

# A THEOLOGICAL DEBATE

BETWEEN

T. W. BRENTS  
*Of the Church of Christ*

AND

Eld. E. D. HEROD  
*Of the Primitive Baptist Church*

HELD IN

FRANKLIN, KY., BEGINNING MARCH 29, 1887, AND CON-  
TINUING FOUR DAYS

---

CINCINNATI  
GUIDE PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO.  
1887

## PROPOSITIONS DEBATED.

The Scriptures teach that salvation from sin is conditional, the condition or conditions to be performed by the sinner in order to salvation or freedom from sin.

T. W. BRENTS *affirms*.

E. D. HEROD *denies*.

The Scriptures teach the unconditional election and salvation from sin, by Jesus Christ, of all his seed or generation.

E. D. HEROD *affirms*.

T. W. BRENTS *denies*.

First, second and fourth days' debate reported by A. M. Growden, Stenographer, Franklin, Tenn.

## INTRODUCTION.

In presenting this debate to the public, a few words of explanation are deemed necessary. The subjects debated being somewhat novel, and believing that the range the discussion would likely take would bring out some thoughts not developed in any debate now before the public, I felt an anxiety to have the debate published; hence I secured the services of a stenographer, without consulting Elder Herod, and not until the debate had been in progress a day or two did he know that it was being taken down for publication. He then said he thought he ought to have the privilege of revising his own speeches. I told him he could do so, so far as correcting the grammar was concerned. When I received the reporter's manuscript, I sent a letter to him, through a friend in Franklin (I not knowing his address), proposing that if he would revise and re-write his own speeches, confining himself to the same proofs, and as nearly to the same verbiage as practicable, and bear half the expense of bringing out the work, we would divide the books, and each one sell his own. Or if he did not wish to take part in the publication, if he would revise his speeches without expense to me, I would bring out the book. If not, I would revise and correct the reporter's copy, and publish it myself. To this letter I received no reply. I have, therefore, revised the manuscript, supplying such words as were manifestly left out by the reporter, yet as far as possible bringing out the debate just as delivered.

By reason of sickness in his family, the reporter was absent on the third day. I secured the services of a number of expert penmen to take as full and copious notes as possible, so that the speeches might be reproduced by a comparison of the notes taken by the several parties, each one having taken every proof text, and the points made, and as much of the precise verbiage as possible. In this way the speeches of the third day were substantially preserved; and

though it is not presumed that every word was delivered just as here presented, yet in the main the verbiage is preserved, and certainly every proof introduced and every argument will be found in this work.

All of my *opening speech*, and most of my *fourth speech* on the *first proposition*, was spoken from manuscript, where every word was preserved, and no time lost in turning to notes and proofs; hence these speeches will be found longer than any other speeches of the same time in delivery; but I know that these speeches are presented here exactly as delivered, without the change of a single word.

The debate was well attended throughout, and the kindest feelings prevailed, both in the audience and between the speakers; and when the parting hour came, the people seemed loth to leave the place, feeling that it was good to be there. May the publication do much and lasting good.

T. W. BRENTS.

## BRENTS-HEROD DEBATE.

---

### FIRST PROPOSITION.

The Scriptures teach that salvation from sin is conditional, the condition or conditions to be performed by the sinner in order to salvation or freedom from sin.

#### Opening Speech of T. W. Brents.

MR. PRESIDENT: —I am happy in the privilege of meeting my distinguished opponent under circumstances favorable for the examination of the word of God pertaining to the proposition just read in your hearing. It is exceedingly plain, and but few of its terms need to be defined.

Sin is the transgression of the law—God's law (I. John iii. 4). *Salvation*, or freedom from sin, is a release from the punishment due the sinner for such transgression.

The same thought is substantially expressed in several other forms, as "Remission of sin, " "Forgiveness of sin, " "Blotting out of sin, " "Ceasing to remember sin," "Justification, " etc., etc., the difference being merely technical.

About these, I suppose we will have no controversy, as it is the great subject of *pardon* that concerns us, not the phraseology in which it is expressed. One more term, perhaps, I ought to define.

"A *condition* is that which must exist as the occasion or concomitant of something else; that which is requisite in order that something else should take effect; stipulation; terms specified."— *Webster*.

That God alone has power to forgive sins is well understood and admitted by all; but the issue with us Does he pardon the sins of men on conditions to be complied with by them? Than this, no more important subject can be considered by the human race, provided I am correct. If, however, my proposition is not true, it may be that the importance of the subject is not very great. If God unconditionally saves men without a single *thought*, *word* or *deed* on the part of the sinner, then he may fold his arms and go to sleep, for nothing that he can do will secure his salvation, or in any way affect his future destiny. If he must even *desire* his salvation in order that

God may save him, then that desire is a *condition* and my proportion is true. If he must *believe* anything, or in any person or thing, in order that God may save him, then that *belief* is a *condition* and my proposition is true. If he must perform any physical act, as an act of obedience to God, in order that he may be saved, then *that act* is a *condition* and my proportion is still true. My proposition does not require me to show *what* the conditions are—it is simply my duty to show that there are conditions with which the sinner must comply or be lost. I may incidentally do more than this.

#### KING JAMES' VERSION.

At the suggestion of my worthy opponent, King James' version, as it is called, is made the standard of authority in this discussion.

I would have preferred this otherwise. While I believe it, on the whole, about as good as any other version, yet I know there are manifest errors in it; and in discussions like this, it should be the great aim of all parties to get at the truth; and where there are errors in the translation, known to be such, we ought to be at liberty to correct them by any light we can get, either from critics or commentators who have given us the benefit of their labors, or by an appeal to the *original* for ourselves. But with all its defects in translation, we believe it sufficiently clear to enable us to understand the will of the Lord and be saved. We have agreed to be governed by it in this discussion, and to it we go for proof of our proposition.

