure. Each is put in its proper place. In the one we have the obedience of Christ for us. In the other we have our obedience through Christ.

Mr. Franklin tells us that if I had required it he would have proven that salvation is by *grace, through the blood of Christ*. I did not require it of him. I prefer the proof should come from another source. A man who in one breath will say it is all of grace, and in the next breath say that only part of it is of grace, and in the next breath say it all turns on what alien sinners do, can prove nothing save his own inconsistency. He says it is of grace, etc, *but it is not of grace*. It is of grace, *but* the seeker is required to be baptized into Christ. *He that is not baptized shall be damned*. Please, sir, show us these words in the Bible. Here he says I strand off from the Bible. Show us, sir, from the Bible that the unbaptized are damned. We agree that the unbeliever is damned. The Bible teaches it. But, sir, you know that faith on the one hand and unbelief on the other hand are the tests set up in the Bible to distinguish the justified on the one hand, and the condemned on the

other. The one has eternal life, the other shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. (John iii. 36) The one is of God, the other is not of God. (John viii. 47.) The one are the children of God, and blessed with faithful Abraham; the other is none of his. We now have the Bible doctrine of pardon of sins, remission of sins, justification from sin, clearly before us. Rom. iii. 24-26: "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation *through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.*" "To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the *justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.*" Does this covenant of justification *through faith* belong to the Jews only? No; but to the Gentiles also. Rom. iii. 30: "Seeing it is one God, which shall *justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith.*"

The promise of this covenant was that in Christ (the seed) shall *all* nations be blessed. The extent of this promise is not bounded by national lines; it is to all in every nation that the Lord our God shall call, even, just even, that number. Acts ii. 39. To whom is this promise given? To all them that believe. Gal. iii. 14. 22: "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith.*" "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise *by faith of Jesus Christ* should be given to *them that believe.*" See also the 26th verse: "For ye are all the children of God *by faith in Jesus Christ.*" To the children of the prophets, the called of God, the believers in Christ, was the promise preached and applied by Christ and by his apostles; and they called them children, heirs, sons, and justified without reference to baptism, and before they were baptized;

they rested their sonship, heirship and justification through the faith of the Son of God. Our Savior says, John iii. 18, 36, "He that believeth on *him* is not condemned." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Peter preached the same doctrine, Acts x. 43: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name *whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.*" Paul preached the same doctrine, Acts xiii 36, 39: "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." "And by him *all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.*"

This is the gospel of God as given by himself to the prophets, and through them to the Israelites. Jesus preached the same gospel that the prophets preached. He commanded his apostles to preach the same gospel. The field of their preaching was not to the Jews alone, but to the Gentiles also. Gal. v. 6: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but *faith which worketh by love.*" They preached the same gospel in all the world that God preached to Abraham. Wherever and whenever, in every age and among all people, whether by God himself or his servants, the gospel has been preached, it is the same gospel of the grace of God. The remission of sins as set forth in that gospel to the heirs of promise in all ages is according to the riches of God's grace and received and enjoyed by faith in Christ Jesus. Rom. iv. 16: "Therefore it is of *faith*, that it might be *by grace*; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed." The covenant promise, "their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more," was confirmed to Abraham by the oath of God, and can not be annulled or added to. It is, therefore, immutable. Our Lord did not add to it. He distinguished the heirs of God by the same grace that had distinguished them in former ages, recognizing the believers

as the heirs of God and the unbeliever as condemned. The body of believers be constituted together into a new congregation, with new services and ordinances peculiar to the dispensation, different from the former constituted congregation and their ordinances and services, but sustaining the same relation to God in the eternal covenant as the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

This new congregation is called the Church of Christ, because the congregational laws and ordinances are given to it by Christ, its Lawgiver and Head. It is only in this congregational relation that the Church set up by Christ and perpetuated till the present time differs from the heirs of promise under the preceding dispensations. The ordinances and services given to believers by Christ differ in form from those given in preceding dispensations, but are the same in significance. Abel, Noah, Abraham, Moses and the prophets, in all the ordinances by them obeyed, or commanded from God to be given to his people, taught by figure or form the taking of life or shedding of blood for sin. The ordinances of Jesus given to the Church teach the same in a different form but the same fact. The fact is, "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." (Heb. ix. 22.) Here the family of God all come together; their services all unite in the one great truth signified, or figuratively set forth by them all, *remission of sins through the blood of Christ.* Their faith is all one, even the faith of God's elect, the faith of Abraham. And that one faith in all, faith in Christ Jesus, is visibly expressed by the services which they render in each dispensation. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the peculiar ordinances given to believers by Christ. The first, or baptism, is the introductory ordinance by which believers take upon them the name of Christ in a congregation or church relation, and by which they visibly set forth in figure, death, burial and resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4: "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."

This ordinance is *for* the remission of sins. Not to put away sins in a personal or real sense, but in form, in figure, in visible representation of that great gracious truth, the remission of sins through the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus. Here is an act performed because our sins are washed away in the blood of Christ. It is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. It is not to make us sons of God, neither in covenant nor in spirit, but an act by which we become sons of God in the church relation. Like all ordinances, it is an outward form. But where is the substance, the power, the salvation, of which it is the form? It is in the believer, the hope of glory, Christ in you. Without this grace, this life, this spirit, in us, we are reprobates, aliens, dead in sins, and baptism or any other form is of no avail.

The second ordinance, the Lord's Supper, is like baptism in significance. It represents visibly the broken body and shed blood of Jesus. John vi. 53: "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" Why does not the gentleman tell us that no man has life till he eats the Lord's Supper? Because the Supper is only a visible memorial of the body and blood of Christ, to be taken by those who by faith live upon the substance, not the form. Certainly. And it is in the same sense that we are baptized for the remission of sins, and wash away our sins. But Mr. Franklin raises up his hands in holy horror because a church should recognize the congregational law that baptized persons *only* shall sit at the Lord's table in the church and will admit no others. He says we make more of baptism than the Lord does. He is mistaken in this. We just

make the same of it that the Lord does. He gave it as an ordinance to enter the visible Church, and not to make us spiritually children; not to take us to heaven. It relates only to the church relation. Therefore only in that relation does it have anything to do with our fellowship. Our Lord pardoned sins and gave gracious promises to the unbaptized. And there are before me to-day many whose names are in the Book of Life, I have no doubt, that were never immersed in water. I now ask in the name of truth, if all ordinances are figures of the invisible and spiritual, and certainly we can not doubt it, did not our Savior point to spiritual power, spiritual water, when he spoke of living waters in us springing up into eternal life? To be born of such water and the Spirit is to be made partakers of the divine, and not the earthy. To be washed in such a fountain is to be made clean indeed; and being renewed by the Holy Ghost we are saved according to his mercy. If my friend wishes the outward figure alone he may have it thus, and condemn all the holy prophets and saints because they had not his form. But may God grant us the same inward grace by these holy men enjoyed; and by which they were the sons of God in spirit, and we will willingly obey our forms of service in full fellowship with them in the one great truth taught by all ordained forms, salvation by the blood of Jesus.

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—My worthy friend has emphasized the word grace till he can give it no more force in that way, and, to give us a little relief and variation, he now styles it "inward grace." That of course makes it much more sacred, and makes the argument much stronger. *Inward* grace is certainly stronger

than simply *grace*, or the *grace of God*, or the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. But this "inward grace" is what annoys me and makes me so sore, he thinks, and I refer to it with an "emphasized sneer." I am not conscious of any soreness, nor do I refer to the grace of God with a sneer, but his ridiculous use of the word *grace* and repetition of it, and his improvement, *inward grace*, I can not seriously respect as argument. If he has not learned from previous parts of this debate, if he did not know it before that I receive the grace of God as much as he and award to it as much, refer to it with as much gravity, reverence and dignity, it is useless for me to try to teach him any truth. No matter how often his groundless statements are refuted, he continues to repeat them as if they were oracles.

I know not how many times I have stated that there is no dispute about *grace*, or our salvation being *by grace*, and that not of ourselves; it is the gift of God. I am as fully sensible as he can be that not only pardon is by grace, but the entire system of redemption is by grace. Baptism itself is of grace, and would be the empty and unmeaning form he makes it, were it not for the grace of God and the blood of Christ. But the difference between him and myself is that he can not tell a living man how to obtain the grace of which he talks; how to come to it, get into it, or get it into him. The whole matter is as dark as Egypt. He can not tell "if his salvation depends on it, how any man can get this *inward grace*; how he gets it *into him*, so as to make it *inward*, or how to get the benefits or the saving efficacy of it. No, sir; there he stands talking about grace; *inward grace*; that it is not of works; that it is the gift of God; but not a man here can tell, from all he has said, how to come to this *inward grace*, obtain it, or the salvation which is by grace through faith and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. He can not tell any man *what to do*. He is good on negatives—that is, telling men what they

can not do, and when he is done with it, and the sum is worked out it amounts to this: they can not do *anything*. They are not free; not accountable; not to blame. The reason they do not believe is that the Lord does not *work in them* to believe; the reason they do not repent is that the Lord does not *work in them* to repent, and the only reason they are not, in all respects, what they ought to be, is that the Lord does not *work in them*, give them the *inward grace* and make them what they ought to be. If they die in their sins and go to perdition, the reason is simply that God did not *work in them* and save them. This is the system he has the glory to advocate.

I stand on different ground. I have the grace of God; all the grace he knows anything about and make as much of it as he does. Not a soul of us could be saved without it. Salvation is by grace through faith, and not of ourselves; not of works of righteousness which we have done, and I can show a man how to come to this grace, obtain it, or the salvation which it brings. I do this by going to the apostles and following them under the last commission, to where sinners inquired of them, "What shall we do?" and hear them answer, telling them *what to do*, and find the demonstration, they can do something in their *doing* what they were commanded. In this way the apostles showed them *how to come*, what to do to obtain the salvation by grace. This is precisely what my friend does not do.

To whom did Paul say, "Work out your own salvation?" Was it sinners? No. To whom did he say, "It is God who works in you?" To alien sinners? Not a bit of it. But to saints in Thessalonica and Ephesus, he said, "It is God that works in you." He was not working in them to *make them* Christians. They were already Christians, and commanded them to "work out" their own salvation. God "worked in them to will and to do," by the exhortations, entreaties and persuasions of holy men; by the warnings,

promises and threatenings of the gospel; by the exceeding great and precious promises, the grand expectancies and anticipations of the future. "Knowing the terror of the Lord," Paul says, "we persuade men." But all this has nothing to do with the question we are now discussing. I will give my friend his full satisfaction on this, when he gets on to his last proposition, in which he virtually affirms his old theory of final perseverance of saints.

My friend owns that he *does work*, but thinks it is not him, but the grace of God working in him. One part of this all present can testify, that is, that *he works*. He can not say of this debate, "It is not of works lest any man should boast," for it is, on his part, all *of works*. But as to the grace of God, working all this in him, there is reason to doubt. The grace of God was in our Lord, when he said, "He who believes and is immersed shall be saved," and the same grace of God can not now be in him, and working in him to evade the force of this clear language and try, as he does, to get round it. The grace of God does not teach men, nor in any other way work in them to try and get rid of the force of what the grace of God did teach in the lips of Jesus. The grace of God and the inspiring Spirit of God moved Peter, and worked in him to say, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," and the grace of God does not now work in my friend to oppose this. It is another spirit and not the grace of God at all that is working in him. It is all *of works* and not *of grace* at all.

The gentleman is wide of the mark when he speaks of "flings at the Baptists." He can not produce a fling at the Baptists in anything I have said. I have shown that the Baptist Church, according to his view of it, is closer than heaven itself, for he maintains that persons can enter heaven without baptism, but admits that they can not enter the Baptist Church without baptism. According to his own

teaching he makes more of baptism than the Lord does, for he claims that the Lord will receive persons without baptism, but he will not. The grace of God in our Lord, he will have it, receives persons without baptism, but the "*inward grace*" working in him will not receive a soul into the Church without baptism. If the grace of God, yes, the "*inward grace*," is in the Baptist Church, no man can get it without baptism. If the salvation by grace through faith, which is not of works, is in the Baptist Church, not a soul can get it without baptism, for not a soul can get into the Baptist Church without baptism. In this matter I am trying to help him by showing that, though the Baptist Church is not the Church or body of Christ, it is *like it* in one particular—that baptism is its initiatory rite; that members enter by baptism and can not get into it without baptism. But he will not agree even to this. While he admits that no one can enter the Baptist Church without baptism; that no one can have Baptist fellowship without baptism; that no one can have Baptist communion without baptism, and that he will receive no one, commune with no one and fellowship no one without baptism, he persists in maintaining that persons enter into Christ, into the kingdom of God, the Church of God or the body of Christ without baptism; that they can have the fellowship of the people of God, commune with the saints and be received into the Church of God without baptism; that they can have the fellowship of the Father, of the Son and of the Spirit without baptism. I am sorry that I can not convince him that the body of Christ, or the kingdom of God, is *like the Baptist Church* in these points, but he persists in maintaining that the kingdom of God is not like the Baptist Church. I admit that it is not like it in many particulars, but in the points specified *it is like it*.

But I must explain how it is that salvation is ascribed to different things. When grace is the theme of the writer or

speaker and he has in view what grace does and is treating of its work, he ascribes salvation to grace, in view of its work, but at the same time says it is *through faith*, and, of course, not of grace *alone*, or *grace without faith*. There is no grace that will save a man without faith, or without the blood of Christ; yet salvation by grace *alone* would be without the blood of Christ or faith. In the same way, when faith is the theme, and the speaker or writer is treating faith, with a view to the part it performs in the work of saving the sinner, he ascribes salvation to faith, but not *faith alone*, for that would be faith without grace and without the blood of Christ, and there is no faith that will save a man without the blood of Christ or the grace of God. In the same way, we are said to be justified by his blood; but this is said when the blood of Christ is the theme, and in view of the part it performs in the justification of the sinner, and not the blood of Christ *alone*, for this would be his blood without faith or grace, and there is no blood of Christ that will save any man without the grace of God and faith. When we are said to be justified by works another feature is brought into view. It is not in the same sense, or in view of the same part of the work in justifying or saving a man. It is in view of the human part, or what man is required to do himself in order to his justification. The same is true of the words of Peter, "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." That which he intended them to do to *save themselves* did not interfere with the grace of God, the blood of Christ, but it was to believe on Christ, repent, confess him and be baptized, as the appointment of God on the part of men, that they might be saved or pardoned by the grace of God and the blood of Christ.

When the apostle says, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now *save us*," he does not put baptism in the place of the blood of Christ, the grace of God, or faith, or interfere with either of these, or salvation without each

of these, but associates baptism with the salvation of the sinner, when he is saved by grace through faith and the blood of Christ. The grace and the blood of Christ are the *efficacious cause* that saves the sinner. The faith, repentance, confession and baptism are the *submissive* and *receiving* part. The divine part, or the part on the side of heaven, the efficacious part, is the *giving* part, or the part that *bestows*. The part on the side of man is the *receiving part*, in acts of *submission*, in the faith, repentance, confession and immersion. The only sense in which man *saves himself* is in these acts of submission or obedience, in which God has divinely appointed, by his grace and through the blood of Christ, to save his soul from sin. In these acts of obedience he *receives* and God *gives* salvation, justification. God *gives* it by grace and through the blood of Christ, and the sinner *receives* it by *grace* and through the *blood of Christ*.

Of all the absurd theories advocated by any man, the theory of the worthy gentleman that God, by his grace, regenerates men in unbelief, and then commands them to believe as the "delightful service" of a regenerated person, is the most absurd and ridiculous. This giant absurdity leads him to maintain that the Pentecostians were already regenerated when Peter said to them: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Singular idea that they were regenerated, pardoned, had the miraculous power in them; the "*inward* grace," as my friend would say, and the remission of sins! Yet Peter told them what to do "for the remission of sins," and promised them that they should receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. The same absurdity has led him to maintain that Saul was regenerated and already pardoned when Ananias said to him: "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Strange, too, that he should be told what to do to *wash away his*

sins, if already regenerated, pardoned. The case does not strike my mind in that way. He inquired of the Lord: "What wilt thou have me to do?" The Lord did not tell him, You can not do anything. Not a word of it; but said: "Go to Damascus and there it shall be told thee what thou must do." The Lord then sent Ananias to him to tell him what he *must do*. What did he tell him he *must do*? That he must tell an experience? Not a bit of it. That, as a pardoned man, he must now be baptized into the Baptist Church? Not a word of it. There was not a Baptist Church in the world for more than a thousand years after that. Did he command him to be baptized as a "delightful service," the "duty of a Christian?" By no means. If it had been a "Christian duty," then there is no man can give a reason for its only being performed *but once*. All items of the practice of a Christian are repeated and continued. But baptism is performed but once. The reason is that it stands before the world, the divine appointment in which God, by his grace, through faith and by the blood of Christ, cleanses us from sin on our entrance into the kingdom of God. It is not a mere ceremony of induction into the Baptist Church, nor a mere sign, or an "outward sign of inward grace," but God's appointment, in which we are "baptized into one body," "baptized into Christ," "baptized into his death," where we come to his blood, are baptized "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," "born of water and of the Spirit," and enter into the kingdom of God. We enter "into Christ," "into one body," "into his death," "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," "into the kingdom of God," but once, and baptism, being connected with this *one* entrance, is to be performed *but once*.

The same absurdity leads the gentleman to the groundless conclusion that the jailer was regenerated before Paul

commanded him to "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," and promised him that he should be saved. Strange regeneration, this that he had, in *unbelief* and before he was *saved*! Strange command this, to a regenerated man, to "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," and a strange promise to a regenerated man, that he should be *saved*! A wonderful regeneration, this, that takes place in a sinner before faith, or without faith, or repentance, in which man has no more volition than a block of marble! This is "confusion worse confounded."

But before I sit down I must give a little attention to the gentleman's speech, or he will think I am not paying him due respect. Our Lord did not use the words "refuse to be baptized." These are our own words that we have used in talking about the case the Lord mentions. His words are, "You rejected the counsel of God against yourselves, not being baptized by John." The simple charge against them is, "*not being baptized by John.*" John was the *lesser* and Christ the *greater*. If they rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not *being baptized by John*, or by the lesser, what of him who is not baptized by Christ, the greater; or, which is the same, by his authority? Certainly the offense is no less, in "not being baptized" by Christ, or by his command, than in "not being baptized by John." Will a man be saved who "rejects the counsel of God against himself?"

When Ananias was sent to Saul to tell him what he *must do*, he told him to be baptized. Would he have been saved if he had not done what the Lord said he *must do*? Come, my dear sir; if you intend to teach that men may disobey God and still be saved, let us hear it. What does he mean when he talks of "*immersed in water*?" When he immerses does he not immerse *in water*? Why, then, does he add the words, "*in water*?" Is he turning Pedobaptist, or Quaker, or what? I am afraid I shall run

clear out of the Baptist Church. He is getting to have a wonderful affection for the Pedobaptists. Wonder how long it will last? I would be pleased to see one at the close of the debate come to him to join the Baptist Church without baptism, and hear him explain to him how *it is not essential* and how *it is essential* to entrance into the Baptist Church; and I should like to see some of these Pedobaptists to whom he is making love, come forward to commune with him. He would turn them over to the "uncovenanted mercies," and invite them not to come up here and commune with us who have been "immersed in water." True, he could say, I esteem you as Christians, and believe you have fellowship with the Father and with the Son, and I have many kind words to say to you *in debate*, but you can stand off there, and not presume to commune *with us*. We believe you have experienced a work of grace, and that the Lord has received you, but we can not unless you will be "immersed in water." True, when I have my coat on one side out, I am almost one with you, and want your tender sympathies, specially when I am debating on baptism with those whom I regard as the "worst of idolaters," but when it comes to fellowship, commune with, or receive into the Church Pedobaptists, they must be "immersed in water!" They can not get into our Church without this, no matter how much *inward* grace they have. This is his love for the Pedobaptists.

He will receive none into the Church without immersion, neither will I, nor did the apostles. The reason is that they can not enter into the kingdom of God unless "born of water and of the Spirit," "baptized into one body," "baptized into Christ," "baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," "baptized into his death." All, in the time of the apostles, were immersed that were in the kingdom, or the Church. The mercies in Christ were *covenanted*, and outside *uncovenanted*.

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S THIRD ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators: Respected Audience:—We have before us a proposition of sufficient importance to demand at our hands a careful and earnest investigation. But if the last speech of Mr. Franklin is to be our guide in this discussion, the proposition will have little attention given to it. His speech is a conglomeration of anything and everything that would fill up time and hide his real sentiment from the people. He tries to patch up his failure on the first proposition, by a denial of his having derided *grace*. But his speeches are before you, and while he has asserted again and again that it is all of grace, and through the blood of Christ, he has as often asserted in the next sentences the whole to be of man free from any grace or blood of Christ either. His assertions can only convey to us his most profound contempt for grace, so long as he follows them with his denial. He talks about grace saving the sinner. How does grace save them? By giving them the privilege of saving themselves! His theory of grace is that it gives the sinner liberty to go to heaven or hell on the merit or demerit of their own acts; and, therefore, God is just as much the cause of the damnation of sinners as he is of the salvation of saints! But he says, *I can not tell a living man how to obtain the grace*. Look at that sentence seriously. What does it teach? We shall see soon. But the term *inward grace* is an improvement on *grace*, or the *grace of God*. Not at all, my dear sir; grace can not be improved upon. "But if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." "He shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth *in you*." Can you see the power, sir, that worketh *in them*? No, you can not see it; it would spoil your theory, and refute your argument to admit a power for good in man by the indwelling Spirit of Christ. Therefore, to deny the work of the Spirit, you attribute

this power in man to the *warnings, promises and threatening of the gospel*. But he says, I can not tell how the *sinner gets this grace into him*. My answer to these absurd declarations is, God gets it there, and not the sinner. "God begins the work (Pfil. i. 6), and will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." But he says, I will not tell them what to do to get grace. No; nor does God tell them what to do to get grace. Grace is not the doing of man, but the doing of God. I therefore tell the sinner of God's work that saves the lost. But Mr. Franklin says, if God saves the lost, then if any are lost, it is because God does not save them. But are they not justly condemned because of sin? If not, they never will be condemned, because God is just. But if God saves the lost, it by no means removes the responsibilities of the condemned.