#### ARGUMENT.

Much may be learned as to what God is doing and proposes to do by an examination of what he has done in ages past, and I insist that the same general principle embodied in my proposition has characterized God's dealings with man from the time of his creation until now; He has blessed and prospered him while he believed and obeyed Him; and He has cursed and punished him when he forsook Him, rebelled against Him, refused to obey Him, and violated His law. This has always been, is now, and ever will be true as long as man dwells in a tenement of clay. We find an illustration of this principle in the first law given to

#### ADAM IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN. —Gen. ii. 16, 17.

When God placed him in the garden, he commanded him, saying, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Here is a clearly implied *condition*—if you eat of it you shall die; if you do not eat of it

you may not die, but live. Another illustration we find in the case of:

CAIN AND ABEL. —Gen. iv. 6, 7.

When they made their offerings, God respected the offering of Abel, but did not respect the offering of Cain; and Cain was angry about it, and the Lord said, "Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shall thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." Here is the spirit of my proposition—if you do well, you shall be accepted; but if you do not well, sin is at the very threshold of disobedience. Another example we have recorded in the history of

NOAH AND THE FLOOD. —Gen. vi. 5-7.

Coming down the stream of time twenty-five hundred years, "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them." God carried out this determination, and did destroy the wicked by a deluge of water. And why did he destroy them? Was it because God had unconditionally reprobated them, and decreed the wickedness for which he destroyed them? We suppose not, for their sins grieved him at his heart. Then again we ask why this destruction came upon them? Surely it was because they were wicked, even to every imagination of their thoughts. But Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord (verse 8). And why did he find grace in the sight of the Lord? "For thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation." Thus we find the spirit of my proposition. God blessed and saved Noah and his family because he was righteous in his generation, and he destroyed the residue of the human race for their great wickedness. And be it remembered that these examples are referred to in the New Testament as instructive to us. When God gave the law, in detail, to the Jews, through Moses, at Horeb, he most graphically set forth the importance of obedience and the consequences of disobedience, that the people might well understand the principles upon which he proposed to govern them. In giving

THE LAW AT HOREB—Deut. xxviii. 1, 2.

He says: "And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his

commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth; and all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God." Then follow, in detail, the rich blessings he promised them; and to impress them with the necessity of obeying the Lord in order to enjoy his favor, he adds, "And the Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath; if that thou hearken unto the commandments of the Lord thy God, which I command thee this day, to observe and do them; and thou shalt not go aside from any of the words which I command thee this day, to the right hand, or to the left, to go after other gods to serve them." Then he gives the other side of the picture in the fearful fruits of disobedience. In verse 15 he says: "But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee." Then follows a list of the curses that should come upon them, until the heart sickens in contemplating the wretchedness to which rebellion and sin should reduce them; and then, as if to more forcibly impress the lesson upon them, he adds, "Moreover all these curses shall come upon thee, and shall pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which he commanded thee" (ver. 45). Thus we see the principle of my proposition clearly set out in the covenant which God made with Israel at Horeb; and it characterizes God's dealings with man everywhere. He blesses, prospers and saves him when he believes and obeys Him; and fails not to punish him when he rebels and pins against Him, The conditions have been changed in different dispensations; but conditions there always have been, and always will be, until the God of the Bible ceases to rule.

The same principle was reaffirmed in the covenant in the land of Moab; and it was again proclaimed to Solomon at the

#### DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE. —II. Chron. vii. 14-22.

God said to him: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and heal their land. . . . And as for thee, if thou wilt walk before me, as David thy father walked, and do according to all that I have commanded thee, and shalt observe my statutes and my judgments; then will I establish the throne of thy kingdom, according as I have covenanted with David thy father, saying, There



shall not fail thee a man to be ruler in Israel. But if ye turn away, and forsake my statutes and my commandments, which I have set before you, and shall go and serve other gods, and worship them; then will I pluck them up by the roots out of my land which I have given them; and this house, which I have sanctified for my name, will I cast out of my sight, and will make it to be a proverb and a by-word among all nations. And this house, which is high, shall be an astonishment to every one that passeth by it; so that he shall say, Why hath the Lord done thus unto this land, and unto this house? And it shall be answered, Because they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, And laid hold on other gods, and worshiped them, and served them; therefore hath he brought all this evil upon them." Therefore, yes, because they forsook the Lord.

Coming down to within six hundred years of the advent of Christ, we, find God, by the mouth of Ezekiel, affirming the same great principles. (Ezekiel xviii. 20-28.)

"The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him; in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked shall die? saith the Lord God: and not that he should return from his ways and live.... When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die. Again, when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. Because he considereth, and turneth away from all his transgressions that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die."

Comment on such Scriptures as these is surely unnecessary. They can not be made more plain than God has already made them. If you will not deem it *irreverent*, I will say that were God here himself this day, seeking to defend my proposition, we can not see how language could be better selected for the purpose than is here recorded.

Please note the fact that temporal blessings are not all that are here promised; for he who obeys the commandments of the Lord, shall save his *soul*. Is not this conditional salvation? Note

the additional fact, too, that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but most earnestly entreats him to cast away his transgressions, make himself a new heart and a new spirit—turn, and live (very. 31, 32). God compels no man to obey him; but he sets before him motives vast in importance as is the destiny of the human soul to induce him to obedience, and faithfully warns him of the dreadful consequences of disobedience, and allows him to choose for himself. Deut. xi. 20-28: "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day; and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God; but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods which ye have not known." Does this not look about as conditional as my proposition? A blessing if you obey; a curse if you disobey.

But again (Deut. xxx. 15-19): "See, I have set before you this day life and good, death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply; and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thy heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shall be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you; that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." Does this look as if man can nothing to do? The two roads are open before him—life is at the end of one, and death is at the end of the other. Man is perfectly free to choose the road he will travel. God says to the sinner in the road to death, "Turn ye, turn ye; why will you die? I have no pleasure in your death, but rather that you turn, and live."