But now let us see the ground upon which Mr. Franklin stands. 1. "Not a soul of us could be saved without the grace of God." That is a good sentence, but I fear it is spoken for a purpose of perversion. Let us follow the gentleman only a few sentences further on in his speech, and he tells us that the apostles told them what to do to obtain salvation by grace. He has not found a text in the word of God that sustains any such assertion, and yet he repeats it, as though his assertion was conclusive proof. But he says the body of Christ is like the Baptist Church, because the Baptist Church will not take persons into it who are not immersed. I suppose that is the reason the gentleman prefers to talk about the Baptist Church, rather than the gospel which God preached to Abraham. Abraham was justified by faith, and was not baptized, and so Mr. Franklin will not fellowship him as an heir of God. And although God made oath to Abraham that he would bless him, he not being baptized in water, is to-day with the rich man in hell, according to Mr. Franklin's theory. And God himself did not legitimately administer the gospel, according

to Mr. Franklin when he promised and swore to Abraham that he would bless him and all nations in Christ. According to the gentleman, Jesus perverted the gospel when he said of the publican (Luke xviii. 14), "he went down to his house justified." That he perverted the gospel when he said to the penitent thief (Luke xxiii. 43): "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." And on other occasions, when he said: "Thy sins be forgiven thee." (Matt. ix. 2. Luke vii. 48.) That Paul perverted the gospel, and violated the commission, when he said (Acts xiii. 38 39): "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that *through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins*. And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." That Peter was guilty of a giant absurdity when he said (Acts x. 43): "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, *whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins*." And especially in the words (47th verse), "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Mr. Franklin thinks Peter guilty of an awfully ridiculous idea, to teach that unbaptized persons, and, according to his theory, unregenerate, had received the Holy Ghost as well as those of the Jews who had been baptized. But if he will look back a little in the record, he will learn that God had cleansed this man in that fountain that cleanseth from all sin.

But Mr. Franklin wishes to explain to us how salvation is ascribed to different things. When the theme of the writer is grace, salvation is by grace; when it is faith that is spoken of, salvation is of faith; when the blood of Christ is spoken of, we are said to be justified by his blood; when works are spoken of as a ground of justification, we are justified by works! "Hold!" says Mr. Franklin, "justification by works is not in the same sense as justification by

the blood of Christ." True, it is not; and you have only caught yourself, and exposed your folly, by the attempt you have made to explain, as just given. Salvation from a state of death in sins is ascribed to the blood of Christ, as the purging or cleansing power, and to the Spirit of Christ as the life-giving power. Christ, therefore, in his fullness, as the cleanser and vivifier, is the grace of God by which we are saved. Faith, the fruit of his Spirit, is the evidence of our heirship of this grace, and distinguishes us as the children of God.

But now permit me to lift the veil from off the gentleman's system, and expose it as it is. Faith, repentance and baptism are three steps which the sinner takes before he enters the "body of Christ," or Christ himself, or the virtue of his life, his death, his blood, his resurrection, his Spirit, his mediation. What do these three steps save us from before we come to the grace of God? Faith saves us from unbelief, repentance saves us from the love and practice of sin, and baptism washes our sins away, and cleanses us from every spot or wrinkle or any such thing. This is his theory. If it be true, what do the life of Christ, the death of Christ, the blood of Christ, the Spirit of Christ, or the mediation of Christ save us from? It being after salvation from unbelief, impenitence, disobedience and sin, I insist that Elder Franklin shall tell us what Jesus can do for us to better our state, or what remains from which he saves us. I need not repeat to you that Christ has no place in his theory, and he is named simply to take away the reproach. The founder of this theory says: "So when a person becomes Christ's he is a son of Abraham, an heir, a brother, or is pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, saved." "To be *in* Christ, then, is to stand in these new relations to God, angels and men; to be out of him, or not under his mediatorship or government, is to be in or under Adam only. It is to be in what is called 'the

state of nature,' unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, and an 'alien' from the family of God, lost in trespasses and sins."—*Christian System*, page 188. Baptism is declared to be that act by which this change of relation to God, angels and men is effected. Therefore all unbaptized persons are in a "state of nature," unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, and aliens from the family of God, lost in trespasses and sins.

Mr. Franklin fully indorses this doctrine, making the act of an alien in baptism produce regeneration, the new birth, pardon, justification, sanctification, and heirship to, and entrance into the kingdom of God. He does not agree with the father of his theory with reference to being the children of Abraham. Abraham is not reckoned among the regenerated, born, pardoned, justified, etc., he never having been immersed in water. The prophets, too, all died without regeneration, or the birth of water and the Spirit, or pardon, or justification, or sanctification, or an entrance into the kingdom of God. In a word, all who lived on earth for four thousand years of time died unregenerate, without being born of God, unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, lost in sins according to this theory. And since the keys which open the kingdom were first used, as Mr. Franklin says, by Peter on the day of Pentecost, not one in ten of the race have been immersed in water. Therefore nine-tenths of the race since then have died unregenerate, without the new birth, or pardon, or justification, or sanctification—lost in sins. And if we may speak comparatively, worse still, the little children whom Jesus was wont to bless while here, all die out of Christ, without reaching his life, his death, his blood, his resurrection, the only way to them being baptism in water. Mr. Franklin's logic is, if the modern self-styled Christians will not take infant children into their Church, God will not take them into communion with himself, or their angels

who behold his face. If Mr. Franklin only succeeds on the last proposition to prove that the few immersed fall from grace and are finally lost, he will have Universalism reversed, and the entire race lost eternally.

But while my friend is not at all startled at all this, one thing to him appears awfully absurd. It is that God regenerates unbelievers. That he quickens sinners who were dead in sins. That he creates them new creatures in Christ Jesus, and that as new creatures they are his workmanship and not their own. Oh, this is terrible indeed! And that I should believe Peter to speak truly when he designates those at Pentecost as the called of God, and children of the promise; and those at Solomon's porch, as children of the prophets and of the covenant before they were baptized in water. And that they should be commanded to be baptized in the name of Jesus, because their sins were pardoned. But sad as it may be to my friend, I must still believe the word of inspiration, and call them children before they are baptized. I defy Mr. Franklin to point out one case in the Bible where the promise of God is applied to an unregenerate man. Peter says it is to "even as many as the Lord our God shall call." So in the case of Saul; he always refers to his call by Christ while he was on his way to Damascus, as that by which he enjoyed pardon and sonship, and not what he did himself in being baptized in water. But why do I say immersed in water? Am I turning Quaker or Pedobaptist? No, I am neither. But my Bible talks about baptism in the Holy Ghost and fire. I wish simply to keep in view the baptism by which Mr. Franklin tries to exclude Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the prophets, the Pedobaptists, the Quakers and infant children from the kingdom of God. It is literal water baptism. It sounds rather amusing to hear Mr. Franklin talk of the age of the Baptist Church. Mr. Campbell, the author and founder of the Church to which Mr. Franklin

belongs, was a Baptist before the thought of his Church ever entered his brain. But we are not discussing the antiquity of churches, and Mr. Franklin's constant effort to bring these things before you but shows how weak his system is. The gentleman asks the question, "Will a man be saved who rejects the counsel of God against himself?" If the counsel be a command or condition on which God has suspended the man's salvation, I answer *no*. Will God pardon the sins of any man who is not immersed in water? Will you point out the text that says he that is not baptized shall be damned? I see many Pedobaptists before me, and have known many in my life whom I sincerely love as the children of God. But how long will it last, Mr. Franklin asks. I hope, sir, it will last forever. Would I take the Lord's Supper with them? No, sir. Why not? Because the law of Christ for the Church, as a congregation, does not recognize them as in that congregation.

Having noticed all the points of any note in his speech, in fact I have had to notice much that deserves no notice, being entirely foreign to the proposition, I shall occupy the remaining time of this speech in proof of the negative of this proposition. The Bible doctrine attributes the change of relation to God, angels and men to the quickening power of God, by Jesus Christ our Lord. Therefore, Paul in his letter to the Ephesians is particular to tell them the course which they were walking, and the relation they sustained to God till he quickened them with Christ, and saved them by his grace. Instead of their having taken the three steps, faith, repentance and obedience to bring them to Christ, they walked according to this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh, and of the mind, and were by nature the children of wrath even as others. But how was their state and relation changed?

Hear Paul tell it: "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), or as the margin reads, by whose grace ye are saved. The whole volume of God's word holds forth this same doctrine. Therefore did they preach Jesus the Savior. All the fullness of the divine power was by him. He is declared to be the wisdom of God and the power of God. Peter says, Acts iv. 12: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Again in Acts v. 32: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." Again in Acts x. 43: "To him give all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." In this last quotation the apostle derives the doctrine of remission of sins from the prophets. But the prophets taught no such thing as baptism in order to remission of sins. Therefore if the prophets spoke by the Spirit of God, and Peter accepted their testimony, the remission of sins was through his name to all that believe. Paul teaches the same doctrine. Acts xiii. 38, 39: "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things; from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Paul was here speaking to persons who were not baptized, and tells them by Christ all that believe are justified. He states the same doctrine in his letter to the Church at Rome. Rom. v. 1, 2: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Again, Rom. iv. 16: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to

the end the promise might be sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all." Paul shows here that Abraham was a father of many nations. The promised blessing was to all nations. But what constitutes us heirs? Faith in Jesus Christ. Who ever read in God's word that we are the children of God by baptism, heirs of the promise by baptism, justified by baptism? No such language is found in God's word. Peter once in his writing refers to baptism as saving us in a figurative sense, as the water saved the eight persons in the ark, which was in no sense in order to remission of sins. But the remission of sins is not a figurative work, but a real work. That which purges the conscience from dead works to serve the living God is the blood of Christ. There is no other cleansing power recognized in the plan of redemption. It is all in Christ. Faith has no other object to rest in. Here is the rock of salvation that God hath laid in Zion, elect, precious: he that believeth in him shall not be ashamed. He is the substance of all types set up in service to God, and by his commandment since the world began. The service of faith has ever, in all dispensations, presented a likeness of Christ in the visible forms of that service, whether individual or congregational.

The services or ordinances given by Jesus Christ to the Church do not vary in the least from this principle so clearly set forth in every age. In Rom. vi. 3, we are said to be baptized into Christ, or into his death. How does the apostle explain this? He tells us that it is in form or likeness. Verse 5: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." But why should baptism be a likeness of Christ's death? Because the death of Christ, his blood poured forth in death, purges us from sin and washes us from pollution, and by the power of an endless

life he is raised up to die no more, and raises us up from death by the same power. We have, therefore, salvation in Christ both in the sense of washing and also in the sense of resurrection to life eternal. Baptism is a likeness, or figure, or form, in both these senses. Water is a temporal purifier in which persons are washed, and also an element in which persons are buried, and from which they may be raised up again. Thus it becomes the visible form of entrance into Christ, and is therefore set as the initiatory ordinance to the congregation or church visible. It is no more in order to remission of sins than the Lord's Supper; nor are there any stronger terms employed in God's word to explain the design of baptism than there are to explain the design of the Lord's Supper. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28, our Lord says of the bread: "Take, eat; this is my body;" and of the cup, "Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Did Jesus mean that the bread used at the supper was his body literally or spiritually? Certainly not; but a likeness or figure of it. So with the cup; it was a likeness or figure of his blood. The terms "wash away thy sins," "baptized into Christ," or "into his death," etc., are no stronger, and are explained by the apostles to have reference to the likeness or figurative meaning of the ordinance. But when figures are not considered, but the substance of all these figures, Jesus Christ the Lord and Savior in the greatness and glory of his work in our salvation from sin and death, is considered, then the work is real. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done" (baptism or any other obedience), "but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior, that, being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." What is his grace by which we are justified? The

washing or cleansing of regeneration and renewing or new life of the Holy Ghost. This grace is of God, through Jesus Christ, to all and upon all them that believe. This is the righteousness to which all the prophets witnessed, and is the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ. (Rom. iii. 21, 22) No ordinance nor obedience on the part of man brings about this gracious state, but we are of God in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption, as it is written, "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." 1 Cor. i. 30, 31. "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood" (not baptism) "to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." Rom. iii. 24, 25. Heb. ix. 15: "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, *they which are called* might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Eph. i. 7: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, *the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace.*" Do you see the use I make of this grace of God? Mr. Franklin says it is ridiculous. Ridiculous for God to save sinners through Christ? It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Jesus saves the chief of them. In the foregoing Scriptures the covenant of God, executed and fulfilled by Christ as Mediator, gives remission of sins and eternal life to every heir of God. Christ as executor in behalf of the heirs has died and put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. His blood has been carried into heaven and presented before God, and God has accepted it, and exalted Jesus a Prince and Savior to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins. This the Holy Ghost is a witness and messenger of to us. Therefore Peter could not refuse bap-

tism to those who had received the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is a witness of the remission of our sins, and those who had received this witness Peter commanded to be baptized for, or because of the remission of sins.

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S CLOSING ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—I dislike mere *contradiction*. It is unpleasant and unworthy of an occasion like the present, and specially of the grave matters we have engaged to discuss. I have no objection to my worthy friend giving any opinion he may please of my speeches. This audience can see what is clear and intelligible, what they can understand and what they can not understand. But when he undertakes to tell what I have asserted I like to see it, at least, substantially correct. He says: "While he has asserted again and again that it is all of grace, and through the blood of Christ, he has as often asserted in the next sentences the whole to be of man, free from any grace, or blood of Christ." This latter part which he says I have "as often asserted," that the whole is "of man, free from any grace, or blood of Christ either," has not been asserted by me in any speech, nor anything of the same import. This any intelligent person who has heard me knows. I did hope that I should not be compelled squarely to deny any statement made by my friend, or that he would not have occasion to deny any statement made by me. How he could have heard my closing speech on the second proposition, and then utter such a statement as the one I have referred to, is hard to account for. I shall have to attribute it to his inability to take notes that he can read. He certainly would not jeopardize his honor as a Christian and a preacher by making such statements intentionally.

He says: "His theory of grace gives the sinner liberty to go to heaven or hell on the merit or demerit of their own acts." He can not meet my arguments *in my own words*, but he uses words never used by me. I have not at any time used the words "merit" or "demerit" as here ascribed to me. But I will simply dismiss all this, and if my friend is not satisfied with his effort on our second proposition and thinks he can improve any on it, and considers his attempt to reply to my arguments on the present question an utter failure, he can, if he is not under some inflexible fatality that will not let him do it, occupy his time in his closing speech in an effort to that end. This appears to be his style. In his closing speech on the first question, to which he knew I could make no reply, he told you that I *wrote the proposition*. The truth was simply that he wrote it himself, and that I prevailed on him to *change it a little*. This I mention now, not because it is of any serious importance to me, but to show his *manner of procedure*.

After his reference to the second proposition, and his effort to recover himself from his failures, he darts off to Abraham and represents me as dooming him to perdition because he was not baptized. Am I to take it seriously that my friend did not know that there was no argument in this? Is he so far from the enlightenment of the gospel as to believe this has any application to the question? If he is, I shall have to begin at more rudimental matters with him than I had supposed. Does he or any man here think that our proposition has anything to do with Abraham? To say that he thinks so is an impeachment of his intelligence. Does our proposition relate to those of the Patriarchal dispensation or the Jewish? Surely he knows it does not. Why, then, is he vaunting at this rate about Abraham? But now he is preaching that Abraham was justified *by faith*. When we were on the first question he

would no more admit faith was a condition of justification than baptism. The truth is, that he has no system, does not hold anything clear and intelligible. The whole affair is one grand muddle in his mind. He has no system of salvation for any man. He can not now in his closing speech tell a sinner how to come to God; how to get the benefit of the grace of God or the blood of Christ; how to obtain the remission of sins. That matter is all in the dark with him. The divine rite of baptism was not given to Abraham nor to any of the ancient worthies. It was not required of them. They were saved without it. We are not discussing an ordinance of the Patriarchal or the Mosaic institution, or an ordinance of any age before Christ, but an ordinance of the gospel of Christ, and the design of baptism is nothing only where the gospel of Christ is preached, received and obeyed. Where people do not receive the gospel, believe and obey it, baptism is nothing to them. They have no need to trouble themselves about baptism. Baptism would do them no good. They are not proper subjects. Our proposition has nothing to do with the design of baptism, only when properly administered to a proper subject. This is all we have to inquire into. Where the gospel is preached, received into a good and an honest heart, believed and obeyed, what is the *design of baptism*? It has no design in any other case, nor should it ever be administered in any other. Those who never hear the gospel, of course, have nothing to do with it, or any of its requirements. Those who hear it and do not receive it, of course, do not come under it and have nothing to do with any of its appointments or promises. The only question about these classes is about what will become of them, not without baptism, but *without the gospel*, and, you may say, *without Christ*, for without the gospel is without Christ. Those who hear the gospel and do not believe it will be condemned for their unbelief. They have nothing to do

with baptism, prayer or anything else in the kingdom of God. Their unbelief is an inseparable barrier between them and God. Infants who can not believe are not gospel subjects, can not receive the gospel, believe it or obey it. They do not need the gospel nor any of its provisions, but are as safe without it as the saint is with it. They need the resurrection, to be changed and glorified, precisely the same as saints, and no more. They need no baptism, and have nothing to do with it. My proposition is simply that "baptism, as commanded in the commission, is in order to the remission of past sins." This is not baptism to Abraham, Moses, Enoch nor Elijah, nor anybody else before this commission was given. Before this commission was given nobody had anything to do with this baptism; and since this commission was given nobody has anything to do with it only those to whom the gospel is preached, who hear it, receive it, believe it, repent and submit to the gospel. What is it for to these? It is nothing to anybody else. Nobody else has anything to do with it. To those to whom the gospel is preached, who hear it, believe it, repent and are immersed, "it is in order to the remission of past sins."

This baptism is only in order to the remission of sins, secured by the grace of God and the blood of Christ. It is the same remission of sins that is of grace, the blood of Christ and through faith. There would be no remission of sins by baptism, or without it, were it not for the grace of God and the blood of Christ. Our faith would be nothing, our repentance would avail nothing, our baptism, prayers, songs, communion, or anything we do, would all amount to nothing were it not for the grace of God and the blood of Christ. I delight to say this because it is true in itself and precious truth to me, and to show how much confidence you can put in the terrible representations in the speech you have just heard. I make nothing of baptism only sim-

ply what I find clearly set forth in the language of Scripture. Let us turn to the word of God and see where we find it there and what is said of it. I will not occupy my time in giving the references to the chapters and verses where the Scriptures are found, as this has already been done in my previous speeches.

In the commission, as given by Matthew, we have the command to "go disciple all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you." "Into the name," is the same as "into Christ," "into one body," or "into remission of sins," in amount, for all in the name are pardoned, and all not in the name are not pardoned. This is what Mr. Campbell meant in the quotation from the Christian System made by my friend and which he did not understand, by "a change of state," or *relation*. This I set forth in my opening speech on this question. It is the change from out of the name "into the name," from out of Christ "into Christ," from out of the body "into one body," from out of the kingdom "into the kingdom." Faith changes the heart, and prepares a man in heart for this change of relation, and repentance changes the character, or life, and prepares the man in character or life for this change in the state or relation. But these are changes *in the man*, and not changes of state or relation. There is no transfer in them into any new state or relation, but simply a preparation of heart and life for such a transfer. This transfer is into a state of justification or pardon. Hence we never read of baptism changing any man's heart or life. It never did change any man in heart or life, but changes the relation or state of the man already changed in heart and life. It never stands connected directly with the eternal salvation, but is directly connected with the salvation from sin.

The Lord says, "He who believes and is immersed shall

be saved." *Saved* here is *saved from sin*, or *pardoned*, and not saved in heaven, for many who believe and are immersed afterward sin, turn away from the holy commandment and will never be saved in heaven. The Lord here puts the belief and the baptism together in the same sentence in order to the same end. That end is *pardon*. Suppose you quote the passage with a view simply to find out what the belief is for and omit the baptism. It will then read, "He who believes shall be saved." Can any man fail to see that the belief is in order to *be saved*? That is precisely what it is for, or in order to. Well, it is for, or in order to the same thing, with the baptism in its place, and the baptism is coupled with it, by the conjunction "and," in order to the same end. Two things are commanded to be done, in the same sentence, in order to the same end—being *saved* or *pardoned*. In carrying out this commission the Apostle Peter, on the day the Spirit came from heaven to guide him into all truth, coupled two things together in order to the same end, remission of sins, or salvation from sins, in the following words: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Leaving the baptism out no one would fail to see what the repentance is for. "Repent every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." No man can fail to see that the repentance is for the remission of sins, or in order to it. Well, it does not change its design when baptism is connected with it, but is in order to the same thing. The baptism being connected with it, in the same sentence, by the conjunction "and," is in order to the same end, in order to the remission of sins, and thus contains terms of precisely the same import as the terms of my proposition.

When you put the two sentences together, you have the belief, repentance and baptism, all in order to the same end,

and that not the figment of my friend, of salvation without the grace of God and the blood of Christ, but in order to the salvation which is *by grace*, through faith, and that salvation not of yourselves but the gift of God, and by the blood of Christ. The Lord, in the commission, and Peter on Pentecost, were setting forth salvation, not without the blood of Christ nor the grace of God, but *by the grace of God, and the blood of Christ*; not without faith, repentance and baptism, but by faith, repentance and baptism. My worthy brother forgets that in the very sentence where Paul says our salvation is *by grace*, he says it is *through faith*. This connects the faith and grace in order to the same salvation. Then the Lord, in the commission, joins the faith and baptism; and Peter joins the repentance and baptism, and thus the grace, faith, repentance and baptism are all joined together in order to the remission of sins. Alluding to the same remission of sins or justification, we are said to be justified by his blood. To this we come when we are baptized into his death. This connects "the grace of God which brings salvation," the faith, repentance, baptism and blood of Christ, all together, in order to salvation or remission of sins, and what God has thus joined together let not man put asunder. This takes the empty frothing and vamping of my brother's speech all out, and shows that there is nothing in all he has said about my teaching salvation without the grace of God and the blood of Christ. There is no issue between us about the grace of God and the blood of Christ. I hold that salvation is by the grace of God and the blood of Christ as firmly as he; but we receive the salvation which is by the grace of God and the blood of Christ, in believing on Christ, repenting and being baptized "into Christ," "into his death," when we come to his blood; "into one body," "into the kingdom of God," "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," I and

defy any man to show that a man is saved by the grace of God, or the blood of Christ, who is not in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, not in Christ, not in his death, not in the one body, not in the kingdom. I thought my friend would become frantic when he saw that all he had been saying on this point was gone—that I was not talking about salvation without the grace of God, or the blood of Christ, but showing how men are saved *by the grace of God and the blood of Christ*. He saw that he had not even a shadow left to stand on.

Paul says: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Here is a salvation, or remission of sins, already enjoyed, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, declared to be "*by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit*." This Scripture joins the washing of regeneration with the renewing of the Holy Spirit, in saving man, and that which God has joined together, I say again, let not man put asunder. This, too, is salvation by grace, through faith and by the blood of Christ. It is also by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. This does not call baptism regeneration, but the *washing* of regeneration, and joins it with the renewing of the Holy Spirit. This also shows that baptism is not included in works of righteousness, for the salvation is declared to be *not by works* of righteousness, but *it is by the washing* of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit. Yet it is God that saves us, by his grace, by the blood of Christ, and through faith, *by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit*. This perfectly accords with all the other Scriptures we have introduced.

There is no one that doubts that Saul was saved by grace and by the blood of Christ; but, in order to this, he was

commanded to "Arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord." This baptism was connected with *washing away sins*, and not merely "a delightful service," nor a door into the Baptist Church. Washing away sins is pardon, or remission of sins, and, in order to this, Saul was commanded to "arise and be baptized." This was the way he was saved by grace, or what he was commanded to do to be saved by grace, by the blood of Christ, through faith.

Alluding to the salvation of Noah by water, Peter says: "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us;" not without grace and the blood of Christ, but *by* grace and the blood of Christ. God saved Noah, and he *saves us*, not without his grace, the blood of Christ, and faith; nor without baptism, but "baptism doth also save us." It has something to do with salvation, and is connected with it.

Paul says: "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water by the word." Here the sanctifying and cleansing of the Church are ascribed to Christ, and he cleanses, or pardons, not without the washing of water, or baptism, but "*with the washing of water by the word.*" Sanctify is to *set apart*, and cleanse is *pardon*. This the Lord performs. He sets men and women apart to his service and pardons them, not *without*, but *with* the washing of water by the word. He does this, not *without*, but *by* his grace; yes, and by his blood and through faith.

Paul says: "God be thanked, that" (though) "you were the servants of sin, you have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to you. Being *then* made free from sin, you have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." Being made free from sin is remission of sins. They were made free from sin when they

obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine delivered to them. In the fore part of the same chapter we learn how they *obeyed* from the heart that form of doctrine, and learn that in *obeying* that form of doctrine, we are buried with him by baptism, and *then* made free from sin. This shows that burying in baptism is in order to being *then* made free from sin.

But my friend is troubled to know whether a man can not be saved without baptism. I answer him squarely, not by any salvation in the Baptist Church, for he can not get into it at all without baptism; nor is the Baptist Church different from the kingdom of God in this respect, for a man can not enter into the kingdom of God except he be born of water and of the Spirit. The Lord commanded Saul to go to Damascus, and promised that it should be told him there what he *must do*. Ananias was sent to him to tell him what he *must do*. In doing this, he said: "Arise and be *baptized.*" When the Lord says a man *must* do anything, it is *imperative*. The Lord said to certain Jews: "You rejected the counsel of God against yourselves, *not being baptized by John.*" If a man rejected the counsel of God against himself, not being baptized by John, who was the lesser compared with our Lord, what does he do, not being baptized by the greater, or when he commands? "He who shall break one of these least commandments" (the commandments in the law of Moses) "and *teach men so*, shall be least in the kingdom of God." Jesus was baptized to "fulfill all righteousness," and how can a man be a follower of Jesus who stops at baptism, is not baptized in obedience to the authority of the Lord, but *refuses* to be baptized to fulfill all righteousness"—refuses to do what the Lord says he *must do*; that without which the Lord says, "he can not enter into the kingdom of God"—rejects the counsel of God against himself, not being baptized in obedience to the commandment of the Lord Jesus; who will not be baptized

after the example of the Savior? Such an one is not a follower of Jesus. What of the preacher who will encourage such an one, strengthen his hands, that he should not return from his wicked way, *by promising him life*? May we all choose the better course, not only in reference to baptism, but everything else enjoined by the Lord.

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S CLOSING ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators: Respected Audience:—The candid and prayerful investigation of the words of truth, conducted in a Christian spirit, with the single purpose in view of reaching the truth as God has revealed it, and of accepting the truth as the rule and authority of all religious belief, is characteristic of the true Christian intelligence, and the only justifiable motive in a discussion of biblical teaching. If I know my own heart, that motive prompts me to-day, in prosecuting this debate.

I was pleased to hear Mr. Franklin say, in his opening speech, that he came here to oppose error, and not men. I came with a like purpose in view; and I am sorry that an effort has been made in his last speech to impeach my honor as a Christian gentleman. Such a course is not debating, but to me looks very much like an extreme effort to divert attention from a failure in the argument of the proposition before us. In fact, the closing speech of the gentleman is one of the most puerile attempts to cover up a complete defeat it has been my lot to witness. Did he not assert again and again, that the remission of past sins was the work of man, without grace, the blood of Christ, or anything else? I ask you to look over his arguments on John iii. 5. Acts ii. 38; ix. 6; xxii. 16. John i. 12. What were his arguments? To be born again was to be converted, or, rather, to convert, which was to turn to God. This turning

is the act of aliens, in which they as aliens act. Is there any grace, or blood of Christ either in it? Has it not been denied during the entire debate?

Again: It was claimed that those to whom Peter said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," were aliens, and were told *what to do in order to the remission of sins*. Was there any grace or blood of Christ connected with their acts in remission of sins? Was it not claimed that Saul had to wash away his own sins, in the sense of *doing something in order to pardon*? Was it not argued that God gave them the privilege to become the sons of God, but that as aliens they become such by *their own act*? The case is before you, and I am willing to abide your decision. Does a theory that thus hinges the remission of sins on the act of an alien sinner give that sinner liberty to go either to heaven or hell on the merit or demerit of their own acts? I leave your intelligence to decide.

Mr. Franklin says I wrote the first proposition, and he prevailed on me to change it. I am sorry his memory is so treacherous, and his condition so very embarrassing that he imagines that which has no existence in fact. I have the original correspondence between us, and hold myself ready to prove the proposition to be his own production, written in his own hand; over his own signature. The next statement Mr. Franklin makes, after a little play about rudimentary matters, is to ask the profound question, "Does he, or any man here think that our proposition has anything to do with Abraham? To say that he thinks so is an impeachment of his intelligence. Does our proposition relate to those of the Patriarchal dispensation, or the Jewish? Surely he proves it does not." Will you please look over this quotation from the gentleman? It has great significance in it. God preached the gospel to Abraham, in a covenant promise of remission of sins, in the promised seed, Jesus Christ.

Abraham believed, and received the promise, and was recognized as righteous. The dispensations, consisting in ordinances and forms, had nothing to do as conditions to bring him into relation to God as an heir of his eternal covenant, but was a sign of the righteousness of faith which he had before he obeyed these ordinances and forms. Abraham is recognized by the inspired apostle as the father of all them that believe, and an example by which is explained the way in which all are justified who are the heirs of promise. Has the ground on which Abraham was justified nothing to do with the ground of justification as set forth in the gospel? Have the apostles impeached their own intelligence by keeping the case of Abraham conspicuously in view as an illustration of the plan of justification as ministered through the gospel? Are there two covenants granting remission of sins and justification unto life through different mediums? I need not answer these questions. Every intelligent man who reads his Bible knows there are not.

Why, then, does Mr. Franklin seek to evade the Scripture referring to the justification of Abraham by faith; and that it is written for our sakes who believe in Christ? Just because it destroys his proposition, and defeats his whole argument. But he has a little comfort, he thinks, if he is defeated. It is this: That I make faith a condition in order to remission of sins. I am sorry to take this crumb of comfort from him, but I shall do it. Faith, as I have shown from a multitude of texts, is a gracious characteristic by which the heirs of promise are distinguished in every dispensation; but not a condition which aliens perform to make them reconciled sons, in any dispensation. It is that fruit of the Spirit through which we receive Jesus Christ as our justifying righteousness, and enjoy peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Mr. Franklin says this is no system. There is no system in his view but what *aliens do*; that is all system with him. Hence he wants me to tell a

sinner, an alien, I suppose, *how to come to God; how to get the benefit of the grace of God and the blood of Christ; how to obtain the remission of sins.* The sinner comes to God because it is given him of the Father. John vi. 65. The Father draws them. John vi. 44. He makes them willing by working in them to will and do of his good pleasure. Phil. ii. 13. But is the benefit of the grace of God and the blood of Christ something that sinners get by some procedure of their own? Verily, I thought God gave them that benefit, and they received it through faith, the gift of God: *not of works, lest any man should boast.*

Mr. Franklin is correct in the view that baptism is only commanded to those who believe the gospel in this dispensation. And this admission destroys his proposition, that it is commanded in order to the remission of past sins. The remission of past sins has been set forth since the world began, in every dispensation of time, and is the same in all ages of the world. And whether we speak of Abel, or of Noah, or of Abraham, or of the apostles, the same medium of the remission of sins is set forth in the forms given them through which their faith was visibly expressed. We have the whole matter stated fully in Rom. iii. 21, 22, 24, 25: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets: even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe: Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." I need to remark on this quotation that it is direct to the point in debate, and, in the terms of the proposition, states the ground of the "*remission of past sins.*" What is it? Let the word of God decide between us. God hath set forth Jesus Christ to be a propitiation through

faith in his blood, to declare *his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past*. It was to this righteousness that all the prophets gave witness. Acts x. 43: "To him" (Jesus) "give all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

Why has Mr. Franklin quoted no text having in it the terms "past sins," as stated in the proposition? Because the very text where the terms are found sets forth the righteousness of God for the remission of sins that are past, through faith in his blood. The conclusion of the whole doctrine of justification from sin is given thus tersely by the apostle: "That he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Mr. Franklin changes the translation of the word *eis* from "in" to "into," and then proceeds to say, that "'into the name' is the same as 'into Christ,' 'into one body,' 'into remission of sins,'" etc. Therefore he holds that Mr. Campbell is correct in the doctrine that all unbaptized persons are dead in trespasses and sins, and he proceeds to argue that faith changes the heart, repentance changes the character, but the *relation* of the person to God is just the same as before, till baptism changes the relation to God.

We certainly have a jewel in this argument of the gentleman, borrowed, it is true, from his ecclesiastical guide. Let us look at its sublime depths! Faith *changes* the heart, but the relation is not changed. As to a state in sins, the relation is just the same after the heart is *changed*, as it was before it was *changed*. Why, then, did Paul say, "he is a Jew which is one *inwardly*?" Does one who is a Jew inwardly sustain the same relation to God as one who is not? No. The gentleman has ruined his whole system by admitting that faith changes the heart. For we are all the *children of God* by faith in Christ, and whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ *is born of God*. Again, when he

admits that the "heart" and "life" are *changed* before baptism, what of the man remains to be changed by baptism, in his relation in any sense? Nothing but the body, and that only in its relation to the visible congregation of believers, called the Church. Just as circumcision in the flesh was a visible sign to mark the external man or body, so is baptism an external sign to mark the external man or body, transferring it from among the world to a position in the Church. It has, therefore, no more connection with washing away sins, or remission of sins, than the flood had in washing away Noah's sins. How much was that? It was a figure of that remission of sins which God hath set forth in the blood of Jesus Christ. We then have the key as given in these admissions of Mr. Franklin, by which the sense of his proof-texts is obtained. "Into the name," "into Christ," "into one body" mean in a figurative visible form. This figure or form being applied only to the bodies of believers, to change their relation from among the world to a position among the visible congregation or church. In a word, the believer in Christ is born of God, is a child of God, an inward Jew, before baptism, and obeys that ordinance as a visible sign of the relation he sustains to God, by faith in the blood of Christ.

But we are told that Jesus said, when he gave the commission, that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. But the antithesis is between belief and unbelief. Why is not the gentleman's proposition stated here, he that is not baptized shall be damned, whether he believes or not? But there is a copulative connecting baptism with faith in the salvation. And there is a good reason why the visible sign of relationship should be connected with the relationship. Therefore, as damnation does not depend on the believer not being baptized, neither does salvation depend on the believer being baptized. But as faith is that grace by which the

saved are distinguished and known as the heirs of God, so baptism is connected with the faith as the visible sign of heirship.

On the day of Pentecost, Peter said: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Why do this? Because the promise is to you. Ye are the children of the promise; ye are the heirs of God by faith in Christ, in whose blood you have remission of sins. Baptism is the figure of this; the visible form of it; therefore be baptized because your sins are remitted in the blood of Jesus, and you visibly set forth that truth which has been taught by all forms and ordinances since the world was. But read this text as Mr. Franklin reads it, "in order to the remission of past sins," and it not only makes it the most important item in the salvation of sinners—that upon which all others depend—but it strikes down the covenant to Abraham, and nullifies the oath of God.

But Mr. Franklin admits that we are justified in Christ's blood; and then he goes on to say: "To this we come when we are baptized into his death." But why did not Mr. Franklin prove that we come to his blood when we are baptized? Just because there is no such proof in the word of God. We have seen in what sense they are baptized into his death; even as the text itself declares; Rom. vi. 5, in the *likeness or figure of his death*; and not one word about coming to his blood by baptism. But then Mr. Franklin thought that if he could not prove his proposition by the Scripture, he could give us his own word for it, and that, in his opinion, will do quite as well. Not so. Such proof is not taken here. But he puts the blood of Christ after faith, repentance and baptism. He is too late getting to the blood. Paul says the blood of Christ purges from *dead works*, to serve the living God. But are faith, repentance and baptism *dead works*? Are they the service of the living God?

The gentleman has tried to reverse the order of God. Instead of the blood of Jesus purging us in order to the service of the living God, he has to wash away our sins by baptism in order to come to the blood of Christ. When we come to the blood of Christ, therefore, it can do us no good, for the reason that we have already washed away our sins by baptism. The human part is, therefore, the first part, and washes away our sins; but the divine part, if it be anything, is the granting to alien sinners the privilege of doing all that is done to put away sins.

Again: Mr. Franklin becomes defiant. He says: "I defy any man to show that a man is saved by the grace of God, or the blood of Christ, who is not in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and not in Christ, not in his death; not in the one body, not in the kingdom." Did any one ever see such barefaced sophistry as this quotation from his speech? Why did he not say, I defy any man to show that a man is saved by the grace of God, or the blood of Christ, *who is not immersed in water*? He knew the Bible was full of such cases, many of which have already been cited in this debate. But, to put a false face upon the matter, he groups together the sum of his assumptions, and vamps, and rants, as though he felt sure that he could knock down a very large man of straw! He knew all the time that his proofs had no further reference to the death of Christ, the body of Christ, and to being in Christ, and in the remission of sins, than a sign, likeness or figure of it. But he runs over these expressions, as if he thought the sophistry of his argument was not patent to every mind present here to-day. Paul says: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us." It was not, then, something that *we did*, but something *he did*, that saved us. How was it done? By the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost. How was this performed? *Which he shed on us*

abundantly through Christ Jesus our Savior. What was it for? That, *being justified by his grace*, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. Does this show that baptism is not a work of righteousness? No, it does not. But it shows that baptism is neither regeneration, nor the washing of regeneration. It shows that our salvation is through Christ. We are therefore justified by his grace.

Again: Mr. Franklin goes to the case of Saul. He says, "There is no one that doubts that Saul was saved by grace and by the blood of Christ." But he shows in the very next sentence that he does both doubt and deny that Saul was saved in any such way. As far as grace and the blood of Christ are concerned, Saul would have remained in his sins and been eternally condemned, according to Mr. Franklin, if he had not washed his own sins away! But Saul was saved by grace, and purged from his sins in the blood of Christ, and therefore obeyed Christ in a delightful service, which is a figure of this salvation. *Paul never told us what he did to be saved by grace.* That kind of instruction was not known by inspired men. The Latter-Day Saints that teach that alien sinners can believe, repent and be baptized, and wash away their sins in order to get into Christ spiritually, have invented that abominable trash which exalts the sinner above God, and puts his work in the place of the blood of the blessed Lamb of God. But we are told that Christ sanctifies and cleanses the Church from sins by baptism. But Paul has declared that the cleansing is done by Christ. What water does Christ employ in cleansing the soul? Paul says, "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." 1 Cor. vi. 11. We have before shown that the water which Christ gives is living water springing up into everlasting life. Jesus says, "It shall be in you." The outside may be made to look as white as a sepulcher by the application of literal water,

but the blood of Jesus only can take away the stain of sins. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son shall cleanse from all sin." "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace." Those who obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine were made free from sin, and had become the servants of righteousness. When were they made free? Before they obeyed. What made them free? Christ. What was the fruit of that freedom? They became the servants of righteousness. My friend would like to make it appear that aliens made themselves free by obedience in order to get into Christ, and does not tell us why Paul thanks God for what these aliens do, unless it is because God gives them the privilege of doing it all themselves.

Again, we are told that a man can not enter the Baptist Church without baptism, and in this respect the Baptist Church is like the kingdom of God. Why then not answer the question directly and say no man can enter the kingdom of God without baptism. Why this skulking and evading your own pet theory? There can be but one answer, and that is that you are ashamed of your doctrine. No wonder that he avoids a direct answer. It is not only a doctrine without proof or foundation in the Scripture, but revolting to its own advocates. Alexander Campbell himself, when contemplating the millions of pious devoted people who were Pedobaptists, and had not been immersed in water, doomed to endless perdition according to this doctrine, cried out, prayerfully, "I leave them to the tender mercies of God!" He believed God's mercies were more tender than this doctrine, and therefore this doctrine was not a revelation of God's tender mercies (and it certainly is not), or else he left them to endless condemnation because they had not been immersed. Mr. Franklin leaves them without hope to suffer endless condemnation. Not because the grace of God had not done as much for them

as for him; not because Jesus had not shed his blood for them as for him; not because they had not faith in Jesus equal to his; not because they had not as pure repentance for sins as he; not because of any grace wanting in all their duty to man or God, save the one fault, that they did not understand baptism as Mr. Franklin does. For this, and for this only, they are all doomed to endless condemnation; and for his obedience in this one act only beyond what they have done, he is justified, and eternally saved. Well may any man skulk and equivocate who holds such a monstrous theory. But he says Jesus was baptized to fulfill all righteousness. Not in order to the "remission of past sins." This is not very much for his proposition: The baptism of Jesus was by John the Baptist, who speaking of the greater baptism of Christ said, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." And he pointed to Jesus, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." We now have the sum of Mr. Franklin's proof and argument. How stands the case?

In his closing speech on the second proposition, Mr. Franklin claimed that I had failed in my proof, because I had not the terms, nor equivalent terms in my proof, as those in the proposition. If this be the rule of logic, he has completely failed. The terms, "Baptism in order to the remission of past sins," or equivalent terms, are not found in any proof by him referred to. There are no such terms in the Bible. His nearest approach to the terms of the proposition, in his proof, has been, "Be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins;" "Be baptized and wash away thy sins." His other quotations determine the meaning of these to be, "Be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ because of the remission of sins;" "Be baptized and wash away thy sins in a ceremonial sense." The Apostle Peter says it is a like figure to the salvation of Noah by water. Certainly Noah did not wash away his

sins by the flood! Neither was the flood in order to the remission of his past sins. But the affirmative proof not only fails in its terms, but no such a doctrine has been taught in any part of the Bible, as belonging to any dispensation. On the contrary, I have proved the remission of past sins and future sins, in all dispensations, to be "through the blood of Christ, as a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." To him give all the prophets witness; John the Baptist pointed to him, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;" the apostles all proclaimed the remission of sins, and justification through his blood and righteousness. Jesus pardoned sins throughout his ministry without any reference to baptism; and his last act was to pardon a penitent sinner, and pronounce his gracious promise on one who was not immersed. Faith is the gracious gift of God, through which this divine bounty, the remission of sins, is received. I have proven that it is of faith that it might be by grace, that the promise might be sure to all the seed. We are all heirs of God just as Abraham was, and therefore in a gospel sense he is the father of us all. In all dispensations Jesus has been set forth "the way, the truth, and the life;" the only Savior God has anointed to save us from our sins. God hath set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God. To him that washed us from our sins in his own blood be glory and praise given throughout all generations.

[Time expired.]

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

The Eternal Salvation of Christians, as set forth in the Scriptures, is the work of God, independent of conditions to be performed by man

THOMPSON'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators: Respected Audience:—I proceed in the first place to define the terms of the proposition to be discussed. 1. The eternal salvation means the final deliverance from mortality, sin, and corruption, into the immortal, holy, and incorruptible state. 2. Christians are those who have been redeemed by the blood of Christ, quickened by the Divine Spirit into eternal life, and recognized as sons of God in the everlasting covenant. 3. The work of God is what God does through Christ, by his Holy Spirit, in the salvation of Christians. 4. Independent of conditions to be performed by man, as a ground or merit to secure their salvation. I do not deny the mention of good works, in connection with the salvation of saints; nor do I believe that they are saved without good works; but good works performed by man depend upon the work of God, and not the work of God dependent on them. Good works are therefore named in connection with the salvation of Christians as a characteristic belonging to the saved, and not a cause of their salvation; therefore the eternal salvation is independent of them as conditions of merit to secure it.

My first argument is taken from the covenant of God. Heb. viii. 10, 11, 12: "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the

†

(256)

Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

1. The promise of this covenant is an eternal inheritance. Heb. ix. 15: "And for this cause he" (Christ) "is the Mediator of the new testament" (covenant), "that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

2. God is their God in an eternal relation as their Savior. Isaiah xliiii. 11: "I, even I, am the Lord, and beside me there is no Savior." Ps. lxxviii. 20: "He that is our God, is the God of salvation; and unto God the Lord belong the issues of death." The eternal salvation is therefore his work, and to him will all the glory be given.

3. The heirs of his covenant (all Christians) are his people in an eternal sense. He has confirmed his covenant to them by his own oath which is immutable. Heb. vi. 17: "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath." In Gal. iii. Paul declares that a covenant that is confirmed can not be disannulled; and that the law could not therefore make the promise of God without effect. I conclude therefore that every heir recognized in the covenant of God will eternally be an heir of God; otherwise his counsel would be mutable, and his oath a nullity.

4. God does not remember their sins against them in an eternal sense. He says, "I will remember their sins no more." They are perfected forever, through Christ Jesus.

Heb. x. 14: "For by one offering he" (Christ) "hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." God justifies them in the righteousness of Christ, and holds them as free from condemnation. Titus iii. 7: "That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

5. God gives this covenant, independent of a condition to be performed by man as a ground or cause why he is an heir, or shall enjoy the eternal salvation promised. There is but one ground stated upon which the whole scheme depends; and that is the work of God, according to his own will. Eph. i. 11: "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

6. If Christians perform the conditions upon which depend their eternal salvation, then their eternal salvation is their own work. And if this be true, their salvation is no more of God than is the damnation of the unbelieving and disobedient. In either case God rewards them according to their works. But the eternal salvation of Christians is according to his grace, and not according to their works.