We come now to the examination of the New Testament, and though the conditions have been changed, we shall find conditional salvation meeting us at every step of our investigation. We will have to abridge and condense every proof we introduce as much as we can, and then we will not be able to present a tithe of the proof available in support of a proposition so universally taught as is the one under consideration at present. We begin our investigation with a very brief examination of

#### THE MISSION OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

He was to go before the Lord in the spirit and power of Elias, to

turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just—to make ready a people prepared for the Lord (Luke i. 17). As it was John's God-appointed work to make ready a people prepared for the Lord, did he perform the work assigned him? If so, how did he prepare them? He gave them knowledge of salvation. How did he give them knowledge of salvation? "By the remission of their sins" (Luke i. 77). But how did they get knowledge of salvation? We suppose they got it by compliance with the conditions upon which God authorized John to offer it to them.

What were the conditions of salvation preached by John? "There was a man sent from God whose name was John. The same came for a witness to bear witness of the light, that all men, through him, might believe" (John i. 6, 7). Notice, in passing, that the object of John's testimony was that *all men, yes, all men, might believe*. Then it was necessary that men believe in the days of John the Baptist. But what were they to believe? "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus" (Acts xix. 4). Thus we see they believed on a Christ to come—we believe in a Christ already come; this difference—no more. Christ was the object of their faith, and he is the object of our faith to-day. But what else? "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. iii. 1). Then *repentance* was necessary in the days of John. What else? "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins" (Mark i. 5). But *for what* did John baptize the people? He "preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3). What did he preach for the remission of sins? Certainly that baptism that belonged to, or followed, repentance. However important faith may be, there is nothing affirmed of it here; nor is there anything affirmed of repentance, only that it was connected with the baptism preached by John for the remission of sins. Suppose I say, "The coat of my friend kept me warm." What do I say kept me warm? Certainly, the coat that belonged to my friend kept me warm. Again: "The house of my friend gave me shelter for the night." What do I say gave me shelter? Certainly, the house that belonged to my friend gave me shelter. Very well. "The baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins." What is for the remission of sins? Certainly, the *baptism* that belonged to, or followed, repentance, was for the remission of

sins. If this is not plain and conclusive, then human language, common sense and Holy Writ can make nothing so.

Then we have found believing, or *faith, repentance* and *baptism* preached by John, and when the people submitted to, or performed, these *conditions*, they had knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins. Then our proposition is clearly sustained in John's ministry. They were pardoned, and had knowledge of it, and were fit material for position in the great spiritual temple to be erected in the near future by divine authority.

We come now to examine the personal teaching of Jesus, and we will begin with an examination of his ever-memorable conversation with Nicodemus, recorded in the third chapter of the gospel by John: "Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God" (vers. 3-5). That the word *see* is here used in the sense of *enjoy*, we suppose no one will doubt. The thought is, that without being born again no man can *enjoy* the kingdom of God. How is he to be born again? "Except a man be born of *water* and of the *Spirit*, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." The converse of the statement is clearly implied, that if he is born of water and of the Spirit, he does enter the kingdom of God. In this kingdom is a state of salvation; out of it in a state of condemnation. Paul 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 "(Col. i. 12-14). Then outside of the kingdom we are subject to the power of darkness, and under the dominion of Satan; in the kingdom we are delivered from the power of darkness, and have redemption and forgiveness of sins through the blood of Jesus.

Now we have a few very plain questions for our worthy opponent, to which we invite his very special attention; and we promise to pay our respects to his answers when he makes them:

1. Can the class of persons for whom the kingdom was established be saved without entering it? If so, how?
2. Does the phrase *born of water*, in John iii. 5, refer to water baptism? If not, to what does it refer?

## 3. Can a man enter into the kingdom without being baptized? If so, how?

Nicodemus did not understand the Saviour, and hence did not believe what he said. Then said Jesus, "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell ye of heavenly things?" (ver. 11.) He then seeks to impress him with the importance of believing on Him. Not that he intended him to stop at believing on him, but by believing he might be prepared to attend to what he had previously taught him. And he begins with an illustration drawn from Jewish history, with which Nicodemus, as a master in Israel, was presumed to be familiar. He says: "And 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" (vers. 14, 15). As the dying Israelite had to look upon the brazen serpent on the pole in the camp, that he might live (Num. xxi. 8, 9), so Jesus must die upon the cross, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life. Now, what is the object of, and necessity for, believing? That the believer may not perish, but may have eternal life. What can this mean? Is believing not a condition upon which depends eternal life? Will my worthy opponent say no? Will he say that looking on the brazen serpent was not a *condition* on which depended the life of the bitten Israelite? Was looking upon the brazen serpent any more a condition of life to the bitten Israelite, than believing on Christ is to the sinner to-day? We will listen attentively to his explanation of this.

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (ver. 16). Whom did God love? He loved the world. And how *much* did he love it? He so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son. For what did he give his Son? That whosoever of the world he loved, might have everlasting life, on *condition* that they would believe on him. Is not believing on him here made a condition on which depends the eternal life of the sinner? Will our opponent say no? Surely we are here taught that the "world may be saved, if they will accept salvation on the conditions upon which it is offered to them. "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved" (ver. 17). Here the mission of Jesus is most beautifully expressed—*might be saved*, not shall be saved, whether they want to be saved or not. He came to provide a way by which men might be saved if they will believe and obey him, not to force salvation upon them. And the means of salvation are as free to *all men* as they are *to any man*. He came to save the world, and tasted death for every

man. Though JESUS came not to condemn the world, yet all will be condemned who refuse to believe on him. "He that believeth on him in not condemned." But what of him who does not believe? "He that believeth not, is condemned already." And why is he condemned already? "Because he hath not believed on the name of the only-begotten Son of God" (ver. 18).