7. If eternal salvation depends on conditions performed by man, it is a covenant of works or law, and therefore opposed to grace. Gal. iii. 18: "For if the inheritance be of the law it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Gal. ii. 20: "I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." But eternal life is the gift of God, and not of man, nor dependent upon conditions to be performed by him. This eternal life, God, who can not lie, promised in Christ before the world began. All his promises in Christ are yea and amen. Therefore they are not dependent on conditions to be performed by man.

My second argument is taken from the gift of eternal life.

This gift saves the Christian from death in an eternal sense, and is therefore eternal salvation as set forth in the Scriptures. 1 John v. 11, 12: "And this is the record, that God hath given to 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." John xvii. 2: "As thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." John x. 28, 29: "And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." This eternal life is eternal salvation as set forth in the Scriptures, and is that life and immortality brought to light through the gospel of Jesus Christ. The Christian is quickened by this life, and shall never die. Jesus therefore says, they shall never perish. And again he says, John v. 24: "And shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." In Rom. v. 10, it is said: "We shall be saved by his" (Christ's) "life;" and again, verse 21: "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." This gift we have proven to be of God, bestowed upon the heirs of God according to his eternal purpose in Christ, and secured to them by the immutable promise and oath of God, as their eternal inheritance, with the promise of Christ that they shall never perish, nor be plucked from his hand. Jesus also condemns to infamy those who profess to be shepherds, and leave their flocks to be scattered and destroyed, John x. 10, 12, 13; but contrasts his own faithful care with their unfaithful selfishness and cowardice. Will Mr. Franklin dare accuse our Lord of giving up one of his flock to be destroyed? Will he condemn him out of his own mouth? No. Our Lord is faithful and true, and his

promise shall never fail. He assures us that there is none can pluck them out of his Father's hand; for his Father is greater than all. The Father hath promised, saying, Gen. xxviii. 15. Ps. xxxvii. 28, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." God is faithful; he can not lie.

My third argument is founded on the birth of the Christian as a child of God. 1 John v. 1: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." John i. 13: "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." 1 John iii. 9: "Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he can not sin because he is born of God." John iii. 6: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Rom viii. 10: "The body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." This birth is of God. It is not of man, nor of the will of man, and can not be of conditions which man performs. It is not a temporal birth, nor of corruptible matter. It is of the divine nature, an incorruptible seed by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. It is a birth of Spirit, and contrasted with the flesh. The Spirit is life because of righteousness, for it is of God. The Christian, therefore, lives unto God, and shall not die. In their flesh they are sinners, but in their spirit they are holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling. As born of God in Spirit they can not sin because they are born of God. Jesus, the Holy Son of God, is not ashamed to call them brethren. They have the earnest of the inheritance, or first-fruits of that inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for them. The spiritual life and immortality into which their bodies shall be raised in the resurrection from the dead are the work of the same God, by his Spirit which now dwells in them. That resurrection will be eternal salvation; this in Spirit is eternal

salvation now, and is a freedom indeed. Until the divine nature shall perish, the sons of God shall live, pure, holy, and undefiled in spirit; for Christ liveth in them.

My fourth argument rests on the atonement made by Jesus. Rom. v. 8, 9, 10: "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Much more then being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Christ died to save all his people. The angel said, "He shall save his people from their sins." Matt. i. 21. In 1 Cor. xv. 3, it is said, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." Also in Gal. i. 4, it is said, "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." We are therefore saved by his blood, from the guilt of sin; and by his life saved from death in sins. Purged, purified, redeemed, and perfected before God, in the blood of the Lamb. Paul reasons that, if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of Jesus, much more, or it is more manifest to us, that we shall be saved by his life. If one Christian, to whom the virtue of the blood of Christ has been imputed, can fail of eternal salvation, the whole economy of grace in Christ Jesus can fail. And if the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ can fail in one case to which it has been applied by divine power to eternally save, it can fail equally in all cases; and is therefore of no profit. But we have the whole matter put to rest, by the plain testimony of the word of inspiration, Heb. x. 14: "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Eph. i. 7: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." John xiv. 19: "Because I live, ye shall live also."

My fifth argument is based on the love of God. John xvii. 23: "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." The emphasis is my own. Rom. viii. 37, 38, 39: "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." God is immutable, and changes not. He is in one mind, and none can turn him. Having loved his own, he loved them to the end. He loves them, even as he loved Christ Jesus. Paul affirms most positively that nothing shall be able to separate the Christian from his love. His argument in Rom. viii. covers every possible contingency that may arise, every possible power or influence that can intervene or interpose to separate them from his love, and in his conclusion of the whole subject he is persuaded that nothing shall be able to separate them from the love of God. If Christians can possibly be separated from the love of God, in the final eternal salvation, does not the argument and conclusion of the apostle become a chimera, and the attribute of Jehovah as the immutable God, upon which rests the hope of all Christians, have no real existence? The doctrine that God is changeable would unsettle the whole plan of salvation, and render the Scriptures useless as an expression of his will. The conclusion is therefore inevitable, that his purpose in the salvation of all Christians, finally and eternally, shall stand, and his pleasure, as manifested in his love to them in Christ, shall be fully consummated in their eternal glory. Rom. viii. 29, 30: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the

first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified."

My sixth argument is founded on the faith of Christians. 1 John v. 4: "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." Faith is here said to be born of God. In Eph. ii. 8 it is said to be "the gift of God," and connected with the grace of God in eternal salvation. In Heb. xii. 2, Jesus is said to be "the Author and Finisher of faith." And in Gal. v. 22 it is said to be the "fruit of the Spirit." That which is born of God is not temporal and destructible, but eternal, holy, and imperishable. Faith is therefore classed with the abiding graces, given to Christians of God, and is here said to be a victory over the world. God's spiritual gifts to his children, and declared to be abiding, are indestructible and eternal. That which Christ hath wrought as a Divine Author is perfect and therefore eternal. The fruit of the Spirit of God is that immortal, incorruptible perfection which our bodies shall enjoy when quickened by the Spirit that dwelleth in us; and we in spirit now enjoy the first-fruits of that state, by faith, the fruit of the Spirit. Therefore, said the Apostle Peter, or God by him, 1 Peter ii. 6: "He that believeth on him shall not be confounded." And Christ said, John v. 24: "Shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." And the Lord said by Paul, Acts xiii. 39: "Are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses." And Christ the Lord said, John xi. 26: "Shall never die." Such a cloud of witnesses, as the word of God affords to sustain this argument, can never be set aside. The whole volume of inspiration abounds with the proofs of this argument.

My seventh argument is founded on the confirmation of

Christians in Christ, and the faithfulness of God who thus confirms them. 1 Cor. i. 8, 9: "Who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. God is faithful, by whom ye were called into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord." The faithful God, who hath called them into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ, also confirms them unto the end. The term, "confirm," is of the same meaning as "establish." See 2 Cor. i. 21: "He which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." Shall that which God establisheth in Christ be removed? Shall the work of God be destroyed? Is God faithful to perform that which he has confirmed, established, and sealed with his own Spirit, the earnest of which has been given to Christians? I hope Mr. Franklin will meet the questions squarely, and without equivocation. God is faithful, says the text. See also 1 Cor. x. 13: "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." How long, or till when does God establish them in Christ? "*Unto the end; that they may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.*"

My eighth argument rests on the work of God in the heart of Christians. Phil. i. 6: "Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." In this same letter it is stated, chap. iii. 21, that he (God) is able to subdue all things to himself, by the power that worketh in us. And in chapter ii. 13 it is declared that "God worketh in us, to will and to do of his good pleasure." In Eph. ii. 10, Christians are said to be "the workmanship of God." In 1 Cor. xii. 6 it is said that it is "the same God

that worketh all in all." In Eph. i. 11 we read that, "He worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will." Mr. Franklin said in the early part of this debate that remission of sins was a work done in heaven, and not in the hearts of men. But if this work was not done in the heart, the heart could not be saved. The work of God is therefore declared to be within us, just where we need it, and where it saves us from sin and death. The word of God is therefore very positive not only as to *who* does the work, but also as to *where* it is done. See Heb. xiii. 20, 21: "Now the God of peace . . . make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever." Rom. ii. 29: "But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Had Paul any doubt as to the final consummation of this work of God, in the eternal salvation and glory of all Christians? No, he says he is confident that God will perform it till the day of Jesus Christ; that God will make them perfect, *working in them* that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Christ. Had their eternal salvation depended on conditions to be performed by man, would Paul have been confident of the salvation of any Christian? And if he had been confident of the salvation of any, would his confidence have been in the work of man in performing the conditions? But Paul states his confidence to be in him who had begun a good work *in them*. We have seen in the foregoing Scriptures that the work of saving, with an eternal salvation, is the work of God. A gracious, glorious work begun, carried on, and perfected "by power divine, even the Omnipotent Jehovah. Therefore in this most gracious work it is the same God which worketh all *in all*. Here has been the issue since this debate began. The same question has been

before us all the time since we began this debate. It is this: Is salvation from sin, to eternal glory, the work of God? I affirm it is, and prove it by a chain of evidence so overwhelming that even Mr. Franklin dare not try to meet it. He keeps as far from it as possible.

My ninth argument is based on the kingdom of Jesus Christ, as set forth in the Scripture. My first proof is Ps. lxxxix. 3, 4, 28, 29, 34, 36: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations." "My mercy will I keep for him forevermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven." "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips." "His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me." See also Isaiah ix. 6, 7: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end." Also Daniel ii. 44: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people." Daniel vii. 18: "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." 27th verse: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." The kingdom of Jesus Christ shall stand forever, and shall never be destroyed, nor have an end. All opposing powers shall be broken in pieces, and fall before it. The King is highly

exalted, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but that also which is to come, and is Head over all things to the Church which is his body; the fullness of him which filleth all in all. All Christians are subjects of this kingdom, and under its dominion and power, and by the immutable oath and promise of God, established in its blessings forever more. In Col. i. 12, 13, the work by which we enter this kingdom is fully stated, and I hope Mr. Franklin will not conclude it is impracticable because God does the work! Hear what the word says, "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." God's word tells its own great truth right plainly, and keeps in view the wondrous work of God in our eternal salvation. Look back to the 11th verse, "Strengthened with all might." How? Will Mr. Franklin give attention? "According to his glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering, with joyfulness." It is according to his glorious power, that worketh *in* us, and delivers us from the power of darkness, and translates us into the kingdom of Christ. When Christ cast out devils, he did so by the Spirit of God. And he declared that it was the kingdom of God come to the people. This is divine power, or heavenly power, or power from heaven. Christ and his apostles preached, the reign of heaven drew near. This kingdom is within the Christian, it is righteousness, joy, and peace in the Holy Ghost. Hence Jesus said, John xvii. 22, 23: "And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I *in* them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast

sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." 1 John iv. 4: "Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them; because greater is he that is *in* you, than he that is in the world." Will sin or the devil overcome the power that is in the Christian? Will the power of darkness drive out of the Christian, Christ and his kingdom? No. I am astonished to think that any one can be found, who will assert a sentiment so derogatory to Christ, and in such direct conflict with his word. The greater power, the kingdom of Christ, shall gloriously triumph, till the last enemy shall be destroyed, and the bodies of all the saints raised to immortality and divine life; and then shall the triumphant shout go up to the throne of God, "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—My friend did, this time, attempt to define his proposition. In part I have no special objection to his definition so far as relates to our discussion. The definition he gives of "eternal salvation" is sufficient for this occasion. The same is true of his definition of "Christians." Nor need I trouble his definition of the "work of God." But I object to his definition of the words "independent of conditions to be performed by man." He adds to these words the following: "As a ground or merit to secure their salvation." This is an addition of *his own* to the proposition, and no part of the *meaning of it*. There is nothing in the proposition about conditions being "*ground or merit*," much less "ground or merit to secure salvation." This reveals a conscious inability

on the part of my friend to come up to the work and prove his affirmative proposition in the obvious import of its terms, and not attempt to take a *twist* on it the first thing. "Independent of conditions," means *without regard to conditions*, or, in short, *without conditions, to be performed by man*. The simple issue is, whether eternal salvation is conditional? He has undertaken to prove that eternal salvation is to be given to Christians regardless of any conditions to be performed by them. There is no question before us about God *giving* eternal salvation. We all know that God gives eternal salvation to all that ever obtain it. Nor have we any question about man *meriting* it, or conditions to be performed by man, being the *ground* of it. We all know that man *merits* nothing, and nothing that man can do is the *ground* of salvation. The merit is in Christ, and his atonement is the *ground* of it. But does God give Christians eternal salvation without any conditions to be performed by them? My friend affirms and I deny.

I am perfectly aware that God is immutable; that his promise is immutable, and his covenant is immutable; but that God, who is immutable, in his immutable promise and his immutable covenant, proposes to give Christians eternal salvation without requiring them to perform any conditions, is what my friend has undertaken to prove, and what I deny. The immutable Jehovah has made an immutable promise and an immutable covenant, in which there are *conditions* to be performed by the Christian, and the immutable covenant has nothing in it for the Christian that does not perform the conditions. The *conditions* themselves are in the covenant and a part of it, and as immutable as any other part of it. There is no question about God being *able* to save us without conditions, or his being *dependent* on conditions. For anything I know to the contrary, he could save us without conditions as well as with them. The question is not about what he *can* do, but what he *will* do.

My friend may save himself from all the trouble, therefore, of proving that God is immutable, or that his promise or covenant is immutable. The very question now before us is whether the immutable promise is conditional. My brother affirms that it is *unconditional*. I deny it. This is the issue, and I hope he will come to the point and debate it and not spend his time in proving something that nobody denies.

The worthy gentleman has made quite a display in quoting Scripture, or *reading* it from his little scrap-book, and referring to it; but, unfortunately for him, not one Scripture, in his *piece*, which he *spoke* from his book, contains the word "independent," or any other word of the same import. Which one of the Scriptures in his note-book contains the word "independent" at all, to say nothing of "independent of conditions," which is the same as *without conditions*? Not one that he has quoted, or can quote. He has tried his Concordance on it, when preparing his note-book and failed. Here he is, at the close of his first speech, and here he will remain to the end of this discussion, *without a proof*.

But I do not propose to stop, simply doing no more than showing that he has no proof—that not a Scripture produced by him covers the ground he has affirmed; but I intend doing more; I intend to refute and utterly overthrow his theory. This immutable covenant has immutable conditions in it, and one of them is that "Christ is the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." The Lord is the immutable author of eternal salvation, not to any, whether they obey him or not, but "to all them that *obey him*." See Heb. v. 9. Thus it is that the very first Scripture that came into my mind ruins the entire theory advocated in the speech you have just heard. In the immutable covenant, it is declared that the immutable High Priest "became the author of eternal salvation to all them that

obey him," and thus shows that he gives eternal salvation on the condition that men *obey him*. Obedience is performed *by man*, and is a condition on which the immutable promise of eternal salvation will be given. This perfectly accords with another part of the immutable covenant, which declares that the Lord Jesus will come, "taking vengeance on them that know not God and *obey not* the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." See 2 Thess. i. 8. This makes *obedience* a condition, and the failure to perform this condition is the *sin* referred to in connection with their destruction.

Let us hear Paul, writing to Christians. Speaking of God, he says: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life; but to them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God." See Rom. ii. 6-9. Any conditions in this? Where is the blame placed? Look at this language. How will God deal with men in the judgment? He will render to every man according to *his deeds*. The deeds of men form a consideration in the judgment. To whom will he give eternal life? To them who by *patient continuance in well-doing seek* for glory and honor and immortality, *eternal life*. The "patient continuance in well-doing," and "seeking for glory and honor and immortality," are the *conditions* to be *performed by man*, and the "eternal life" is that which God promises to *give* to those who thus seek; and the "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," are hurled against those who "are contentious and *do not obey the truth*, but *obey unrighteousness*"—"every soul of man that *does evil*." Are there no conditions here? This is not the oily doctrine of the worthy gentleman that is so careful

not to find any connection between the deeds of men and eternal life. The deeds of men will be matter of consideration in the day of judgment, and be found to have a connection with eternal life; not as *ground* or *merit*, but conditions to be performed by men in view of the Lord giving it.

The Apostle Peter was, at one time, a kind of predestinarian, holding that the Jews were God's elect, and that the whole Gentile world were passed by, and no provision made for them; that God was a respecter of persons, saving one man and condemning another, without regard to conduct, a little after the order of the gentleman by my side. But after the Lord showed, in the vision, that he should call no man common, he said: "I perceive of a truth that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he who fears him and works righteousness is accepted with him." Acts x. 33, 34.

This is not the *unconditional* doctrine we have just been hearing, but the doctrine that makes *fearing* God and *working righteousness* conditions of acceptance with him. This, too, is the general principle in God's dealings both with Jews and Gentiles, or with "every nation." It is an item in the immutable covenant, and declared by the man who had the keys of the kingdom of God, and introduced the gospel to the Gentiles, in the *general law*. It is not a *scrap* dished up, as many of the quotations made by Mr. Thompson are, merely for the *jingle of words*, without any regard to the connection, but a *clear expression* that can not be misunderstood.

But I must take the gentleman to the Sermon on the Mount, and let the Lord teach him. I know this thing of *doing* is unpalatable to an *anti means* Baptist, and were it not that the necessities of the case require it, I would not inflict on him all that is coming; but there is no case for him without it. The Lord, in teaching *his disciples*, says:

"Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v. 19, 20. This the Lord said to his disciples about *doing* the commandments given in the law of Moses, before the new law had gone forth from Jerusalem. But now let us hear him in regard to the *new will*—the "better covenant upon better promises"—the immutable covenant—the gospel. "Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth the will* of my Father who is in heaven." Matt. vii. 21. Here the Lord in the clearest terms makes the *doing of the will of God* a condition on which his disciples would enter into the kingdom of God.

Let us follow the Lord to the close of his discourse. He concludes with these words: "Therefore whoever hears these sayings of mine, and does them, I will liken him to a wise man, who built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that hears these sayings of mine, and does them not, shall be likened to a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell, and great was the fall of it." Matt. vii. 24-28. Here we have the *means* and *anti-means* doctrines side by side set forth by our Lord, and the difference he makes between *doing* or *not doing his sayings*, and not the commandments in the law of Moses. Is there nothing conditional in *doing* or *not doing* the sayings of Jesus? The clear import is, that if we hear his sayings and do them, he

will liken us to a wise man that built his house on a rock. If we hear his sayings and do them not, he will liken us to a foolish man that built his house on the sand. The wise man is accepted and the foolish man rejected. This reception or rejection turns upon *doing* and *not doing* the sayings of Jesus. They who *do* the will of God are safe. They shall enter into the kingdom of God.

Let us hear the Lord discourse on the final judgment: "Then shall the King say to those on his right hand, Come, you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was a hungered, and you gave me meat" (food); "I was thirsty, and you gave me drink; a stranger and you took me in." Matt. xxv. 34, 35. What of all that? What will that have to do with man's reception? Hear the Lord explain how they did this, and what account he makes of it in the judgment: "Inasmuch as you have done it to one of the least of these my brethren, you have done it to me." The doing of these acts of beneficence to his brethren he accepts, and will accept in the day of judgment, as done to himself. He does not stop simply by stating how it is with those who *do* these things, but states the other side; where they *do not* these things. Hear him: "Then shall he say also to them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was a hungered, and you gave me no meat" (food); "I was thirsty, and you gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and you took me not in; naked and you clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and you visited me not." Matt. xxv. 41-44. Wherein did they fail to do all this? In failing to do these deeds to his brethren. What are the consequences? I will let the Lord explain: "Inasmuch as you did it not to one of the least of these, you did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." See Matt. xxv. 45, 46.

The benevolent deeds the Lord described are here connected with the judgment as a reason for their being received or rejected. Of course, it is only the reason on the *human part*. The *doing* of these deeds is to be mentioned in the final judgment as a reason for their acceptance. The *failure to do them* is to be mentioned as a reason for their being rejected. The *doing* of these deeds is a condition on which Christians enter into eternal life, and are thus connected with that entrance into eternal life. Recollect, this is simply the reason of acceptance or rejection on the *human part*, and not the reason on the *divine part*. The ground of it is in the *grace of God*, the *atonement*, the *blood of Jesus*. Without the grace of God, the atonement, the blood of Christ, on the divine part, all the benevolent deeds that could be performed on the human part would never save one soul. On the other hand, the grace of God, the atonement, and the blood of Christ will not save a man who lacks the deeds described by the Lord. The grace of God, the atonement and the blood of Jesus were for those who failed to do the deeds as much as for those who did them; but they failed to perform *their part*—the conditions clearly set forth and required in the immutable covenant; also implied in the immutable promise. The promise is to those who *do* the will of God, and not to those who *will not do it*.

This eternal life, Matt. xxv. 46, is the "eternal life" referred to in our proposition, and at the *same time* the righteous enter this eternal life, the wicked "go away into everlasting punishment," and the same word, in the original (*atonion*), that expresses the duration of the state of happiness expresses also the duration of the state of punishment. No anti-means preacher ever answered the argument founded upon this Scripture, or ever will. This principle of *doing* or *not doing* the will of God, and its consequences, will follow us to the final judgment, and no man will there be lost because there was no grace of God for him, nor because

there was no atonement or blood of Christ for him, but men will be lost because they did not *do the will of God*. The failure will be on *their part*, and not on the part of the Lord.

The Apostle Peter has seven conditions, to be performed by man, in order to entering into the everlasting kingdom, which is the same as entering into eternal life, so far as our debate is concerned, for all who enter into the everlasting kingdom enter into eternal life. They are laid down, 2 Peter i. 5-7. They are virtue (or fortitude), knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity (or love). On these items the apostle has the following teaching: "If these things be in you and abound, they make you that you shall be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." This is the affirmative side, or part of what he says of those who *do* the sayings of Jesus—*do these things*. Let us hear him on the negative side: "But he that lacketh these things is blind, and can not see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins." This is an unfavorable account of them. But let us hear the apostle a little further on: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if you do these things you shall never fall." Here is some more of the immutable covenant, disastrous to the labored speech preceding this. What will my friend say to this? Did he ever exhort his brethren to "give diligence to make their calling and election sure?" Not a bit of it. He has no use for this Scripture. He has tried many times to prove that their calling and election were *already made sure*, but never exhorted them to *make* their calling and election sure. This is not his doctrine. He does not believe that Christians, such as those to whom Peter wrote, *can make* their calling and election sure. Nor does he believe the closing clause of the Scripture just quoted: "For

if you do these things you shall never fall." What use has he for this Scripture? He ridicules the idea of there being any "if" in the matter. But this Scripture has an "if" in it—"if you do;" and the word *do*, much as my friend dislikes it, is there also. Well, "if you do" what? "These things"—the seven things already enumerated. Well, what if we do these things? We "shall never fall." This "if" is implied and should be understood in every promise of the Lord to hold us up, to keep us from falling, etc. The promise is, "*If you do* these things you shall never fall."

But we are not through with this Scripture. Let us read on: "For so an abundant entrance shall be ministered to you into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." See verse 11. What is the meaning of this? "For so"—that is, by *doing* these things—an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom. This is death on the anti-means doctrine. It has too much *doing*. It has seven things to be done, or seven conditions to be performed by man in order to an assurance, on the one hand, that we shall *never fall*, and, on the other, that we shall have an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom. From these conditions there is no escape.

In the seventeenth chapter of John we have what is truly the Lord's prayer; the prayer the Lord *prayed himself*, and not the one after the manner of which he taught his disciples to *pray*. In this prayer he mentions and repeatedly refers to those whom the Father *gave him*. These have been referred to in all the Calvinistic works, as *elect* persons, and they were *elect*, but their election *did* not secure them against *falling*, or being lost. Let us read John xvii. 12: "Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." Here we learn that one that

the Father gave him was *lost*. How did he fall? or on what account was he lost? Acts i. 17, we learn that he was numbered with the other apostles and had obtained part of the apostolic ministry. They prayed the Lord to show which of the two men before them he had chosen, that he "might take part of this ministry and apostleship from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place." Here we have a man that the Father gave to Christ, that had part of the ministry and apostleship, who *fell* from it and was *lost*, and this by transgression. No matter if he was *elected* and *given to Christ*, nor if he had a part of the apostolic ministry, *by transgression* he fell and was lost. He violated the condition with which he was required to comply, and so doing fell.

The great and good apostle to the Gentiles says, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away." 1 Cor. ix. 27. If such a man as he had to keep his body in subjection, lest he should be a cast-away, what shall we say of the conceit of him who now thinks he can not fall? Let him who thinks he stands take heed lest he fall. The Bible is full of the same thing, showing that eternal life is conditional. I have simply time before I take my seat to refer to a few of the closing words of the sacred canon: "If any man shall add to these things, God shall add to him the plagues that are written in this book." "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book." Look at these thunders of the Almighty in regard to what man *can do*, in complying with, or violating conditions, and the terrible consequences.

Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators: Respected Audience:—I had expected that but little notice would be given my proofs or arguments on this proposition by Mr. Franklin. In fact, after having witnessed his course while on the other propositions, no one had any ground to suppose that he would condescend to notice them. We are not, therefore, disappointed as to his course. But the question will present itself to our minds, Why does the gentleman refuse to notice these proofs and arguments? Why not treat them to some little respect? There are just two reasons for his silence.

First, he is defeated by them, and has no answer to offer. And second, they speak of the work of God, and that is a subject that gives him pain to contemplate. If the Bible revealed no work of God, and taught simply the eternal salvation of Christians to be their own work, it would much better suit Mr. Franklin. This is the reason why he can notice no text save those which speak of Christians doing. He has ventured to speak of a divine part, but he no more finds a place for the divine part to come in, than if there was no divine part. It is simply a flourish of words to hide the real sentiment held.

The real sentiment of his last speech, and it is of a piece with all its predecessors, is that the acts of man just as certainly take men to heaven, as that their acts take them to hell. All depends upon their acts whether good or bad. If they obey, their obedience is the ground of their eternal salvation; but if they disobey, their disobedience is the ground of their eternal damnation. His divine part, therefore, of which he once in a while speaks, has just as much to do in damning men for disobedience, as it has in saving men for obedience. In either case it is giving them the privilege of doing good or evil, and rewarding them according to their deeds. I now state that not one text quoted

by the gentleman in his last speech, but with the application he has given, teaches this doctrine. Why then did he deny conditions being meritorious? Can any one tell why he denied the only point he could prove by his interpretation of his proof texts? There is one of two positions which he is forced to take: that obedience merits eternal salvation, and is the ground upon which man is saved, or that man is saved independent of obedience as a condition performed in order to eternal salvation. He has denied the first, and the last is my proposition. I leave the gentleman to kick and flounder between these two positions, afraid to take either. Like a certain animal, it depends very much on circumstances what color he will be when you see him next. He says he will not stop by showing that I had no proof! How did he show it? Did he notice one proof? No. Did he answer one argument? No. What did he do? Oh he said there was no proof in it all, and that was the *end of it!* How wonderful is the magic of his say so; before it, proof and argument must surrender, for there is *no escape!* If we had come here to take Mr. Franklin's say so for our sentiment, the point would soon be settled. But we have a more sure word of prophecy than his say so, and he will please show from that, and from the proofs taken from that, that we have no proof; this he will not try to do. But he says that I have not found the words "independent of conditions to be performed by man." I did not expect to find these words in the Bible. Have the terms of the proposition been found in the proof on any proposition discussed since this debate began? No. It is not expected that any man would oppose a proposition, the terms of which were Bible terms. And it is childish to talk of the failure of proof, because the words of the proof are not the same as those in the proposition; and it is equally childish to say that proof fails, without noticing what the proof is.

But, as Mr. Franklin will not notice my proofs, I shall notice his. He prefers to lead, so as to get on to the subject of the *human part*, or *man's doing*. I do not dislike this part of our salvation, because, "it is God which worketh in us, to will and to do of his good pleasure." "A good tree brings forth good fruit." "By their fruits ye shall know them." The character of the Christian, as seen in their good works, proves the relation they sustain to God, as the heirs of salvation, and are mentioned as the character which divides them from the wicked. Therefore, good works do not procure eternal salvation, but are the fruits of salvation, wrought in us of God, and are therefore the work of God.

When Paul speaks of his works of obedience, he says, 1 Cor. xv. 10, "But by the grace of God I am what I am; and his grace which was bestowed upon me, was not in vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all; yet not I" (it was not conditions which he performed), "but the grace of God which was with me." But to prove that obedience is a condition to procure the eternal salvation of Christians, we are presented with a quotation from Heb. v. 9: "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Is the obedience here a condition to be performed to procure the salvation, of which Christ is the author? Is it, as Mr. Franklin asserted, a condition in the immutable covenant? Look at the second chapter and tenth verse. It was to bring his "sons to glory" that Jesus was made perfect through sufferings. How did his suffering bring them to glory? By "purging their conscience from dead works to serve the living God," and "perfecting forever them that are sanctified." Their obedience, therefore, was the fruit of his salvation and their sonship to God. Obedience is a condition performed by man, says Mr. Franklin. And this, says he, accords with another part of the immutable

counsel, that Christ will take vengeance on those *that obey not the gospel*. If obeying is a condition which man performs, and disobeying is a condition which man performs, and if the demerit of disobedience damns a man, I ask Mr. Franklin to say why it is that the merit of obeying does not save him? And if the merit of obedience does not save him, how is it a condition upon which eternal salvation depends? The saved are obedient, because the salvation is unto obedience, and not dependent upon it. Rom. ii. 6-9: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds," etc. What is this text produced for? To prove that the ground upon which Christians are judged worthy of eternal life is *their deeds, or conditions by them performed*. Was Paul treating on any such theme? Look at the connection and see. Instead of this he is condemning the self-righteous Jew, for dishonoring God, by breaking the very law which he claimed to obey most scrupulously. But who were those seeking for glory and honor and immortality? The Jew which is one inwardly, circumcised in spirit, whose praise is not of man, but of God. "Being freely justified by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. ii. 29; iii. 34. Therefore, the works do not procure the salvation, but the salvation procures the works, and the works are stated as the fruits belonging to the saved. If the eternal life given is because of the deeds of man, as conditions performed, where is the merit?

Peter was once an Arminian, and thought that he would be justified because he was a Jew outwardly, and remission of sins was a work done in heaven, and not in man; and because conditions had to be performed in order to eternal salvation. But when God showed him that the Divine Father cleansed poor Gentile sinners, and heard their prayers, he perceived that the evidence of acceptance with God was not distinction of person, but grace of life. Mr.

Franklin thought there was a *jingle of words* in this quotation, or he would have left it out of view. For he believes had Cornelius died before Peter baptized him, his *fearing God and working righteousness* would have been no evidence of a pardoned state. But Peter says, "He that fears him, and worketh righteousness, *is accepted with him*." But the Sermon on the Mount talks about *doing*, and that is unpalatable to an *anti-means Baptist*. Well, if an *anti-means Baptist* does not relish the Sermon on the Mount, so full of encouragement and comfort, to such poor, afflicted, mourning, thirsting souls as we, in the name of reason and truth what possible use can a *Campbellite* have for the words here spoken by our Lord? A people who pride themselves in burlesquing Christian experience, calling it dreams and nightmares, and comparing the work of the Holy Spirit to a fright at ghosts and hobgoblins, are the last people on earth to quote from the Sermon on the Mount. If Jesus had taught a sermon on baptism in order to salvation I should not have wondered at this reference. But what does the gentleman prove? That their righteousness must exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, or they could not enter the kingdom of heaven. Again, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but *he that doeth the will of my Father*." What do these passages prove? That the children of God, in spirit, were more righteous than the Pharisees (Christ being their righteousness), God working in them that which was well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ. Heb. xiii. 21. And they did the will of the Father. This is all true, but accords fully with my view. But the gentleman's closing comment on this sermon is very rich. He finds the *means* and *anti-means* doctrines side by side. This comparison and contrast set forth by our Lord between the wise man who built his house on a rock, and the foolish man who built his house on the sand, are very instruct-

ive. The wise man hears the sayings of Christ and does them. "He that is of God heareth God's word." "It is God that worketh in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure." The foolish man hears them not in the sense of obedience, but builds upon his own works as the ground of his acceptance with God. He loves to boast of the *human part*, and makes eternal salvation depend on what he has done. He dotes on the name *Christian*, but denies the work of salvation to be of Christ. The means in which he glories are his own works. Mr. Franklin can take the side of this foolish means man if he likes, but I prefer to build on the Rock, Christ Jesus. Again we are treated to an exposition of the judgment. Matt. xxv. 41-44. Mr. Franklin makes the Savior teach that the ground on which the saints inherited the kingdom is because they fed the brethren of Christ—gave them drink, took them in as strangers, and visited them when sick and in prison. Does he suppose that Christ states these acts as the conditions on which eternal salvation depends? He certainly believes no such thing; and he will prove that he does not by the very next text which he quotes. Why then did he quote the text? Just for want of proof. He has not the proof in God's word, and must needs put in his time on words that, to his ear, jingle to his fancy. He will never see that grace produces character, and therefore grace saves; but he puts man first in the work, and his work the ground of acceptance and eternal life. He is very willing to speak of the *human part*, but he never has told us anything done on the divine part which saves any man. He never will try to do so for the very good reason which I give in his own words: "This reception or rejection turns upon *doing* and *not doing* the sayings of Jesus." "This principle of *doing* or *not doing* the will of God, and its consequences, will follow us to the last judgment." Remember he does not give the doing the will of God as a character of life dependent on

the grace of God, and, therefore, a consequence which follows salvation, but a condition performed by man, upon which salvation is dependent. Where is the divine part? He has none. It is what man does that makes up his theology. Take away what man does, from his plan, and the race would be condemned without exception. The only difference that he makes between the saved and the damned is what they have done. But he says, "The Apostle Peter has *seven conditions* to be performed by man, in order to entering the everlasting kingdom." Are they the same conditions named in the Sermon on the Mount, and in Matt. xxv. 41-44? If not, will Mr. Franklin tell us which is correct in giving the conditions, Christ or Peter? I hope he will also tell us how many conditions Paul has in order to entering the everlasting kingdom; and how many James has; and how many John has; and which of them is correct.

But let us now look at these seven conditions, which he claims the Apostle Peter gives for men to perform in order to entering the everlasting kingdom. They are virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. Says the apostle, "If these things be *in you* and abound, they make you that ye shall be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." *If they be where?* In you. Who works within you? It is God. How then did these saints add them to faith? By practically acting out what God wrought in their hearts. In what sense did they make their calling and election sure? In the practical sense, "by their fruit ye shall know them." The abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom is in the same sense. But I ask was not their calling and election sure in the immutable covenant, independent of their fruits, in the sense of conditions? Let us see. 1 Peter i. 2: "*Elect* according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the

Spirit, unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." 2 Peter i. 3: "According as his *divine power hath given to us* all things, that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that *hath called us to glory and virtue.*" Was their calling and election sure, in the immutable covenant? Again, 1 Peter ii. 9: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." I inquire again, was their calling and election sure, as the heirs of God, and inheritors of the everlasting kingdom? If Peter states the truth it is beyond peradventure.

If Mr. Franklin does not like the calling and election that God makes sure to every heir of the immutable covenant, he can go on and call virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, the product of man, upon which their entrance into the everlasting kingdom depends. But it will be apparent to all who know the truth, as it is in Jesus, that he is not only in conflict with the apostle, but that he stultifies himself when he asserts, "Nor have we any question about man *meriting* it, on conditions to be performed by man, being the *ground* of it." "We all know that man *merits* nothing, and nothing that man can do is the *ground* of salvation." His comment on this text is, "This is death on the anti-means doctrine. It has too much *doing*. It has seven things to be done, or seven conditions to be performed by man, in order to an assurance, on the one hand, that we shall *never fall*, and, on the other, that we shall have an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom." "From these conditions *there is no escape.*" The emphasis is my own. And permit me to say, that, from a complete self-contradiction, and making virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, to be

conditions having no merit, and being no ground of salvation, *he has no escape.*

I leave him here in all his glory. But he wishes a companion to help him out; so he invites us to consider the case of one who was given to Christ, for what purpose he does not state, who transgressed and fell from an office, that he might go to his own place. This was Judas Iscariot. He is excepted from the other apostles, as to the benefits of Christ, before he transgressed. John xiii. 10: "He that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean." Again, he is called a thief, before he transgressed and fell from his office. John xii 6: "This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief." Again, he is called a devil, before he fell from office. John vi. 70: "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" He spoke of Judas Iscariot. Does Mr. Franklin claim this man to have been a *Christian*? If not, his case does not affect this proposition. If he does claim that a thief and devil is a *Christian*, I ask Mr. Franklin, is he a *Christian* after this type, and does he hold Judas Iscariot to be his well beloved *brother*? If his argument on 1 Cor. ix. 27 means anything at all affecting this proposition, it is, that just one thing kept the Apostle Paul from sinking down to eternal ruin. What was that one potent thing? He kept his body under and brought it into subjection. Was there any *merit* in it? If so, to whom did the *merit* belong? And did not Paul glory in that which saved him from eternal ruin, and made him a sharer in eternal salvation.

But Mr. Franklin nearly always saves the best for the last, so as to leave a good impression on our minds. Here we have it without any reference to chapter or verse: "If any man shall take from the words of the book of this

prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." These, he says, are the thunders of the Almighty, in regard to what man *can do*. What can man do? He can claim the right to take from the words of the book of this prophecy. What man did it? The man of sin, "The son of perdition: who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped: so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." "Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, 8. What part had he in the book of life, and the holy city, and the things written in this book? A nominal part only. "Therefore shall be taken from him that which he seemeth to have." Luke viii. 18.

Will Mr. Franklin say that a Christian has ever claimed the right or power to take from the sayings of God? If not, what relevancy is there in using this passage on the negative of this proposition. Would it not have looked more like the course of an honorable disputant had he come boldly forward and examined my proofs in the order I presented them, and, if possible, have showed that they were defective, instead of this rambling, pointless style, pursued in his last speech? But he has marked out his own course and he feels unable to do better by his cause than to pursue it, point or no point. I propose now, having followed him through his meanderings, to continue my argument.

I prove my proposition from the argument of the apostle as to what the effect would be was it possible for a Christian to finally apostatize from God and be lost. Heb. vi. 4-6: "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word

of God and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." The apostle here supposes a case of final apostasy. He says, "If such were possible *it would put the Son of God to an open shame.*" Is Mr. Franklin here to attribute shame to the Son of God by saying that all the virtue of the blood of Jesus Christ was insufficient to eternal salvation; and that its purifying power, after it has been applied to the conscience, is overcome, and the subject to whom the immutable promise has been sealed and confirmed by the oath of God, sinks down into eternal despair? What does Paul suppose this case for? It is to prove the converse of the case supposed. See his argument on the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. To prove the resurrection, he first shows what the effect would be if there was no resurrection of the dead. So here he shows what would be the effect if the atonement by Christ was not perfect, but a shame to the Son of God, because it failed and was imperfect. He then goes on to perfection by showing the character of Christ as a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. "He" (Christ) "was not made a priest after the law of carnal commandment but after the power of an endless life." "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by which we draw nigh unto God." Heb. vii. 16, 19. "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." "How much more" (than the blood of beasts) "shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." Heb. ix. 11, 12,

14. "But this man, after he had made one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us." Heb. x. 12-15. No man can doubt the design of this argument of the apostle. He gloried in the cross of Christ. He determined to know nothing among the people save Jesus, and him crucified. It was given to him to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ. His gospel was that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he arose again according to the Scriptures. That we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son, and shall be saved by his life. That when Christ who is our life shall appear, we shall appear with him in glory.

Here is perfection. A perfect Jesus who has wrought a perfect atonement in his blood, which has been accepted in the court of heaven. And as a King and Priest on his throne he has power over all flesh, and gives eternal life to as many as the Father gave him, and has pledged his own word that they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of his hand. For his kingdom shall stand forever, and of its peace there shall be no end.

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—You will all agree to one thing Bro. Thompson has repeatedly told you, and that is, that he has the same subject all the time, unless it is when he devotes a little time to myself personally. Then he has another subject and does not treat that very fairly. He now claims that I have

given no attention to his proof, but those who are hearing our debate will see the matter in a very different light from him. A man's arguments do not always appear to other people as they do to him. His persistence in trying to prove what has not been denied, and what I have shown is not the matter in hand, and continuing to repeat it throughout the discussion, must be very irksome to any one simply listening to know the truth. The only wonder to me is, that he can not see the absurdity of it. There has been no dispute about the work of God, the grace of God, the immutability of his promise or covenant. This is not the issue at all. I am as sensible as any man can be that the eternal salvation of the Christian depends on the work of God; on the grace of God, and that it is in the promise and covenant. He needs no effort to prove these matters. But will the grace of God save any man who will not obey the gospel? Will the work of God save any man who will not obey the gospel? Does the promise of God propose to save any man who will not do the will of God? Is the immutable covenant conditional or unconditional? These are plain matters of inquiry. I have pursued the right course to settle these matters. I have gone to the apostolic teaching to show that there is a divine part and a human part; or a part that the Lord performs and a part that man performs himself, and both parts must be performed, or man will not be saved.

I held a discussion with Mr. Thompson's father, Elder Wilson Thompson, and now am in debate with the son. We have a different proposition now from the one I debated with his father, but not a different subject. I recognize it as the same old subject, about *falling from grace*, or "once in grace always in grace." My friend has studied the matter pretty carefully and avoids the old phrases and style; but I recognize it as the same old thing in a new dress. His work is not properly to prove the work of God,

the work of the Spirit, or of the grace of God, nor that the promise or covenant of God is immutable, but to show that the promise or covenant is independent of any conditions—that it proposes to give Christians the eternal salvation without any conditions to be performed by them. Mr. Thompson now says, "I did not expect to find these words in the Bible." No, he did not expect to find the terms "independent of conditions to be performed by man" in the Bible! Did he find any terms of the same meaning? He certainly did not. How then is the proof there? He gets vexed with the matter and styles it "weak and childish" to call for the terms of his proposition, or others of the same import, in his proof! How can he or any man prove a proposition without the terms of the proposition, or others of the same import, in the proof? Will he explain this mystery?

I have shown that there are conditions—that Christians may fall on account of doing what is forbidden, or not doing what is commanded. You have now heard his second speech and the finest things he can say for his position, or for the old doctrine, "Once in grace always in grace." You have seen that the very terms in the dispute, or others of the same import, are not in a single proof produced by him. He talks about *my* doctrine, but we are not testing any doctrine of mine now. We are testing *his* doctrine. The laboring oar is in his hand now. He is perfectly stranded at my square denial, that the conditions to be performed by man are meritorious, or that they are the ground of salvation. This, again, takes the wind out of his sails. On this he depended for material to prejudice the people, and now to find it all set aside is perfectly perplexing. He is so discomfited in this, and defeated, that he appears determined to saddle it on me, and compel me to take the position he had prepared for me. But I can not accommodate him in this. I never thought the con-

ditions were meritorious on the part of man, or the ground of salvation. The merit is in our Lord, and he also is the ground of our salvation. There is no merit in man, and nothing that man can do can merit eternal life. I wish I knew how I could say this so as to save my friend the trouble of repeating over and over again his pointless talk about this matter. Nothing that man can do, no conditions that can be performed by him, would save him, without Christ, without the grace of God, or without the blood of Christ. This is the *divine side*, the *ground of salvation*, and the *meritorious side*. But there are divine appointments requiring us to do certain things to come to his promise to save us. We do these things as the means, on our side, through which we receive the salvation, through the merit of Christ, the efficacy of his blood and himself as the ground of it all. Against this there is no rising up.

I am perfectly aware that "good works do not procure salvation." Christ *procures* and *gives* salvation. But does he give it independent of obedience? Has obedience or disobedience anything to do with our being saved? Does God determine to save one man, by irresistible power, regenerate him, make him a believer and a child of God, and then by irresistible power work in him to will and to do of his own good pleasure; continue and perfect the work, regardless of a man's actions, and finally save him? Then, does he pass by another man, no worse, never exercise the irresistible power on him; never give him the power to be saved and consign him to eternal perdition? If he does, what is the use in our preaching? Those in whose behalf the irresistible power is exercised can not be lost, and those in whose behalf it is not exercised can not be saved. What becomes of man's volition? He is a mere machine, and is not an accountable being. This is the old theory of eternal decrees and has nothing in it to inspire a noble effort, or deter man from a fearful crime. His being saved

or lost in no sense depends on his conduct. In other words, no man is to blame for being what he is, nor in any sense to be praised. The Lord could not, in view of this theory, say, "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joys of thy Lord." All the good in him, according to my friend's theory, was worked into him by irresistible power. He could not have done otherwise than he did, nor been otherwise than he is. In other words, he has nothing to do with the matter, only to be passive in the hands of the Lord. Indeed, I need not say, "be passive," for he can not be otherwise.