Here we find belief in Jesus to be the condition upon which men may escape condemnation, and unbelief I he condition upon which men bring condemnation on themselves. "Of course we understand the Lord to be speaking of such belief as takes God at his word, and goes right along in obedience to his commands—a belief perfected as the word of God directs. "He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life." Yes; the obedient believer has everlasting life in promise, but what about the unbeliever? "He that believeth. not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him" (John iii. 39). And again: "I said, therefore, unto you, that ye shall die in your sins, for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" (John viii, 24). And still again: "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (John xii. 47, 48).

Here we learn that Jesus *came to save the world*; and we learn that the world he came to save is co-extensive with the judgment of the last day. Will all men be judged? Then Jesus came to save all men. But he who *rejects* him, and *receives* not his words, can not be saved by him, however ample the means of salvation provided for him. The words *reject* and *receive* both imply the exercise of *will* in rejecting Christ and in refusing to receive his words.

"Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book, but these are written that ye might believe." Yes, these signs are written that ye *might believe*, not that you shall believe, whether you are interested yourself or not. But that ye might believe what? "That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," These are written as evidence to convince the world of the truth of this grand proposition, that all men might believe it. But what if they do believe this? "And that, believing, ye might have life through his name" (John xx. 30, 31). Yes, *might believe*, and *might have life* by believing. This expresses the thought most beautifully. Now I want to ask my worthy opponent this question: After all these signs are recorded, if a man refuses to believe the proposition set out here, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, is there a possibility for him to get eternal life through his

name? If so, how? And if not, why not? I will not anticipate his answers, but will wait till he makes them.

Peter says: "To him give all the prophets witness that, through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts x. 43). Here we have the same style, except the phrase *remission of sins* is substituted for the word *life*, by which, doubtless, the same thought is intended; and it seems to me that, in the plainest terms possible, *remission of sins* in the name of Jesus Christ is made to depend upon belief in him as a condition to be complied with by those whose sins are remitted at all. Will he who does not believe on him get remission through his name? If so, how? They are condemned already. "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through his name is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts xiii. 38, 39). Here we have *forgiveness of sins* in place of the phrase *remission of sins*, which means the same thing; and all that believe are justified, thus plainly making belief a condition of justification.

Paul says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Rom. i. 16). But the gospel is God's power to the salvation of no one, whether he be Jew or Greek, who does not believe it. Truly then salvation is conditional, as the power of God to salvation is rejected by the unbeliever.

"The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shall 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" (Rom. x. 8-10). Here we have confession with the mouth, and belief in the heart, in the plainest terms possible, made conditions of salvation. If this language does not show these to be conditions, then I respectfully submit that human language can show nothing to be a condition of anything. To this passage I solicit the special attention, of my worthy respondent. Will he say that belief and confession are not here shown to be conditions of salvation? If he will say they are not, will he be so good as to construct a sentence that will express the thought without using the very word condition?

On one occasion a young man came to Jesus, and said: "Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life" (Matt. xix. 16)? Had my proposition been untrue at that time, it

occurs to me that JESUS would have answered something after the following style: "There is nothing that you can do that you may have eternal life; for eternal life is not dependent on *conditions* to be complied with by man." Not thus understanding the subject, however, the Master told him what to do that he might have *treasures* in heaven.

On the day of Pentecost, when Peter convinced the people that God had made that same Jesus whom they crucified both Lord and Christ, "They were cut to the heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do?" Do for what? To obtain pardon, or remission of sins, as the answer plainly shows. 'Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins" (Acts ii. 38).

Here remission of sine, in the case of these *believers*, is made to depend on the additional items of *repentance* and *baptism*. The preposition *for* unites *repent* and *be baptized* on one side with remission of sins on the other. Remission of sins is the object for which and to which the actions expressed in both verbs look as the end in view. Connected, as they are, by the conjunction *and*, they can not be separated, Whatever one is for, the other is for. The relation of one to the remission of sins is the relation of both. Then, if we can find the relation of one we will have found the relation of both. Peter says: "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out" (Acts iii. 19).

Then, as repentance is required that sins may be blotted out, and as baptism sustains the same relation to remission, expressed by the one preposition occurring but one time, it follows that baptism is to be performed in order that sins may be blotted out. From this conclusion there is no appeal. Then, as the Pentecostians believed before they asked what to do, it follows that *faith*, *repentance* and *baptism* were conditions of pardon then, and are so to-day.

That repentance is a condition is already plain enough; but to make assurance doubly sure we will present further proof. Jesus said: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke xiii. 2). And Paul said: "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now he commandeth 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" (Acts xvii. 30, 31). Then without repentance sinners will not be ready for the judgment, but will surely perish.

When the rest of the apostles heard Peter's defense for going in among the uncircumcised, "they held their peace and glorified God,



saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life" (Acts xi. 18). Then repentance is unto life, looking to life, in order to life, a condition on which life depends. But the people at Pentecost, inquired what they must do. Peter told them what to do for remission of sine. Now we respectfully ask our esteemed opponent if he would answer the same inquiry now as Peter did then? If not, why not?

The Philippian jailer said to Paul and Silas: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved" (Acts xvi. 30)? Now, in this question we have the very *issue* presented in my proposition, *What must I do to be saved?* Will my worthy opponent say whether this question does not cover the ground in controversy here? How would he answer such a question if put to him to day? Something after the following style. I imagine: "What must *you* do? Do nothing. What can you do to be saved? Just nothing at all; for your salvation is not dependent on *conditions* to be performed by you; salvation is not of works, lest any man should boast." But did the inspired teachers so treat the question? No, indeed; but they answered it: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." Thus all the conditions of salvation were presented and attended to the same hour of the night. When the Lord appeared to Saul and convinced him that he was Jesus, Saul said: "What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said,... Arise, and go into Damascus, and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do" (Acts xxii. 10). And a man was sent to him who told him to arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord (ver. 16). Now here are four examples recorded, where those competent to answer were asked what the inquirers must do, and in no case were they told *that they could do nothing*: but in every instance they were told what to do in order to be saved. Now will our esteemed opponent tell us how any man, believing in unconditional salvation, as he does, can ask such a question as, What must I do to be saved? or in faith do anything to be saved? or tell any one else what to do to be saved? We suppose he will give us an explanation of these matters, and we will await his answer. We respectfully ask that it be full and explicit.