The effort of Mr. Thompson to evade the force of the Scripture, that asserts that Christ is the "author of eternal salvation to them that *obey him*," was as perfect a failure as any man ever made. Why did he not show that nothing depends on *obeying him*? He is not the author of eternal salvation to them that do not *obey him*. Obedience is performed by man, and eternal salvation is not given independent of obedience, but to them that *obey him*. Does anything depend on obedience? Is salvation for the disobedient as much as for the obedient? Come, my friend, argument is what we want. Tell us then plainly: Does anything depend on obedience on the part of a Christian? Has a Christian any personal responsibility in obedience or not? Tell this audience plainly whether obedience has anything to do with eternal salvation, and not be mincing the matter. Never mind what it is a *fruit of*, but speak out and tell us, can a man be saved without obedience? There are Universalists listening to you, and they are watching to see whether they can give you the right hand of fellowship. This is a capital point with them. They are hoping that you will stand with them, and maintain that eternal salvation in no sense depends on obedience. They have as much at stake as yourself in this matter. Do not trouble yourself about the obedience *procuring* salvation, but tell

us whether the eternal salvation, in any sense, depends on obedience, or whether the eternal salvation can be obtained *without obedience*.

The attempt of my friend to be humorous, about Peter once being an Arminian, was so mystical that I could not see the point in it. If any one here saw it they saw further than I did. But the truth is Peter was nearer a Calvinist than an Arminian before the vision on the house-top. He says, God there showed him that he "should call no man common," and in his opening speech, at the house of Cornelius, in the first sentence, he swept away the doctrine of my friend. He said, "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation, he who fears God and works righteousness is accepted with him." I suppose my friend will continue to talk about "merit" and "demerit," works securing salvation, etc., as if I had used these terms and not discarded them; but there is no dispute about merit and demerit, nor about work procuring salvation, or being the ground of it. The plain language of Scripture is, "that in every nation, he who *fears God* and *works righteousness* is accepted with him." Does anything depend on *fearing God* and *working righteousness*, or will God accept any man who does not fear God and work righteousness? Give yourself no trouble about their being "fruits of salvation," but tell us whether a Christian can be saved without them—whether anything depends on them. Do not forget the word "independent" in the proposition.

My friend has kept his temper pretty well, but the perplexities he encountered in his speech, just heard, were too much! I believe that was the first time he has uttered the word, "Campbellite." When it came to having the Sermon on the Mount arrayed against him, he could withhold his temper no longer, without the nickname. I excuse him, supposing that it must be annoying to have his old sermons swept away after preaching them round the country so

many years. What was the Scripture that pressed him so sorely? "Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but *he that doeth the will of my Father.*" Will any enter the kingdom of heaven *who do not the will of the Father*? Come, friend Thompson, tell us does entering into the kingdom of heaven depend on *doing the will of God*? Do not give yourself any trouble about who it is that works it into their hearts not to do the will, or who it is that works into their hearts not to do the will of God; but tell us plainly whether they can enter without doing the will of God. You need not stop to blame the Almighty for not working it into one class while he works it into another class, nor the devil for working it into some not to do the will of God, but tell us plainly whether entering into the kingdom of heaven is, in any sense, dependent on doing the will of God. Do not get out of humor and call hard names, and make a flourish to rouse prejudice, but answer squarely, or give it up. We are not on experiences, but on the question of eternal life depending on doing the will of God. Can a man obtain eternal life without doing the will of God?

My worthy friend says I "dote on the name Christian, but deny that the work of salvation is of Christ." Wonder when I denied this! Never. It is the work of Christ, and in his work he says, "He who hears these sayings of mine and *does them*, I will liken him to a wise man. He who hears these sayings of mine and *does them not*, I will liken him to a foolish man." What is the difference on the two sides, as here stated? It is not that *God did not do his part*, in working in them to will and to do, on the one side, and *did his part*, on the other side; but that *they did not do their part*, on the one side, in not doing his sayings; and on the other side, *did their part* by doing his sayings. The means in which I glory is not, as he incorrectly says, *my works*, but the works of Christ—"good works which God has before or-

dained that we should walk in them;" doing the sayings of Christ—obeying him—doing the will of his Father. Among the last words of the divine book, we have the words, "They who do his commandments shall enter by the gates into the city." Does anything depend on doing his commandments? If not, why does he say, "They who do his commandments shall have right to the tree of life, and shall enter in through the gates into the city?"

My friend made quite an effort to show that the "calling and election" of the Christians to whom Peter wrote, had already been *made sure*, when Peter commanded them to make their "calling and election sure." But the language does not sound to us as if the apostle considered their "calling and election sure." Hear the apostle: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if you do these things you shall never fall." 2 Peter i. 10. When did my friend ever exhort his brethren to "give diligence to make their calling and election sure," and tell them "If you do these things you shall never fall?" Never did he use such language. Instead of exhorting them to "make their calling and election sure," he tries to make them believe that it is *already sure*, and has been from the beginning of time; and instead of telling them, "If you do these things you shall never fall," he insists that they *never can fall*—that nothing depends on *doing* these things; that eternal salvation is independent of anything we can do.

He tries to escape from the *fall* of Judas, but from this case there is no escape. Judas was one of those given to Christ. See John xvii. 12: "Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition." He was one that the Father *gave to Christ*, no matter how bad he was, nor when he became bad. Not only so, but he was not lost from *something he never had*. He belonged to Christ at some time, and was lost from him.

This contradicts Mr. Thompson's theory squarely. He does not believe that any person given to Christ can be lost. This man was given to Christ and was lost. But how came he to be lost? This part of it also ruins my worthy friend's theory. He will not listen to the Scripture quoted a few moments ago: "If you do these things you shall never fall," nor will he now hear Peter tell how Judas fell. Peter, joining with the other apostles, prayed, saying, "Show which of these two men thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place." Acts i. 24, 25. This man "was numbered with the apostles," and "had obtained part of this ministry." Here stands the clear matters of fact; he was given to Christ; belonged to him; had obtained part of this ministry and apostleship, and from all this *he fell by transgression and was lost*. Does anything depend on *obedience and disobedience*, or on the *actions of men*? One that God gave to Christ was lost—fell by transgression. No matter when the devil entered into him, how long he had been unclean, he was lost. He by *transgression fell*. Was he lost from something he never had? Did he fall from a place he never occupied? No ill-natured twits about Judas being my "well-beloved brother," can answer my argument or do more than manifest the bad feeling engendered by defeat.

Paul did not say, nor did I say, that "just one thing kept him from falling," but I quoted his precise words. There is nothing about *merit* or *demerit* in his words or in mine. He says, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." Does anything depend on his keeping his body in subjection? He gives his own reason for doing so in the words, "Lest that by any means, when I have preached the gospel to others, I my-

self should be a castaway." 1 Cor. ix. 27. There is no getting out of this language. Never mind about the "merit in it." The apostle says he did it lest he should be a castaway. Does my friend do the same? Does he exhort others to do the same? No. He tries to convince them that they can not be cast away.

What a ridiculous effort my friend made in reference to the man whose part shall be taken away out of the book of life and out of the holy city! He thinks it was the man of sin who never had any part in the book of life. How can any man, who has no part in the book of life, have *his part* taken out of the book of life? This is absurdity, doubly absurd. No, sir; it does not say, the part he seemeth to have, but "*his part*." Do you believe the language, sir, that a man may have his part taken out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and that, too, on account of an act of disobedience?

The apostle does not say "if such were possible," but "If they shall fall away," and the Bible Union translates it, "who have fallen away." Here we have a clear case of those "who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come," and the apostle says of them, "If they shall fall away, *it is impossible* to renew them again to repentance." He is not talking of something which it is impossible for them to do, in speaking of their falling away, but something possible and involving terrible consequences. Chapter x. 26, he says, "For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." Does the apostle here hypothecate something that can never occur? By no means, but something that he knows man *can do and may do*. He can sin

willfully after coming to the knowledge of the truth, and thus subject himself to a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.

But we will now hear Peter tell what may befall those whom the Lord *bought*, on account of their sins: "There were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." 2 Peter ii. 1. This is a plain Scripture, showing that the Lord *bought* them, and that they can bring on themselves swift destruction, and that, too, by bringing in damnable heresies. In accordance with this, we have the following from Paul: "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." Rom. xiv. 15. Did my worthy friend ever exhort his brethren to "destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died?" Not a bit of it. He tries to make us all believe that if Christ died for a man he *he can not be destroyed* without any regard to his behavior. He applies the words, "None can pluck them out of my hands," and "they shall never perish," as is the language, implied no obedience on their part. But all such language is hypothetical, implying what is elsewhere clearly expressed. The "if" is always implied and understood, whether mentioned in every case or not. Judas was in the Father's hand, and gave him to our Lord, but he transgressed, fell and was lost. None could pluck him out of the Father's hand, or the Savior's hand, but he could transgress, and by transgression fell and was lost. Let us hear the word of the Lord: "When the righteous turns away from his righteousness, and commits iniquity, and does according to all the abominations that the wicked man does, shall he live? All his righteousness that he has done shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he has trespassed, and in

his sins that he has sinned, in them shall he die." Ezek. xviii. 24. Against this there is no rising up.

We will now hear Paul: "Behold, I Paul say to you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." I know these "if's" trouble my friend, but he must not blame me; I did not make the Bible, and it is not myself that says "*If* you be circumcised," but Paul, and he never heard the doctrine of my friend, that a man can not fall from grace, and that nothing depends upon anything we can do. Hear him still further: "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect to you, whoever of you are justified by the law; you are fallen from grace." See Gal. v. 2-5. Any falling from grace in this? Certainly no one ever fell from grace that never had any grace. Paul, then, being witness, by a man's own act of going back to the law and being circumcised, a man can *fall from grace*, and Christ will *profit him nothing*. But my friend has virtually given up his idea of eternal life being given *independent of obedience*, and spent the half hour preceding in a fruitless attempt to extricate himself from the difficulties in which I involved him.

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S THIRD ADDRESS.

*Brethren Moderators:—Respected Audience:—*In deciding the sense of any written instrument, or determining what is contained in it, the instrument itself is acknowledged to be the best evidence that can be produced. Therefore, when a will, or other instrument of like character, is proven in court, being duly confirmed, it stands immutable; and no evidence can be taken that would add to or take from the sense of the expressed will or instrument. Hence,

Paul expressed it thus, Heb. vi. 16: "For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife." Gal. iii. 16, 17: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." The point being established, then, that the covenant or will of God is immutable, we inquire, What is the will or covenant of God? The true answer to this inquiry is, The promise to Abraham and his seed. Was that promise conditional, and, if so, what were the conditions? Permit me to say right here, that no conditions can be inferred as belonging to the promise or will of God, which are not named in the promise or will itself. Now look at the argument of Paul in Gal. iii. and Heb. viii., and you will see that the promise is not only immutable, but unconditional. He says, "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Yet certainly the law was the rule of life given to the heirs of promise from Abraham to Christ.

It will not be claimed, I presume, that there were other conditions under that dispensation, not contained in the law, which the people performed in order to eternal salvation. If, therefore, Paul has stated the case truly, there was no condition upon which the inheritance depended, to be performed by man. The inheritance is of the immutable promise of God, and not of the law; which is the same as saying, not of conditions performed by man. I take this time also to state to Mr. Franklin that while no man could do the deeds of the law and be justified, as it is clearly proven throughout the word of God, yet God is just in judging the whole world by the law, and condemning them.

Therefore, those who are saved, are saved by grace, and not by the works of the law. And this grace is an irresistible power, or else we have to thank man that it has not always been resisted, and proved an entire failure. But to return to the covenant. In Heb. viii. it is said that this covenant is not according to the covenant made with the fathers, when God took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt. Why is it not according to that covenant? Hear God's reason: "Because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." But Mr. Franklin asserts that they do not continue in this one either, and the Lord does not regard them, and they are eternally lost. Does he not charge the Almighty with folly, when he does so, and render the argument in Hebrews a labored piece of nonsense? What does Paul seek to prove, if it be not the perfection of God's plan to save the heirs of promise through the mediation of Jesus Christ, the High Priest of good things to come? And this covenant system is contrasted with a system of works and declared to be not according to that plan at all. This is the evident design of the whole argument.

Therefore, after presenting the contrast between a covenant that depended on conditions to be performed by man, and the eternal covenant of God, the apostle goes on to state just what the new covenant is. I am glad that he has given it right in this connection; for the reason that he has been contrasting it with a system of conditions, and if there is a condition in it, the performance of which, on the part of man, secures his eternal salvation, it will be stated prominently in this place. But, thanks be to God for his exceeding grace, it opens by stating what he will be to them—a God—and what they shall be to him—a people. No "if" here. God is not stating a supposition. No. Nor is he stating a yea and nay promise. But it is the eternal yea and amen of that God who can not lie. He says, "I

will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." There is not an "if" nor a condition on the part of man stated nor implied in the whole instrument as God gave it—not one. Is it given in full? Or must we do as Mr. Franklin has done, scrap out every text in the Bible that states the character of the heirs of this covenant, the fruits which follow this salvation by grace, and cry out lustily, "These are conditions?" *There is no rising up against it!* Paul told Timothy to bring his cloak from Troas, therefore, eternal salvation is conditional. Could Timothy have been saved if he had not obeyed?

I am sorry that any man will profess to be so ignorant of truth as to claim that the duties of Christian life are so many conditions set before men to perform in order to secure eternal salvation. That eternal salvation depends upon these performances of men, and yet there is no merit in them. Salvation eternal, therefore, depends upon that which has no merit in it. What a theory is this? No merit in obeying God; in following Jesus; in loving one another; in adding to faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity? If there be no merit in these things, in the name of truth, what is there that is meritorious? These are of God, and they are of infinite worth, being the fruit of, and, therefore, possessing the value of the grace of God in them. But we have seen that no conditions are given in God's eternal covenant for men to perform in order to eternal salvation; and as it is immutable, and can not be changed, the point is settled, and the will as given by God, through his apostles and prophets, forever establishes my proposition.

Mr. Franklin knows this as well as we, and therefore his effort to dodge backward and forward on his self-made phrase, *divine part*, and *human part*. In one sentence he

says it is all of the grace of God; the ground of it is all in the merit of Christ; *but*, it is conditional and man performs the conditions; and it all turns upon his doing; but there is no merit in his doing, etc. He talks of confusion and excitement, but such a medley of absurdities and self-contradictions I am sure none of you ever witnessed in a religious discussion, as appears in his speeches since this discussion began. He honors me by saying I have but one subject. But I must say of him that he appears to have a little of almost all subjects, and occupies both sides on them all.

Mr. Franklin informs us that our subject is the same old one about *falling from grace*, or "once in grace always in grace," or, more properly, *once a child of God always a child of God*. This is the issue. But I do not avoid the old phrases. I take them in their full sense, just as my father used them, and as the Bible proves them. I answer the gentleman's question squarely, "Does God save Christians independent of conditions to be performed by them?" He does. How do I prove this? By the word of God. Mr. Franklin responds, "I believe that as much as he, and, could prove it if necessary." Why then is he here debating with me? "Oh, there is a *human part* that man performs," says Mr. Franklin. There is where the point of difference lies. But what does the Bible say of the *human part* of eternal salvation? It declares it is not of man—not of works. And Mr. Franklin, to make his case hopeless and proofless, comes forward and vociferously declares "there is no merit in the works of man." There is, then, no *human part*, the performance of which obtains for Christians eternal salvation. Eternal salvation is the work of God, not dependent on works performed by man. Virtually, Mr. Franklin admits this, and thus yields the real issue in debate. Also, in his denial of any merit in human work, he abandons his proof-texts for his negative argu-

ment, and virtually admits that what Christians do in obedience to God is not as conditions in order to eternal salvation, but graces of life belonging to the saved. What then remains of our proposition in issue between us? Simply the question, "Do all who are Christians at any time in life always thereafter remain such?"

Mr. Franklin enters upon the discussion of this point with great warmth. He returns to Judas Iscariot with triumph in his eyes, and quotes from John xvii. 12: "Those which thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition." Who of them is lost? *The son of perdition! The thief, the devil*, whom Jesus denounced, before he fell. But what did he fall from? A bishopric; an office to which Matthias was afterward appointed by lot. But he was given to Christ. As an officer, he was; to fill the very station that he did. And having betrayed Christ, as the Scripture had before declared he would do, he transgressed and fell from his office, and died, and went to his own place. Mr. Franklin says, "No matter how bad he was, nor when he became bad." But it does matter how bad he was; that is just where the matter comes in. The proposition before us relates to the salvation of *Christians*, and not what offices a devil may fall from. I am free to admit, sir, that thieves will be cast out and perish who have filled high stations. But the office, nor any amount of pretense, ever yet made one of these a Christian. Rev. ii. 2: "And hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." 2 Cor. xi. 13: "For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ." (They had great volition, and free-will power.) But they were no nearer Christians than the devil is to being an angel of light when he is transformed. Like Judas, he is devil still. But we are told again that Paul kept his body in subjection lest he should become a cast-away. You would conclude, from the manner in which Mr.

Franklin refers to this language, that there was just one sense in which a Christian could become a castaway, and that is for God to cast them away eternally into perdition. There is no such idea in the text, nor any other text in God's word. Paul states his confidence of eternal glory not to be in his own power, but in the power of God, 2 Tim. iv. 18: "And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom."

We are told now that my effort was ridiculous in reference to those whose part it is that shall be taken out of the book of life. But the case is too clear to be met in this way. The false teachers, and false apostles, who have exalted themselves in the temple of God, and have sought to add to and take from the things written in God's book, are the very ones against whom the thunders of the Almighty are hurled. Jude i. 4: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation; ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." 8th verse: "Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities." But Peter, speaking of these same false teachers, says: "They shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and shall bring upon themselves swift destruction." Here, again, Mr. Franklin jumps at the idea of the Lord having bought them, and infers that these false teachers were redeemed by the blood of Christ, and Christians in a spiritual sense. There is nothing of the kind in the apostle's argument, but the contrary. They are compared to a sow that has been washed, that returns to wallowing in the mire (washing in literal water made her nothing better than a sow), and a dog that returns to his vomit. The term bought expresses no more, in many places, than the preservation of natural life. That these false teachers were not

Christians, and, therefore, not a case in point in this argument, I prove from 1 John ii. 18, 19: "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, *but they were not of us.*"

This decides the case. They were not Christians, and, therefore, went out like a dog or sow to their old haunts. Their names shall be blotted out from among the living, and the plagues of God shall come upon them, and they shall not escape. Do you, sir, believe that a man may have his part taken out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, queries Mr. Franklin? Yes, sir, I do believe it; just as much as I believe that antichrists went out from the apostles because they were not of them. But the part of an anti-Christian is not the part of a Christian, no more than Judas Iscariot was like the beloved John. But the gentleman is now at Heb. vi. 6: "If they shall fall away." The Bible Union translates it "and have fallen away." But it is a supposed case, to show what the result would be to the system of salvation by the blood of Christ, were it true. It is either so, or else Jesus is put to an open shame, and his work a fruitless one. Which side do you take, Mr. Franklin? His answer is: "*Here is a clear case.*" The case is clear then, that the blood of Jesus, applied in all its saving power, fails, and the person with all its benefits upon him sinks down to hell. Well did Paul say that such a result would put to an open shame the Son of God. I tremble when I think that a man lives, who for his love of self, and to hinge eternal salvation on his own works, will thus trample under feet the Son of God, and count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and do despite unto the Spirit of grace.

Mr. Franklin next goes to Heb. x. 26: "For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth,

there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins," etc. Is not this a supposed case? What is its use? To show how hopeless the case of all would be, if it were true. But what is the true case? Heb. x. 12, 13, 14: "But this man, after he had made one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting until his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."

Mr. Franklin, the Universalists would like to know just how long this forever lasts, that applies to the perfection of those who are sanctified; possibly you can get their right hand of fellowship. But is the Christian a willful sinner? Do they sin willfully? 1 John v. 18: "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not. Chapter iii. 6: "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth, hath not seen him; neither known him." And so Mr. Franklin but destroys his theory every effort he makes to prove it. It is hard for him to kick against the goads. But again, Rom. xiv. 15: "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." This destruction relates to eternal salvation, does it? No, sir, nothing of the kind; and was only dragged in to fill up time. Did I ever warn my brethren against destroying each other? Yes, often. But Mr. Franklin said I did not. That was like much that he says, an assertion of which he neither had knowledge nor proof, spoken while in sore vexation of mind. He will be sorry that he said it when a better humor comes to his goaded mind. Jesus says, "They shall *never* perish."

Please, sir, tell these Universalists how long "never" continues. If only till some one eats meat, they will give you a warm grasp of fellowship. Surely there is a very profound thought couched in the suggestion "None can pluck them out of my Father's hand;" but Judas fell out. Hence Jesus should have said, "None is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand;" but they can fall out. Will

this people, who have heard us to-day, not feel sad that the gentleman has no better answer to offer to my proofs than to thus render the words of Christ deceptive and foolish? Did Jesus mean that they would or would not perish? Neither, if Mr. Franklin's theory be true; but that some would, and some would not, just according to which side of an "if" they put themselves. Is there anything of this kind in the text? Nothing like it, but the opposite. He then quotes from Ezekiel xviii. 24: "When the righteous turns from his righteousness," etc. This was national law, and national righteousness, and had not a word in it about eternal salvation. The transgressor was punished by corporeal death. *Against this there is no rising up.* But now we come to his last decisive and finally conclusive proof. Gal. v. 2, 3, 4: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." My friend's first remark on this text is, "I know these 'ifs' trouble my friend." My dear sir, if you have any regard for your conditional system, they will prove your ruin, for Paul is not simply combating circumcision and the law service, but the principles of conditions and human works, in whatsoever form they may be taught. He declares that "if," yes, *if*-men are justified by the law, grace is of no effect; Christ is dead in vain, and the whole scheme of salvation superfluous and useless. Yes, sir, if your conditional theory be true, you have no place for Jesus, nor for the grace of God.

Since this debate began, you have been unable to show any benefit that Christ or the grace of God ever communicated to a man's heart, or conscience, to make it purer or better. Love, faith, repentance for sins, obedience in all

gospel forms, you have held to be the works or acts of alien sinners, and of their free will and power. Acts done just as the Pharisee did his religious acts, as conditions of their own performance, in order to inherit eternal salvation. There is no grace of God, nor Christ either, in any such system. This is the apostle's argument, and he therefore says, "Whosoever among you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace." How many of them were really justified by the law? Not one. But supposing the doctrine true, that by the deeds of the law, or any other conditions, they were justified, then they were not justified by grace, but by their own deeds, or acts. And instead of holding the doctrine in practice which they had first believed—Gal. i. 4: "Who gave himself" (Christ) "for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father"—they had gone back to another gospel, which was not another, but a perversion of the gospel, by a perverse effort to put conditions and terms in it that were given long after the gospel was preached to Abraham, and was no part of the gospel of the grace of God. It was in this sense the Galatians had been bewitched, and were justified by the deeds of the law, and were fallen from grace.