In the commission given by Christ to his apostles after he arose from the dead, and before he ascended to heaven, he said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark xvi 15, 16). Here we learn that the salvation promised in the gospel was intended for every creature in all the world who would accept it on the conditions stipulated. In the

plainest terms possible, we are told that, of every creature In all the world, he that would believe the gospel and be baptized should be saved. If this language does not establish my proposition, then no proposition can be established by any language that may be employed. It is not necessary that I stop to show that belief find baptism sustain the same relation to the salvation promised, for if either one is a condition necessary to the enjoyment of salvation, then *salvation* is *conditional* and my proposition is established.

But suppose I say to a man: "Dig me a cistern, and wall it up with brick, and I will give you one hundred dollars." The specifications are all made, the proposition accepted and reduced to writing. The man makes the excavation according to the specifications, and demands the money for the job—can he get it? Has he complied with the contract? He was to dig the cistern and wall it up with brick; he has dug the cistern, but has not put a brick in it—is he entitled to the pay? Assuredly he is not. Very well, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. The man believes, but has not been baptized—is he saved? Is he not in the same condition of the man who had not put a brick in the cistern, when, by the contract, he was to wall it up? But what of those who do not believe? He that believeth not shall be damned. But why did not the Lord add, "and is not baptized shall be damned"? Because if he did not believe he *would not* be baptized, nor would it do him any good if he were to be, "for without faith it is impossible to please God." Baptism without faith would be about like walling up the cistern without digging it. You say that would be impossible; even so is *scriptural* baptism without faith impossible. The style is, "He that believeth and is baptized." "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest" One of those to whom this commission was given said to the disciples scattered abroad: "Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. 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" (I. Peter iii. 20, 21).

Here we are told that baptism saves us, and not only so, but it *now* saves us. In what sense does baptism save us? Surely it is not the *power* that saves us, but it is a condition, upon compliance with which God *saves us*. We have seen that in the commission under which Peter acted, he was charged to preach the gospel, and Jesus promised that he that would believe and be baptized should be saved; and Peter could have meant nothing else than that baptism save, us as a condition, in harmony with the commission given to him by the

Master. And it must save us from the punishment that is due us on account of our sins, as there is nothing else from which it can or does save us. It can not refer to a future salvation, for it now eaves us. It does not save us from temporal calamity, as insult, persecution, sickness or death, for the baptized man is still subject to them. Then if it does not save us from the punishment due us on account of our past sins, will our opponent tell us from what it does save us?

Isaiah, through the light of prophetic vision, says: "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek" (Isa. xi. 10). Again: "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near: let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon" (Isa. lv. 6, 7).

Jesus says: "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened" (Matt. vii. 7, 8).

Here we learn that we are to seek the Lord, but we must seek after the *due order*. David said: "Ye are the chief of the fathers of the Levites: sanctify yourselves, both ye and your brethren, that ye may bring up the ark of the Lord God of Israel unto the place that I have prepared for it. For because ye did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him not after the due order" (I. Chron. xv. 12, 13). Here we learn that we must seek the Lord's favor after *the due order*; find the due order is God's order. We must seek in God's appointed way. When we ask, we must ask in harmony with God's revealed will. James says we ask and receive not because we ask amiss. We must ask in *faith*, too, for "without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is rewarder of them that diligently seek him" (Heb. xi. 6). Belief is an indispensable condition, without which none can come to God. But we must believe that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Here we have another question for our friend. Does he believe that God will reward a man, however diligently he may seek him, unless he is one of the eternally and unconditionally elect? Will he tell us?

But we will hear Paul on this matter of seeking the Lord. He says: "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshiped with men's hands, and though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face

of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us" (Acts xvii. 24-27).

Here we learn that God made of one blood all the nations of men that dwell on all the face of the earth; and that he intended them to seek the Lord and find him. And every one that seeks him *will* find him if he seeks him in God's appointed way. But we need not *seek* him or call on him until we are willing to obey him.

"Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him" (Heb. v. 8, 9).

The eternal salvation, of which Jesus is the author, is for them, and only them, that obey him. And it is not for *some* of them only, but it is for all of them. Every one. Obedience to him is the condition upon which all men may attain to eternal salvation, and it is attainable to no one who will not obey him. If there was not another sentence in the Bible bearing upon the subject, this one is enough to establish my proposition beyond even respectable quibble. Will my worthy opponent give us a plain, unambiguous exegesis of this passage? It is surely worthy of his most serious attention.

*(Time expired.)*

---

### **Elder Herod's First Reply.**

BRETHREN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I am equally proud that I have the opportunity and pleasure of addressing so large and respectable an auditory of people as there is now before me. I have listened with patience to every word of my brother; and during the entire talk my mind was ruminating, and, for the life of me, I have to decide that after the hour's talk he has failed to make a single reference to the written statement in his proposition. When I present myself before you to discuss a question, it will be knowing that anything presented before a jury that is not relevant to the question would be rejected. The judge would reject everything that was not in accordance with the testimony. I am now going to announce to this people that I expect to be here four days, and at the close of the affirmation I expect to prove all I say, and to confine myself to every word that is uttered in my proposition. I shall use no time in calling attention to foreign questions.

It now becomes necessary for me to announce the proposition. He has affirmed that salvation from sin is conditional. The moment

we state that, we arrive at the point where it is necessary to stop and ask a question, for I know that you will listen to me. *Conditional* is to perform conditions. My brother assumes that the sinner is to comply with conditions. What is to be accomplished by compliance with conditions? He says, salvation from sin. I submit what is his duty now, to devote his whole time to show that the salvation of sinners is in their own hands. A large amount of testimony has been read, but not one out of the fifty passages has any relevancy to the proposition. He goes back to the law, and shows what God's promises and blessings and threatenings are. He would impress the idea that when we comply or obey, we have a free passport to heaven. I repeat that not a single word he read contains a single promise for heaven, or a threat of hell. They are saved from the calamities to which they had become obnoxious. Now, why bring that to prove that salvation from sin is to be perfected by the sinner?