My friend, Mr. Franklin, is in the same unhappy condition to-day, with the same work-monger doctrine in principle so seated in his brain, that he can not see how Christ can be of any effect to him. He can be none, sir, if your doctrine of conditions be true; no more than if you were justified by circumcision, or the law of Moses. But Paul says no man is justified by the law (really), so no man ever fell from the grace of God in his heart, which saves him from sin and conforms him to the image of Jesus Christ. Paul says, verse ten, "I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded." The ground of his confidence is not in the faithfulness of men to perform

conditions, but, says he, Phil. i. 6: "Being confident of *this very thing*, that he which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Rom. viii. 38, 39: "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." These proofs afford a foundation as strong as the eternal throne of God, and can never be moved. They are not suppositions, but facts. The plain words of Him who can not lie. They show the sure wisdom of God in devising a covenant that can not fail, and appointing an executor that will raise up, in the last day, to eternal glory every heir of God. Says Jesus, "On this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. xvi. 18.

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—Since my worthy friend has been pleased to seek for the doctrine of his proposition in the promise to Abraham, I must preach him a short sermon on the promise. In Eph. iii. 11 Paul speaks of "the eternal purpose." Hear him: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known, by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." A little further back the apostle says: "To me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ: and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath

been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. iii. 8, 9. Paul was one of God's elect, but not elected through respect to him as a *person*, nor simply with a view to his own happiness, either here or hereafter; but to the apostolic office, for the good of others, or as a "chosen vessel," or a "vessel to honor," "fit for the Master's use"—"to make all men see," and explains what it is that he is laboring to "make all men see;" that it is "the fellowship of the mystery," which had been "hid in God from the beginning of time"—"to the intent that now to the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known, by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God;" and all this "according to the *eternal purpose*."

The eternal purpose then had Christ in it, the gospel, the entire kingdom of God—the whole of the scheme of redemption; all hid in God before time began. Precisely the same was contained, or embodied, in the promise to Abraham. It was all in the promise, or as my friend delights to say it, in the "immutable covenant." The great "mystery," or "secret," that had been "hid in God," not "made known to the sons of men," was all embraced in the promise, a promise *revealed*, the purpose or will of God embodied, a promise made and confirmed by an oath. The same was embodied in prophecies, but as the promise was simply a revelation of a blessing for all nations, without any explanation what that blessing was, it was still a "secret," a "mystery," "hid in God;" so also, though further developments were made in prophecy, they were not fully unfolded, nor intended to be understood at the time they were uttered, and were still *mystery*. But that which was hid, first in the purpose, then in the promise and afterward in prophecy, is now revealed. Paul says: "The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel to Abraham;" and, to prevent any misunderstanding, gives us the very

words in which it was preached: "Saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Gal. iii. 8. This promise was the *gospel* in promise. The immutable promise, then, is the gospel. Paul makes an item of explanation of what is contained in it, to the ruin of the theory my friend has advocated from the beginning of this debate; that is, that the justification of the heathen, according to the gospel in this immutable promise, is *conditional*; that it is "through faith."

But since my friend seems more inclined to go to Abraham than to Christ to find his gospel, I will give him a lesson concerning Abraham. The doctrine I have produced from Paul, touching the promise, that the heathen shall "be justified by faith," and not unconditionally, as Mr. Thompson is trying to prove it to be, is in accordance with Paul's statement, Rom. xi. 20: "Because of unbelief they were broken off." By faith the Gentiles were grafted in. The branches that were already in the olive tree, the natural branches, were *elect*, in the olive, and *through unbelief* were broken off. These were once in grace, but when they were broken off they were not in grace. In the place of these who were broken off "through unbelief," and "cast away," the Lord will say of the Gentiles, who were "grafted in by faith," "there shall they be called the children of the living God." Rom. ix. 25, 26. Abraham became "the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised." These are the children of Abraham as described by Paul, "Who walk in the steps of that faith." The faith of Abraham had *steps* in which the heirs are to walk, and has something to do with *their walk*. The *walking in these steps* is a condition of their continuation as heirs. If they walk not in these steps, they will lose the inheritance.

Let us hear the Apostle James tell a little about the "steps of that faith" in which Abraham walked, and the

manner in which he walked in them. "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God. You see then how that by works a man is justified and not by faith only." James ii. 19-24 James ii. 14, the apostle starts the matter of that portion just quoted, with the following significant question: "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?" Here the question of *salvation* comes squarely before us, and the salvation of Christians at that, and the apostle puts the matter: "Can faith save him?" He then gives the answer: "Faith without works is dead, being alone." Then he gives the case of Abraham, his *faith* and *works*, to illustrate and enforce his statement. The argument, when summed up, is to the amount that he *can not be saved without works*. Thus it turns out that the talk about Abraham, which we have had from my friend, goes for nothing. The covenant is of grace, and immutable, but it will not save a man *without works*. It is not an unconditional, but a conditional covenant. All it promises is certain, and is of grace, and all it threatens is equally certain, but all it promises or threatens is contingent.

In accordance with this, works would be mentioned in the Scriptures that speak of judgment and punishment. Matt. xxv. 46, we have the concluding sentence, after the Lord's discourse on *good works*. Of these who have *done no good works*, he says, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." On the other hand he says, "but the

righteous"—those who *done good works*—"into life eternal."

The same promise to Abraham, and the immutable covenant; the same grace of God, blood of Christ, the gospel, had been presented to both classes, but would not save them without the *good works*.

Again, "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation." John v. 28, 29. This is a clear reference to the resurrection, and the Lord himself, referring to the judgment beyond, tells what the final award will be to those that have *done evil*, and to those that *have done good*. Doing good, or, which is the same, *good works*, has something to do with entering into eternal life; so much that those *who do* them shall enter into eternal life, and those *who do them not* shall go into eternal punishment.

In John's description of the resurrection and the judgment we have the following: "They were judged every man according to their works." Rev. xx 13 Here any one can see that *works* of men have a place in the final judgment. Those whose works are good enter into the eternal life, and those who do not these good works are subjects of the second death. This accords with what we find among the last words in the book of God: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. xxii. 14. Never was a condition more clearly recognized, than *keeping the commandments* is recognized as a condition on which we are to have "right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

In the introduction of each one of the seven letters to the seven churches in Asia, Rev. ii., iii., the Lord Jesus recognizes works, in the words, "I know thy works," and in these letters we find commendations of the good that had

been done and censure for what was lacking. Recollect, these letters were addressed to churches composed of Christians. Let us hear a few words to the church in Sardis: 'Remember, therefore, how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast, and repent. If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee. Thou hast a few names even in Sardis who have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy.' Rev. iii. 3, 4. Does any man fail to see clear conditions here? And is it not equally clear that these conditions are *deeds, works, actions* of Christians? Can any one fail to see what the consequences will be if these works are not done? Let us now hear the wonderful conclusion of this letter: "He that overcometh shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels." Again: "To him that overcometh will I grant to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." Rev. iii. 5-7. This was addressed to Christians, those whose names are written in the book of life, or of course their names could not be blotted out of the book of life. Is there no condition in all this? How are they to overcome? By *doing the commandments, the good works*, which the Lord required, and recognized when they were done. What will they gain by overcoming? The Lord will not blot out their names out of the book of life, and will give them a "right to the tree of life." Any man who can not see from these Scriptures that all that is clear to the saints in the world to come is contingent on their overcoming, is not to be moved by argument and Scripture. The Savior was given, his blood was shed, his grace was freely bestowed, and all has been done on the part of our heavenly Father, so that he exclaims, "What more could I have done, that I have not

done?" but where there is failure, it is on *the part of man*. Hence, he says: "I will give every man according to his works." Rev. ii. 23. Again, the charge of the Alpha and Omega, against one of the churches, is in these words: "I have not found *thy works perfect* before God." Rev. iii. 2.

All this was included in the immutable promise of God, in the immutable covenant. These Scriptures treat of the final closing up of the affairs of time, and show that the Lord has established a connection between the works of men, yes, and Christians at that, and their final destiny. This has been the trouble with the Bible, on the part of many men, and Mr. Thompson in that class. If there is one thing in which he has been adroit and manifested shrewdness, it has been throughout this debate in evading this connection. But appear it must. It gleams out in every part of the Bible. Even my friend's proof text, Rom. viii. 29, 30, is preceded by a condition. "We know," says the apostle, "that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose." The condition is that *they love God*. This is something to be performed by Christians, and a condition upon which all things working together for their good depends. If they do not love God, they have no promise that all things shall work together for good to them. This was said, too, of those whom God before approved and predicted by the prophets would be conformed to the image of his Son, who had been called to special works, been approved of God and glorified. They had filled their mission, performed their work and were glorified when Paul made his allusion to them. But there is nothing about eternal life being unconditional in this. Let us see whether this condition of *loving God*, or Christ, has any connection with the world to come. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema, maranatha." 1 Cor. xvi. 22. "anathema, maranatha," when

translated into English, is "cursed. The Lord comes." The passage in English will read: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, he will be accursed. The Lord comes." This word, "if," I know is an annoyance to my friend. It expresses contingency, as where one thing depends on another, or if one thing occurs, another will follow. Contingency is condition. The contingency is *loving* the Lord Jesus Christ. This is performed by saints, and Paul tells them what will follow if they fail to love the Lord Jesus Christ. They will be *accursed*, and this is connected with the coming of the Lord.

Again, Paul says, "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." Heb. x. 38. "For if we sin willfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." Heb. x. 26, 27. Hear Paul yet once more: "Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled. Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For you know that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." Heb. xii. 15, 16, 17. Here is the utter refutation of the proposition of my friend. The persons to whom Paul wrote were Christians, and Paul exhorted them to "follow peace with all men, and holiness without which," he said, "no man shall see the Lord"—"looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God." What becomes of my friend's unconditional theory, in view of these Scriptures? Here holiness, and following peace with all men, are clearly shown to be conditions to be performed by Christians, without which no man shall see the Lord. Looking

diligently is shown to be a condition, without which a man will fail of the grace of God. When did Mr. Thompson ever exhort his brethren to look diligently lest they fail of the grace of God? He has tried many times to prove to them that they can not fail of the grace of God, but never exhorted them to look diligently lest they might fail of the grace of God. To illustrate and enforce the argument, the apostle refers to the case of Esau, who for a mess of pottage sold his birthright, and could not afterward obtain it though he sought it diligently with tears. When Esau was born he had a birthright, or was elect. He bartered it away and never could obtain it. When Jacob was born he had no birthright, or was reprobate, passed by and left out of the election. Paul warns the disciples not to do as Esau, barter away their birthright, their hope in Christ, and never be able to find it again. Mr. Thompson never drew an argument from this case, as Paul did, to admonish his brethren not to turn back from the holy commandment. All such Scriptures, as those we have here referred to, are omitted in his ministrations. He has no use for them, and the divine purpose in them is lost under his influence. His main labors are to convince saints that the covenant is immutable, that they are saved by grace, but never explains that the covenant is conditional, and promises nothing to any man without complying with the conditions on his part, and that he may fail of the grace of God. This kind of preaching may inspire a fond conceit, in those who believe it, that all is safe; that they are as sure of heaven as if they were there, but it never made any man sensible of the relation existing between his conduct here and eternal life.

I must give my friend another lesson, that he never gave his brethren. "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who gives richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready

to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18, 19 Here, as clear as the beams of the sun, good works of saints are conditions in order to eternal life. Charge the rich not to trust in uncertain riches—that they do good—be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate. What for? "Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come." Is that all? By no means. He adds, "*that they may lay hold on eternal life.*" This ruins his proposition. I defy any man to escape from the conclusion. The apostle most unequivocally connects good works with eternal life and shows that they must be performed in order to obtain it. I call his especial attention to this Scripture. It is conclusive, showing that eternal life is conditional.

I must, before I sit down, devote a few words to my friend's speech just closed. He talks about "the law," and "the deeds of the law," as if these Scriptures were what is recorded in the New Testament, but these expressions refer to the law of Moses and the deeds of the law of Moses. That law had neither a heaven nor a hell in it. It promised no eternal life. Its rewards and punishments were all temporal. But the faith of a pious Jew was above the law, and rested on the promise to Abraham, embracing Christ, and in that centered his hope of eternal life. The good works that we are speaking of are not "the works of the law" nor "the deeds of the law." Speaking of these works, Paul says, of our justification, "it is not of works," but a few words further on speaks of "good works which God has ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. ii. 1-10. We are not justified by the works or deeds of the law, but we are justified by the deeds of the gospel, or, more plainly, we are not justified by doing what was enjoined by Moses, but we are justified by doing what was

enjoined by the Lord. That which was enjoined by Moses was enjoined on the Jews only, and that which is enjoined by the Lord is enjoined on all the world. "He commands all men everywhere to repent."

I think the assertion of Mr. Thompson, that "there is not an *if* in it," that is, in the new covenant, is the most ridiculous thing I ever heard. In the eighth chapter of Hebrews, Paul quotes Jer. xxxi. 31-34, which contains the promise of the new covenant. This is only the new covenant *in promise*. The language starts out by saying: "*I will make a new covenant,*" and in this promise there is a brief contrast between it and the old covenant. That contrast is not, however, the figment of my friend's fruitful imagination, of works and no works, nor conditions and no conditions, but a contrast between a covenant in which they were members by a birth of the flesh—"those born in thy house"—who were in the covenant before they knew the Lord; and a covenant in which they would become members by being "born again"—members *by faith*, and where they would not have to be taught, saying, "Know the Lord." Another contrast made by the apostle is in reference to the priesthood. Under the old covenant men were high priests; under the new Christ is the High Priest. Under the old the high priest went into the holy place in the temple, which was only a type of the true holy place. Under the new, Christ, the High Priest, entered heaven itself, the true holy place. Under the old the priests offered the blood of slain beasts. Under the new Christ offered his own blood. Under the old the offerings could not take away sins, but the sins were laid over from year to year, or, in this way, a continual remembrance of them was kept up. But Christ, in the end of the ages, made one offering to purge us forever from our sins, and they are remembered no more, that is, by annual sin-offerings, as under the law.

But Paul shows that the new covenant, which God promised, when he said, "I will make a new covenant," etc., is the gospel, and consequently all these conditions, yes, these *ifs* that have so troubled my friend, are in the new and immutable covenant confirmed by the oath of God. The new covenant means the New Testament, and this is exactly what the prophet alluded to.

My friend can not see that doing commandments can be conditions, unless there is merit in them. I can tell him what there is, in doing the commandments, though they are not meritorious; there is *obedience to God* in doing them, and in the judgment the matter will turn upon *obedience* and *disobedience*, and not on grace and no grace; not on the fact that irresistible power saved some and not others.

I never said, "God saves Christians, independent of conditions to be performed by them," nor said I could prove it. It requires more than the strength of Samson to bring something out of nothing, and I know most unequivocally that there is not a proof in the word of God of any such absurd propositions. That, "independent of conditions to be performed by man," is the very thing that he has not found in any proof, or any thing of the same meaning. This is precisely the point just now suffering for attention from him, the precise point at issue, and the one on which he will lose the case.

My worthy friend can not see how there can be a human part and no merit in it! I am not talking of the "human part of *salvation*." I hope I may not so far lose my understanding of the meaning of terms as to talk in that style. I was talking about the human part in *obtaining* salvation, and the divine part in *giving*, or what man does to attain salvation and what the Lord does in *giving* it.

He talked all over the case of Judas, but evaded the clear point that he "*fell by transgression*." What did he fall from? From being a thief? From being a devil?

Not a word of it. He was given to Christ, was a disciple, and more, and *fell by transgression*—fell from Christ, from the apostleship—from all he had and was pertaining to the kingdom of God—ruined himself forever, and ruined the doctrine of my friend beyond redemption.

[Time expired.]

THOMPSON'S FOURTH ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators: Respected Audience:—I am truly glad to see Mr. Franklin bring his argument to bear on the case of Abraham. Throughout this discussion till his last speech he studiously avoided any reference to Abraham, and attached much blame to me because I had so much to say about Abraham, and the gospel which God preached to him. But the light has suddenly broke in upon the gentleman's mind that the "eternal purpose of God," "the eternal covenant," the plan of God to save his people from their sins was preached to Abraham, and immutably confirmed by the oath of God; and that Abraham as a covenant heir of God is set forth by all the inspired writers as the father or representative of all the heirs of eternal salvation. This the gentleman should have done in the beginning of this debate, so that this case, which the inspired writers have used as an exemplification, explaining and deciding all cases relating to the same subject, might have been fully canvassed in the argument. But I am glad to give him credit for his candor in his last speech, and will answer him in the brief time that remains.

The eternal purpose was embodied in the promise made to Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." Acts iii 25. This promise embodied a "mystery," which is the eternal purpose of God to gather together in one all things in Christ. And that in Christ

Jesus the Gentiles are made heirs of the same blessing, and on the same ground as the Jew. Eph. ii. 14-22. And this mystery, as made known to the saints, is "*Christ in you the hope of glory.*" Col. i. 26, 27. "Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision do not avail anything, but a *new creature.*" Gal. vi. 15. The heirs of God, according to this eternal purpose, are "his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that they should walk in them." Eph. ii. 10. Their heirship and relation to God as sons do not depend on the flesh, nor upon the eternal rites, services, nor works, but, "He is a Jew, which is one *inwardly*; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, *but of God.*" Rom. ii. 29. Their heirship does not depend upon conditions which they perform, "For by grace they are saved through faith, and that *not of themselves*" (what about the human part?); "it is the gift of God; *not of works*, lest any man should boast." Eph. ii. 8, 9. Mr. Franklin entirely fails to show an if in the new covenant, for, as Mr. Campbell said in his debate with Walker, "there is not an 'if' in it." Let us now take the case of Abraham as the representative case employed by the inspired writers to illustrate the principle upon which the divine scheme is founded. Rom. iv. 1-5: "What shall we then say that Abraham, our father as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were *justified by works*, he hath whereof to glory; *but not before God.* For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. *Now to him that worketh* is the reward not reckoned of grace, *but of debt.* But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." The case of Abraham's being justified before God through the righteousness of faith, and not by works, is illustrative of God's plan of eternal salvation from sin.

But James says: "Was not Abraham our father *justified by works* when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" When was Abraham *justified by works*? Forty years after God called him righteous, and confirmed to him by oath the immutable promise, or covenant, by which, in Christ Jesus, Abraham was made an heir of eternal salvation. And to prove that Abraham's justification before God and his eternal salvation were not dependent on his works, Paul argues that "to him that worketh the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt," and that the promise preceded circumcision or works of obedience (not simply works of the law of Moses, which are not different from any other works, as to principles making up a conditional system), and was not dependent on them, nor given because of their being performed. Therefore, Abraham being justified by works forty years after God had justified him by grace, and made him an heir of eternal salvation, does not in the least favor the idea that his eternal salvation depended on his works. It was just as sure before he did the works as the yea and amen of God confirmed by his oath could make it. But the manifest proof of his heirship and salvation in the sight of men, and that he was just with God in Christ Jesus, was by the works which he did in obedience to God. And this obedience to God which thus distinguishes all Christians as the heirs of eternal salvation is related to their salvation throughout the entire volume of inspiration; not as conditions upon which eternal salvation depends, but as the living fruits of that grace which alone makes man in spirit right with God.

Abraham was right with God in spirit, because the grace of God had made him right; had saved him from being wrong; had conformed him in spirit to the image of Jesus, and in Christ Jesus he was a new creature, being the workmanship of God. And Abraham being a possessor by gift from God of this unspeakable grace, walked in obedience

to God, laid up a good foundation against the time to come; laid hold on eternal life; overcome; did the commandments of God that he might have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city; was judged according to his deeds or works; will come forth to the resurrection of life as one that had done good, and will be one to whom Christ will say, "Inasmuch as you did it to the least of these my brethren, you did it unto me;" "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." And in all this he is a true representative of every Christian. It is thus they all live, and walk, and obey; this is their character as set forth by the inspired word, and whether a representative man like Abraham is brought forward to illustrate their true character, and who made them so; or whether the covenant be consulted to describe them in character, and the great work which God does for them to make them such; all of these harmonize in the one great truth that it is the work of God to save men from sin; and that to be thus saved is to be prepared to live right before God, and in obedience to him. In a word, the whole scheme of salvation may be summed up in two things: 1. What the blessed God hath done to make us right and acceptable before him in the Lord Jesus Christ. 2. What we do in obedience to him as proof of our righteousness in him. This argument covers the entire argument and proof brought forward by Mr. Franklin, and completely destroys his system. For when he quotes works of men as conditions upon which eternal salvation depends, he at once perverts the entire gospel, and, according to Paul, makes eternal salvation not of grace but of debt.

I have told Mr. Franklin this was the result of his work system, but he has still denied it, and claimed that he believed in grace. But now Paul tells him that if it be of works (and he was not talking about Moses but Abraham),

the reward is not reckoned of grace but of debt. His system is refuted, and my proposition proven, if the Bible proves any proposition. I am glad to be able to-day to leave with you the plain word of God not only that eternal salvation is the work of God, but that it is independent of conditions or works performed by men. Not only have we the plain affirmative that it is the work of God, but the negative. Not of man, not of works, not of ourselves. But the other branch of the argument, about finally falling from the grace of Christ, how does this part of the case stand? I have shown that the case of Judas was the falling from official relation, the only sense in which Jesus ever acknowledged Judas as given to him. Some of the cases referred to I have shown to be but supposed cases to illustrate doctrine. Persons are said to have fallen from grace by teaching a doctrine of conditional salvation, and believing that doctrine. Persons fall away from temporal advantage by disobedience to law.