Another point—salvation from sin is conditional, the conditions to be performed by the sinner. About six times in his discourse he has gone to a second party—somebody to administer baptism. Does he want half a dozen Saviours? I ask, how many questions am I to understand that he is going to bring before this audience for salvation, depending on three or four acts, and every one to be performed by the sinner? A man can not get an administrator, and unless he goes into the water he is out. He can not save anybody out of the water.

I call your attention to the testimony that God has given on the subject of salvation. I will reply to every word.

Salvation from sin—who is the sinner? He says you need salvation if you are a sinner. He says you must perform the conditions. Notice the conditions: Belief in the Lord Jesus Christ. Is belief the cause? or the effect? If belief is the effect, what is the cause? What constitutes belief? I say, legal gentlemen, you are qualified to answer—you are faithful and impartial. What chances have you in that man's case? What control have you in the testimony, if it is to be doubtful? None at all. Do you control the testimony? or does the testimony control you?

Unless he can bring the sinner to God, how can God save him? There must be an influence or cause—belief is an effect—there must be a cause. I appeal to you all, without regard to your religious views, what is the cause? It is testimony. Who gives the testimony? I can answer that fast enough. The sixth chapter of John. The words are the words of Jesus Christ. Now, I remember, he says that "all that the Father giveth me cometh unto me." "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the proph-

ets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me" (John vi. 44, 45). I got that testimony from God. "He that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out" (John vi. 37).

Proverbs of Solomon xvi.: First, I want to quote a declaration in Romans x. Paul says: "With the heart, man believeth unto righteousness. " How can I believe anything without the force of testimony? We want two passages to answer each other. Read the passage. "The preparations"—in the plural—"of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is of the Lord. " Just think! God is to prepare the heart—is to furnish the answer for the tongue. With the mouth, confession is made unto salvation. It is plain enough to be seen that it is unconditional. He must show that man is a free agent He must submit to the proposition that God controls it, or that he does not. The testimony carries your mind to the verdict. The proverbs have said the preparations of the heart in man is from the Lord. Does a man believe before the preparation, or after? He would have you believe after, in order to get into Christ. I will not bring a large amount of evidence on the question, for he will fail in making even an attempt to answer. He said he would not anticipate me. I am not afraid of that. He will not attempt to answer me.

There is an Old Testament Scripture which says: "Look unto me all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved, for I am God: and beside me there is none other." My brother has told you that every man is capable of saving himself if he complies with the conditions. I translate from the Old Testament to the New Testament Scripture. I submit a problem that will not be solved. I said, after he said salvation was conditional, that the winner controlled the condition, thus *buying* his salvation. Read how the apostle disputes that idea. You will be startled when you think of the importance to be attached to the Scriptures I am introducing. Acts iv. 11, Peter said: "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders." How many of you believe the Bible? "The same is become the head of the corner. " You will tell me that Jesus is the sinner's Saviour, and then that the sinner saves himself. Let that settle the question on this subject. If this is true, I have no right to stand here and announce salvation in the name of Christ. But I am just reading God's word now. "The name has become the head of the corner, neither is there salvation in any other. " He has as many Saviours as sinners. I want you to look at the facts as I read them, as he has brought his testimony into the question. Now, Bro. Herod, I have no right to bring up a sinner unless he has no name. He seemed to make it as plain as could be. It looked nice, but would not save from sin. I want him to make a point, and find a sinner that has no name; then he can

save himself. First part of the paragraph, "Neither is there salvation in any other. " Do you carry salvation in your pockets? I did not think there was a man who would deny Jesus Christ in that way. I have quoted a part of the passage. I call attention to the second part, and then you get the reason of my reference. Listen to the apostle (Acts iv. 12): "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name given among men whereby we must be saved. " Didn't he tell you that you could get it without him? No credit reflected on Christ. I am now giving you a plain statement on the subject. I intend to cover the whole ground. You can not put a condition of salvation that shuts the door for every body. I am going to talk plain, and treat all with due courtesy. I am now going to close the paragraph and shut the door, and if my brother can tell who it is outside of the name of Christ that is a Saviour I shall learn something I never knew before. "For there is no other name given among men whereby we must be saved but the name Christ Jesus. " Did Paul preach conditions? No sir. I am on the defensive, and I say that the testimony is irrelevant to the statement of his proposition. He has taken them from their proper channel.

Read Acts iv., next I. Cor. ii. I want to say to you that I have a Saviour. Let us hear the first verse. Every body listen to the language: "When I came to you, I came not with excellency of speech, or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God; for I determined not to know anything among you but Jesus Christ, and him crucified. " Set down a pin, and make a note. Yes, but you say that is troublesome. I appreciate an argument when I hear it, and he is better able to make it than I am. I give testimony—listen to the facts: "Declaring the testimony of God; " "I determine to know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified." Legal gentlemen and intelligent audience, I leave it to you—I want to hear that again. "For I determined not to know anything among you but Jesus Christ and him crucified. " Every saint and sinner he gets to heaven will sing awhile to themselves, and then awhile to the Lord. Are you willing to sit here and hear him say that the Bible knows no Saviour but a frail being?

The apostle does not stop, but continues further: "And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling, and my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. " That your faith and hope may stand on conditions! I would not preach it—it was not a part of the paragraph at all. It gives room for a third party to glory. "That your faith and hope might be in God. " If your faith and hope are in your hands, and depends on what you have done,

then the Lord is valueless. The apostle refers back to what the Lord came into the world for. My brother, give Christ the praise.

The first announcement was from the prophet Isaiah, that glad vision of Christ when he made his advent into the world, and the object of this advent. Where did he come from? He came from heaven. What for? My brother will say he came to tell them to save themselves. If that is Bible teaching, I accept it; but if it is not, we ought to reject it.

The first chapter of Matthew, commencing with the New Testament. Not on a telephone or a telegraph but through an angel to these lower grounds of sin. A dispute has come about the name of the stranger—it had to be settled. "Thou shall call his name Jesus, for he shall"—redeem his people from original sin! Make a way possible for them to save themselves from their sins! That would be nice.

I have offered a \$10 Bible to any one who would show it, but no one has ever got it. I call your attention to the reading. I am coming up to one of the strong points in the Lord's testimony. Will you accept his testimony, or the testimony of my opponent? What is it you determine to believe—him or the Bible? "Thou shall call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins" I submit it to the legal gentlemen, if Christ with that announcement, after he made the agreement to save them, should say I did all I could to save them but they would not let me. Now listen, because I am talking about the passage, I remember, "Let God be true, or every man a liar." The angel said that he WOULD save his people from their sins. If he saved them, is he requiring a second payment for the same debt by their saving themselves? Would God receive satisfaction, and then ask a second payment on the part of the sinner for the same debt, in acts of obedience, in whatsoever way?

The Bible says Christ came to save them. Did the prophet tell them anything about what he was to do? Dan. ix.: Now everybody listen. Daniel is going to prophesy in regard to the coming of Christ, in removing the sacrifice, and hence for a purpose. He says:

"Seventy weeks I have determined upon my people, " to give them a *chance to save themselves!* Pretty clever. I give you a chance to make fifteen dollars. Pretty good to give you a chance to make it. What about those seventy weeks? "To finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, and make reconciliation, to bring in everlasting righteousness," and say, Do certain things and I will seal it to you! Belief—God—Preacher—Water! God is the saviour of the family! Everybody listen, and I will read passages to show. I am well enough posted in the rules of discussion as to the rights of my opponent and my duties. Make an end of sin—seal up the vision of the prophets—bring in everlasting righteousness—and if you have



his righteousness it will do; but if you come without it, you are a *rag-shop*, and the fire will burn it up.

I now call your attention to another passage of the prophecies— Isa. lxxii.: "Surely, they are my people. " What! "Children that will not lie—so he was their Saviour; in all their afflictions he was afflicted, and the Angel of his presence saved them; " and yet you tell me it depends on us to save ourselves, or else we are subject to an endless fire.

I want my life to be spent in honoring the Lord Jesus. If I have a friend, I want to remember him.

Now I want to consult the apostle Peter, third chapter. " He says the sinner is to give up his sins by obedience. What is the language? "Who his own self bore our sins in his own body on the tree?" He (Brents) says they are on you, and they will stay on till you get them off. I can not come two hundred miles, and assemble with you here to listen to these questions. I say there is nothing in that I call your attention to Peter's language I submit it to you. Listen: "Who, in hid own body bore our sins on the tree of the cross. " How long ago? Almost nineteen hundred years ago. He had the sins of his people on him. You can not get away from the conclusion. How came they there? I am ready to respond on the testimony of the Bible. I am not going to spend my time on a proposition unless I can prove it. How came they to be borne in the Lord's body? Let me give the answer. Isa. liii. 6: "All we like sheep have gone astray. We have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." What did that say? They were sinners, and needed salvation. What occurred therein the record given? Try God's love on that subject, Remember, I am in the defensive. I read chapter and verse. How did he bear the sins in his body? All we, like sheep, have gone astray; each one had turned to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on each one his sins, and adopted conditions for him to do, to get free from his sins! Now, everybody listen to this. I am giving forcible language. I transposed it, now I will give the force of the paragraph. What is it? All we, like sheep, have gone astray, each one turning to his own way; and I said by certain conditions we could be made free, and my brother is the exponent of these conditions. He has not a particle of the Lord Jesus about it. Suppose he admits it, and says this was original sin, and that then we have actual sins and transgressions-how can you get rid of your own sins? By three or four steps. Don't you know that it would land you in hell just as certain as if you had a mill-stone about your neck. I am willing that the record shall determine the question. I will devote a moment to prove it, I will discuss this point. If your actual transgressions were not in-

cluded, it would be equal to a mill-stone about your neck. Heb. ix.: "Almost all things in the law were purged from sin. " If the blood of Christ is to purge from sin, and he forgives, where is there any relation in what is done to obtain from Christ what he died for—for the actual sins and transgressions—and to say that the accepting or rejecting him decides it all? Has he died in vain? A stub of a sinner dies, and makes his way to an endless hell, when God is trying to save him! I would not worship such a God. In order to put away sin, a system of conditions has been introduced, and you must obey these conditions; and where is the blood, for there is no remission without it? Is not that a grand idea? I come back to that pin I put down: "And the Lord hath laid upon him. " Who will be responsible for the adulterers and liars, and drunkards? If it were a legal question, I would refer you to the law, and let that settle and decide it. "And the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all, and by his stripes we are healed." Is it the stripes, or the obedience, that heals?

Now let me call your attention to another passage. I have now found the Saviour laden with the sins of his people. They are charged to his account; what did he do with them? Now, Paul, I want your testimony. Hebrews ix., what is said about that question? "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. " Would he not mock the miseries of the sinner if he did it not? The assertion is that he put them away. I return now to the question that I anticipated. What are you going to say? I see men here that have heard me preach for seven years or more, and all will bear testimony that I preach Jesus Christ as the Saviour from sin. Christian duties never save from sin. I read in the epistle as to the amount of sin put away. Titus says, in treating of that subject, "Who gave himself for us, " that he might offer salvation upon terms and conditions for all who would accept it! If he had said that, there would not have been a discussion here now. In place of that, I give it in the language of the apostle, and hence I must begin where the apostle takes up the question. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity. " My brother says that he came to all the world, and died to save it. I emphasize the word "world" as well as you do. I have no secrets, religiously. Read that passage again. It is of interest and importance to every one who would know the Bible facts in denial of the proposition. You will find me there till he has done. I came here to stay four days. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works. "

The product of salvation is to bring salvation. I am defending

Jesus Christ to-day. My brother is defending the sinner. I am proving what Christ did for the pinner. I have a passage that says he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity. I will settle it before I have done with this discussion. I want the benefit of these passages in the after speeches. I want to see how it was done. I am now going to use water. I hope that when the proper time comes he will talk about the water, because there is a *washer-woman* or *washer-man*, and something is to be cleansed. I reckon neither he nor I have had a place in that water yet.