But Mr. Franklin, nor all the advocates that ever have or ever will advocate the eternal loss of one who is spiritually one with Jesus, never have nor never will find in God's word a sanction for such a doctrine. Not one positive text has Mr. Franklin found, although he has sought it earnestly from Genesis to Revelation, that teaches the overthrow of the work of Christ, putting him to an open shame by a soul sinking down to endless ruin upon which his power and perfection as a Savior had spent all its force in vain. Not one text in which it is stated that one of the heirs of promise or sheep of Christ shall be finally destroyed. If such a text is ever found it will stand as a witness to prove that Jesus was a hireling, whose own the sheep are not; that his kingdom is a perishable one, that is destroyed; that he fails to do the will of God; that God's oath is mutable; his love changeable; his covenant promise a nullity; his nature corruptible, and

the universal ruin of all the race sure. The text will never be found. The opposite of such an awful state as this finds abundant proof in the revealed word of God. The positive promise of Jesus is: "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand;" "his kingdom shall stand forever;" "he does the will of God, and will raise up to eternal life all that the Father gave him." The oath of God is immutable. He can not lie. His love is unchangeable and eternal. His covenant can not be disannulled or added to, and all its promises are yea and amen in Christ. His nature is incorruptible, and whosoever is born of him sinneth not, and the evil one toucheth him not. He can not sin because he is born of God. I do not quote indefinite language, and draw inferences that it is in some way connected with salvation. I give you the plain words of God, so plain that Mr. Franklin does not say they are indefinite; but he tries to blind you by saying that there are conditions understood which are not expressed. But we have seen that if there were conditions understood or expressed it would change the whole scheme from grace to works, and end in ruin to every soul of man. It was as a warning, not against the law of Moses, nor any other law, but against a principle or system embracing human works as conditions in order to eternal salvation, that God has guarded his word with a positive negative to the whole scheme of human works and conditions.

But, while God has said again and again in his word that salvation is not of yourselves, not of works, he has not opposed good works and a continuance in well-doing according to his commandment. But he has made it the duty and gracious privilege of all Christians to be obedient to him in all things. And when Mr. Franklin says that I never preach to my brethren "to do his commandments that they may have a right to the tree of life," etc., and that I never

teach them to lay hold on eternal life and to continue in the love of God, and all other exhortations found in God's word, he not only makes a statement about which he knows nothing, but does me injustice by stating what is not true. Has he no material of his own to work on, that he thus makes charges on me without one redeeming feature in them either of fairness or truth? I have no fear that any of you who know me will be deceived by his course. His comment on Rom. viii. 28-30 is the most absurd perversion of a plain Scripture it has been my lot to hear from any man. What is it? To love God is a condition that Christians perform in order that all things shall work together for good to them, and they shall be foreknown, predestinated, called, justified and glorified. Who ever thought of such an idea as the love of God being a condition which men perform in order to eternal salvation? Salvation from what? If there is a higher, holier, purer spiritual state than love to God, I know not what it is. But the sentiment of the gentleman will come out. It is that faith, hope, love and holiness are the works of men; then in the very next breath he gravely talks about salvation by grace. What does grace save the believing, trusting, loving, holy, from? He can not tell. He has a name for grace, but no good for it to communicate to man whatever that in the least betters his state.

Mr. Franklin quotes Heb. x. 38: "If any man draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him." Why not? Because he is not a Christian if he does so. Heb. x. 39: "But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition." Again, Heb. xii. 15, 16, 17: "Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God," etc. And the case of Esau is cited as explaining the case. I ask, How much of the grace of God had Esau? He failed of it entirely; he had none. Neither has any profane person or fornicator who may have crept into the Church unaware, who were before

of old ordained to this condemnation. But Mr. Franklin says Esau was elect because he had a birthright. This was law election, or the law at that time, and illustrates a conditional system. But what was God's election, the election of grace in this case which covers all cases, for Jacob is the lot of his (Christ's) inheritance? Rom. xi. 11, 12, 13: "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the *purpose of God, according to election, might stand*, NOT OF WORKS, but of him that calleth. It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Where is the gentleman now? Just where he has been all the time, struggling against the word of God. But he calls my attention specially to 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18, 19, and particularly to the words, "That they do good," "Be rich in good works," "Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come," "*That they may lay hold on eternal life.*" Now mark it. Mr. Franklin states these acts as conditions upon which eternal salvation depends. If this doctrine, as taken from this text, be true, *the foundation of eternal salvation is the good done by the rich of this world.* Need I say anything more on th text? The absurdity of his view is apparent to every one. 1 Cor. iii. 11: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." What Christians do through the grace given them is an evidence to them of their salvation in Christ and eternal life by him. It is thus that assurance of everlasting life is enjoyed by those "*who do good,*" not because "*their good works,*" instead of the grace of Jesus is the foundation of eternal salvation, but because their good works through grace are evidences of their eternal salvation. But let us hear Mr. Franklin once more: "The doctrine I have produced from Paul, teaching the promise that the heathen shall be justified by faith, and not unconditionally, is in accordance with Paul's state-

ment, Rom xi. 20: 'Because of unbelief they were broken off,' etc. Will Mr. Franklin never cease to misconstrue the Scripture? Look at the first verse of this chapter from which he quotes, "I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid." Is not this the most positive denial of final apostasy? But again, verses twenty six to thirty, "And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob" (not E-au); "for this is my covenant unto them when I shall take away their sins. As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sake; but as touching the election they are beloved for the fathers' sakes; for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." What were they cut off from? The organized body of believers. That is, as a nation they were cut off, and the gospel privileges in church benefits went to the Gentiles; or the Gentiles were grafted into the same olive tree, or organized body of believers. Not one spiritual Jew was ever cast away, in the sense of final separation, from Christ; but all Israel shall be saved. I will close my very brief view of this case in the language of God by Paul, Rom. xi. 5, 6, 7: 'Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more of grace; otherwise work is no more work. What then? Israel hath not obtained that he seeketh for' (remember Mr. Franklin's question, How do they obtain this grace?); 'but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.' If my proposition is not proven by these plain statements of the word of God, language can prove nothing, and words are not signs of ideas. The case is a plain one, and settled beyond a doubt. God has spoken, and his word shall stand forever. While I accord to Mr. Franklin talent as a debater, yet were he possessed of talent a thousand fold

greater than he is it would be vain for him to stand against the word of God. It is the sharp two-edged sword that went out of the mouth of Him who was in the midst of the candlesticks, who is King of kings and Lord of lords, the Almighty. I have shown from the plain word of God that the eternal covenant is unconditional and immutable; that it is contrasted with a system of works or conditions, and that a system of conditions would destroy the idea of grace upon which the eternal covenant is founded. I have shown that the gift of eternal life, which is the gift of God in Christ Jesus, is the blessing of an eternal freedom from sin and death, enjoyed by every Christian, and that they shall never perish. I have shown that all Christians are born of God, and can not sin because they are born of God; his seed remaineth in him. I have shown that the atonement made by Christ reconciled all his people to him, justified them in his blood, and saved them in his life; that by one offering he hath perfected them forever, and that the loss of one of them would put Jesus to an open shame, and involve the loss of all so far as his power to save is concerned. I have shown that the love of God is unchangeable, and that Christians could not be separated from it, neither by life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature; that Jesus said, "Thou hast loved them as thou hast loved me;" that this love was not conditional, for he loved us even when we were dead in sins, and hath quickened us together with Christ, by whose grace ye are saved. I have shown that the faith of Christians is the gift of God, connected with grace, and not of ourselves; that it overcomes the world, and is the assurance of eternal salvation to all Christians. They shall not be confounded nor come into condemnation, but are passed from death unto life. I have shown that God confirms or establishes all Christians in Christ Jesus unto the end that

they may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that God is faithful and will never leave them nor forsake them. I have shown that God has begun a good work in them and will perform it till the day of Jesus Christ. And I have proven beyond dispute the greatness, glory and eternity of the kingdom of Christ; that his seed shall be established forever, and his throne built up to all generations; that God makes all Christians meet to be partakers of the inheritance, delivering them from the power of darkness and translating them into the kingdom of Christ, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. On the negative, that this work of God is independent of conditions performed by man, beside the above proofs, I have shown by the illustrious proof in the case of Abraham, that in a covenant of conditions the reward would be reckoned not of grace, but of debt; that the covenant to Abraham was a covenant of grace, and that it is of faith that it might be by grace, and the blessing sure to all the seed; that Jacob heired the blessing, not of works, but of him that calleth; that it is of grace, and not of works; and that all Israel, the entire family of our God, shall be eternally saved through the Deliverer that came out of Zion and turned away ungodliness from Jacob. Even Jesus who hath delivered us from the wrath to come.

I thank you, Gentlemen Moderators, for the dignified and impartial manner with which you have governed the sessions of this debate. Respected audience, you have kindly listened to us during all the time that we have been engaged in our present discussion, and I hope you will give the same earnest attention till Mr. Franklin closes his last speech, and then I hope you will candidly and prayerfully compare what we have both said with the infallible word of God. In conclusion, I say to Mr. Franklin that if in the heat of debate I have said anything that sounded harsh or unkind it was not intended. I am pleased with

him as a disputant and gentleman, and assure him that my kindest feelings and earnest desire for his good are toward him. If we meet no more in this state, I hope we may meet where they sing without a jarring note, "Not unto us, but unto thy name, O Lord, be all the glory."

[Time expired.]

FRANKLIN'S CLOSING ADDRESS.

Gentlemen Moderators: Ladies and Gentlemen:—You have now heard Mr. Thompson and have the finest things he can say, in the form of argument, to show that the eternal salvation of Christians is not dependent on any conditions to be performed by them. If ever any one thing appeared clear to an intelligent audience, it must be clear by this time to this audience, that he has no gospel to anybody, showing a living human being *how to be saved*. There is not a man in this assembly that can run his mind back over all he has said, pointing to a soul of our race *how to come to God*. It appears not to be any part of his mission to show any human being the way of life and salvation. With his system in view, as I have shown again and again, man is not an accountable being, as he has no volition in being or not being a Christian. As he teaches, one class are made Christians, held up and continued such by irresistible power and saved. They never had it in their power to be lost. Another class are passed by; no provision made for them; the irresistible power never comes to them, nor saves them. They never had the power to be saved. There is no ground in this system for praise or blame, nor for rewarding men according to their works. It is a system of philosophy and not in the Bible; nor any reason, but in contradiction of all just principles in the word of God and reason. He could not, if he had set himself for it, have put himself in more

direct contradiction of the Scriptures than he has done in this entire debate. Nor can I see any reason for his preaching at all, according to his theory, unless it be the *eternal necessity that he must preach*. But not one soul more will be saved by preaching, his own theory being true.

He made a tremendous flourish of trumpets about my comment on the case of Abraham and the eternal purpose of God, and tried to make the impression that I had attempted to keep something back till a late period. But this all amounts to nothing with men who have given a little attention to the matters that have been transpiring around us during the past thirty five years. I have presented nothing in my previous speech *new*, or different from what I have many times presented in discussions and the various volumes that have come up under my hand; but new or old, he has not replied to what I have presented. True, he has mentioned the purpose of God and the promise to Abraham, but in such a way as to evade and keep out of view every point I made. But often as my friend has referred to Abraham, and quoted the words, "not of works," he has given no attention to the explanation I have repeatedly made: that this expression refers to the *law of Moses*, and not the *law of Christ*, and "the deeds of the law," refers to the *deeds of the law* of Moses, and not the *deeds of the gospel*; not to "good works which God has ordained that we should walk in them," nor the works of the gospel of which James speaks, when he says, "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." James ii. 17. What attention did he give to the clear words of Scripture, quoted from James ii. 21? "Was not Abraham our father justified, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" In the first place, God made a *promise* to Abraham, and did not require him to *do anything*, only to *believe the promise*. This Abraham did. This was all *he could do*, and on this *one condition* God justified him, and thus refuted the

unconditional doctrine my friend has been preaching throughout this debate. This was before the giving of the law, and consequently before the deeds of the law, or the works of the law, were required. He was then justified, not unconditionally, but on the condition of faith, before the law was given, and without the works of the law. God required but *one act* of obedience of him, and he *did that* and was *justified by it*, and as the father of the faithful, a representative person, he refuted forever the unconditional theory of my friend. He has found nothing to support his theory, either before the giving of the law, in the law, or in the gospel. Abraham, the father of the faithful, was justified by *one act* of obedience, the *act of believing God*, the only thing he was required to *do*. But when God required him to offer Isaac, it was another act, and styled "works," and he was then justified by works, and his faith was made perfect. This forever writes Ichabod on the theory of my friend. The very case brought to sustain him refutes him forever.

He quotes, "The gospel was preached to Abraham." True, it was, *in promise*. To whom was the promise to be given? Paul says, "To them that believe." Gal. iii. 23. The first clear development of this promise we find in the commission, in the words: "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved." We find the condition then, in the case of Abraham, in Paul's comment on the promise, and in the commission; that it is to be given to them that *believe*. The *act of believing* is then a *condition*, on which men are justified and enter the covenant in the first place, and this same *act of believing* is a condition on which the Christian shall obtain everlasting life. The Lord himself connects believing with everlasting life. John iii. 16. The Israelites had in them an evil heart of *unbelief* in departing from the living God, and we are warned by this to guard against an evil heart of *unbelief*. "If that which you have heard from the beginning shall remain in you,

you shall also continue in the Son and in the Father." 1 John ii. 24. You hear no such language as this from my friend. He never says, "If that which you have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, you shall also continue in the Son and in the Father." He ridicules the idea of any such *if*, but tries all the time to make the impression that those in the Son and in the Father must unconditionally remain there—that they never can turn away from the Lord.

The expression of Paul, "To him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt." To him that worketh, in this Scripture, is to him that does the works of the law of Moses and claims to be justified by doing these works, and has gone away from Christ, and claims that he can be saved by the law, or by keeping the law, after it was abolished. Mr. Thompson, though he does not in so many words say so, intends you to take it as if it read, "To him that does the 'good works which God has ordained we should walk in them,' the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt." But this is not the meaning of it. It does not mean the man who keeps the commandments of Christ, or *obeys the gospel*; to him the obedience is not reckoned of grace, but of debt. The question is not about the works under the law being different *in principle*, but about their being the *same works*. They are not the same works; and we are not saved by the works of the law, but we are saved by the works of the gospel, or, to express the whole, we are not saved by the law but by the gospel; not saved by Moses, but we are saved by Christ.

But I only now have a short time in which to sum up the entire argument. The question is about the eternal salvation of the Christian, as set forth in the Scriptures. Is it the work of God, independent of conditions to be performed by man? My worthy friend affirms and I deny. I deny the latter part of the proposition — the words "inde-

pendent of conditions to be performed by man." He has undertaken to show that the covenant is immutable and confirmed by an oath. I have granted that it is immutable, and shown that it is conditional. The covenant contains the same as the purpose of God, and precisely the same as the promise, which was the gospel in a "mystery," but as preached by the apostles, *a revelation*. That which was hid is now made known, and that which was a secret is now revealed. The great representative of the faithful was justified, as we have seen, by faith—the *act of believing*. That it was his *own act*, we only need observe the language: "Abraham *believed God*." On the condition of his *own act*, in *believing* God, he was justified. And again, by his *own act*, in offering Isaac, he was justified—"justified by works." See James ii. 21. Let us give heed to the word of the Lord. "So speak you, and so *do*, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." Will a man's works have anything to do with judgment? Let us hear: "For he shall have judgment without mercy, who has showed no mercy." Let us hear the word a little further: "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he has faith, and has not works? Can faith save him?" If my able friend had been present, he would have denied to the apostle that either *faith* or *works* has anything to do with salvation, and maintained that it is independent of anything man can do. Hear James proceed: "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say to them, Depart in peace, be you warmed and filled; notwithstanding you give them not those things that are needful to the body, what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it has not works, is dead, being alone." See James ii. 14, 15, 16. Let the apostle expostulate with Mr. Thompson: "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" Then he gives us the example of Abraham offering Isaac, and gives us the following reasoning: "Seest thou how faith wrought

with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" The case of Abraham is against him.

The immutable promise, confirmed by an oath, is against him, for it was to be given to *them that believe*, thus conferring its favors on the condition of faith.

We have seen that the immutable covenant is conditional, for precisely the same is in it that was in the purpose of God, and then embodied in the promise. And when the whole is unfolded, fully revealed, it is the gospel. The commission itself has conditions in it—the conditions of faith, repentance and baptism, thus, at every step, setting at naught the entire system of which my friend has been speaking. After these preliminary steps are taken and one becomes a Christian, I will now proceed to show you that he must work out his own salvation with fear and trembling.

The Lord admonishes us to "strive to enter in at the strait gate," because "strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leads to life, and few there be that find it." This is not the way into the Church, or the body of Christ, for any who seek have the promise that they *shall find*; but it is the way into heaven, after we are in the Church. The Lord says, "He who overcomes shall be clothed in white raiment." Again, "He that endures to the end shall be saved." All Scriptures of this sort imply that a Christian may fall—that he may "turn away from the holy commandment"—that he may "make shipwreck of the faith." Christians are *saints*, or *righteous*. I have shown you, from the clearest language of Scripture, that "the righteous may turn away from his righteousness, and do according to all the abominations that the wicked do," and that when he does this, the Lord says, that "in his sins that he has sinned he shall surely die," and that if Christians turn back to the law, or, which amounts to the same, if they shall be circumcised, Christ shall profit them nothing; "*they are*

fallen from grace." I have shown, beyond a peradventure, that men for whom Christ died, whom the Lord *bought*, may be destroyed—that they may "deny the Lord that bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction;" that even Paul the apostle had an eye to himself, to keep under his body, lest having preached the gospel to others, he himself should be a castaway. He did not think that his eternal salvation was independent of conditions to be performed by himself, and he was careful to watch the conditions and see that they were performed.

Peter did not preach the doctrine of my friend, but taught those who had the like precious faith with the apostles, were partakers of the divine nature, and had escaped the corruptions of the world through lust, and had the exceeding great and precious promise, that giving all diligence, they should add to their faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity, and commanded them to make their *calling and election sure*. This is an exhortation my friend never uses. He never exhorts his brethren to make their calling and election *sure*; but he has tried many times, as he has done here, to make them believe that it is *already sure*, without any regard to their conduct. But alluding to these same things, the apostle says, "If you *do these things* you shall never fall." He must not blame me for this word "if," for I did not write this letter. It was dictated by the infallible Spirit of all wisdom and all revelation. But *if* what? "If you *do these things*," *perform these seven conditions*, "*you shall never fall.*" That is the doctrine to keep from falling from grace, to make your calling and election *sure*? It was not made sure from eternity, only *conditionally sure—if you do these things*. But has the doing of these things anything to do with eternal salvation? The apostle proceeds: "So an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly unto the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

Instead of there being no conditions on which Christians are promised eternal salvation, here are seven, and they are to be *done*, or performed by Christians, to make their calling and election *sure*, that they *may never fall*, and that they may gain an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom. If Peter had written this letter to refute forever the theory of my friend he could not have done it more effectually than he has. There are three things here that Mr. Thompson never does: 1. He never exhorts his brethren to make their calling and election *sure*, but tries to make them think it *is sure*. 2. He never tells them, "*If you do these things you shall never fall*," but tries to make them believe that what they do has nothing to do with their *standing* or *falling*. 3. That so, that is by *doing* these things, they shall gain an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom. These are matters of *another faith*, and not the theory he preaches. There never was a theory more directly opposed to the entire spirit and letter of the word of God than the one advocated in this debate by Mr. Thompson.

In the final account God will render to every man according to his *deeds*. See Rom. ii. 6. This looks to the conduct of Christians. But hear the apostle as he proceeds: "To them who, by patient continuance in *well-doing*, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." Here is not only *doing* connected with eternal life, but *well-doing*, and not only well-doing, but "*continuance in well-doing*," in order to eternal life. This is addressed to Christians too, and the apostle not only gives you the side where they *do well*, but the other side. "But to them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that *doeth evil*, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile." Anything about *doing* here, and any consequences connected with *not doing*, or *doing evil*? But

hear the apostle as he proceeds: "But glory, honor and peace to every man that *worketh good*; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." What becomes of my friend's theory before these wonderful Scriptures? His entire theory is demoralizing and nullifies the gospel, and to the extent of his influence weakens the desire to *do the will of God*. Yet Jesus taught in the Sermon on the Mount that "Not every one who says, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he who *does the will* of my Father who is in heaven." Matt. vii. 21.

Any man can see who will reflect that some of the clearest Scriptures in the book of God are nullified and set at naught by this anti-means theory. The apostle commands Timothy to "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they *do good*; that they be *rich in good works*, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. vi. 17-19. This injunction my friend never obeyed in his life. His effort during this debate and during his life has been to make men believe that eternal life does not depend on their *doing good*. But here we have a most solemn charge to *do good*; to be rich in *good works*, that we may "lay hold on eternal life." Mr. Thompson has now closed his argument, and what has he done with these Scriptures? You all know that they and many more that we can not now mention, in the narrow limits of a half-hour speech, have confronted him all the time, and the arguments drawn from them have never been answered. He has *worked* hard enough, *perspired* freely enough, and thundered loud enough in his tiresome repetitions of things answered over and over again, if that would do any good. But rant, in this predicament, will not answer the purpose, nor will

anything he or any man can do. He can not bring something out of nothing. He had no proof to prove his proposition, and of course could produce none.

He has tried again and again to extricate himself from the case of Judas, but there it stands formidable as ever. He was one that the Father gave to Christ, had part in the apostleship and ministry; fell from it *by transgression*, and was *lost*. The devil entered into him, and he transgressed, and *by transgression fell*. He did not fall from something he never had. There would be no *fall* in that.

I have shown that a man may preach another gospel, or pervert the gospel of Christ, and that *if* any man shall do this he will be accursed, and that if any man loves not the Lord Jesus Christ he will be accursed when the Lord comes. All this relates to *doing* or *not doing*, and shows that the eternal salvation of the Christian is contingent. I have shown that even Esau *sold* his birthright; *lost it* by an act of his own; and that in the case of the potter and the clay, being a vessel to honor depends upon the *action* or the *doing* of men. "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and a kingdom to build and to plant it; *if it do evil* in my sight, that it *obey not* my voice, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." Again: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, or a kingdom, to pluck up, to pull down, and to destroy it; *if* that nation, against whom I have pronounced, *turn from their evil*, then will I repent of the evil I thought to do them." Paul says, "If a man, therefore, shall purge himself from these he shall be a vessel to honor, fit for the Master's use." Among the last words of the book of God, we see that a man may perform *an act* that will cause his part to be taken out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and out of the things written in the book, and we hear it said, "They that *do his commandments* shall enter by the gates into the city, and have a right to the tree of life." I have refuted all

my friend's arguments and shown that they have no relevancy, and by numerous Scriptures refuted his proposition and shown it to be utterly fallacious.

To this audience I return my thanks for their patient attention and good order throughout, and only request them to read the Scriptures and examine the argument and decide for themselves where the right is.

To the Moderators I return my thanks for their fair and gentlemanly bearing in their position throughout; their fairness and impartiality.

To my worthy friend, Mr. Thompson, I also return my thanks for meeting me and giving me the opportunity to lay these important matters before this promiscuous audience; and I reciprocate all his kind expressions in his closing words. May the divine blessing attend us all and the true Israel of God everywhere.

[Time expired.]