(*Time expired.*)

---

### Dr. Brents' Second Speech.

MR. PRESIDENT: —I am now to reply to the speech which was made by my worthy opponent in the forenoon. I will not treat him as he treated me. I made a speech of an hour in condensed scriptural argument, and I gave chapter and verse for every position taken, and asked his special attention to a number of them; and to not one single one of them did he even allude—not one. He did not take hold of a single passage, and attempt to show that it did not teach what I claimed for it. I asked him a number of plain but respectful questions, to which I had a right to expect his attention in his speech; but to not one of them did he make any reply whatever. Does he call this *debating*? Near the close of his speech, he said he was going to set up a theory to wipe my speech all out. Now I respectfully submit that this kind of work is better calculated to make infidels than Christians. When I make an argument drawn from unmistakable proofs from Holy Writ, and call on him, in respectful style, to meet and answer it, but in place of answering it he goes off to hunt passages from the same Bible which seem to teach something else, it brings the Bible into conflict with itself. If it be a book of contradictions, it can not be an emanation from God. It must be consistent with itself in all its parts, or it can not be worthy of its Author and the confidence of men.

I thought debating consisted in the affirmant laying down his premises, and supporting his positions by such proof as he deemed sufficient for the purpose; then the respondent takes up the proofs adduced, and shows that they do not teach what is claimed for them; this done, *then* it is in order to set up an adverse theory. I respectfully suggest that the course pursued by my worthy opponent is not debating at all.

He says that, according to my theory, a man's salvation is in his own hands; and also that I had no Jesus in my speech. Though I quoted much from the mouth of Jesus, and showed by many passages that there is no salvation without faith in Christ, yet I had no Jesus in my speech—no Jesus in my proposition!

When I first sent my proposition to him, it read, "Salvation from sin by Jesus Christ is conditional" He objected to this, and worded for me the present proposition, leaving out the words *Jesus Christ*, though he left them in his own. Did he do this in order that he might throw it up to me in debate? I reckon not, surely.

I have showed time and again that there is no salvation out of Christ, in this or in the Jewish dispensation. He died "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, that they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance" (Heb. ix. 15). The efficacy of his blood looked backward and forward. Every offering made under the old testament was made efficacious by the blood of Christ.

But he says there was no promise of heaven or threat of hell "back there." Paul says they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them; and that rock was Christ. Is there no heaven in drinking of Christ? What becomes of the great cloud of witnesses named in Heb. xi., who all died in faith, and of whom the world was not worthy? Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were mentioned among them. What became of them? "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. viii. 11). No heaven for them! Ezek. xviii. 27: God says, he that "doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." God *swore* that those whose carcasses fell in the wilderness in unbelief, should not enter into his ml (Heb. iii. 16). What becomes of them?

He scoffs at the idea of the sinner having his salvation in his own hands. I did not say he has his salvation in his own hands; but I do say he must comply with the conditions upon which salvation is offered to him in the gospel, or be lost. Because a sinner avails himself of the means God has provided for his salvation, does he reject God, Jesus Christ, or anything else that has anything to do with salvation? God gives us bread—but does that destroy human agency in the production of bread? God does his part, and requires us to do our part. God gives the soil, warmth, light, moisture, none of which man could do for himself; but man can prepare the soil, plant the seed, cultivate and gather the crop—and thus he gets bread; but if Eld. Herod refuses to do anything to make or get bread—because God gives it to him, I guess—if his friends do not provide for him he will be likely to go to bed hungry. God has pro-

vided salvation for man on conditions; "but he that believeth not will be damned." But more of this after a while.

If man has no agency in his own salvation, who is to blame if he is not saved? He is as passive as a block of marble, and certainly had no power to have it otherwise. He says sins were pardoned long ago—will he tell us when? I guess he will go back before the foundation of the world was laid. Then there is no such thing as pardon of sin now at all. Will he tell us whether or not there is any such thing as pardon for sinners to-day? We will have more to say about this when he takes position on it.

If it was all fixed up before time began, the sinner not having even to accept any means of salvation, then again I ask, Who is to blame if a man is not saved? Will Jesus Christ say in the judgment, "Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity?" No, sir; no works of his had anything to do with his destiny, for he never had a chance to be anything else but what he is. God never loved or provided for him—Jesus never died for him; he has not, nor did he ever have, any interest in the blood of Jesus, and yet God will confine him in the rude flames of an angry hell forever—for what? Just to see his writhings and contortions I suppose! He said he would not worship a God whose purposes could be thwarted by a "stub of a sinner; " but here is a picture of the God he does worship. I wish to vindicate the character of the God I worship against such an imputation. The darkest picture of savage cruelty and the inquisition of Rome sink into *pleasantry* before it. They would *speedily end*, but the punishment of the damned *never*; and all fixed up four thousand years before he was born, and that by a merciful God, without giving him any chance to avoid such a destiny. Is this the God of the Bible? It can not be.

If man has nothing to do in his own salvation, why did God mock him, saying, "Look unto me all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved, for I am God, and beside me there is none else. " Why did he set life and death before him, and tell him to choose, when he could not choose? Why did Jesus say, " Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest, " when there was no chance for him to come? Why did Jesus Christ command his apostles (I reckon there is Christ in this, as he is speaking) to "go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," when he knew that only the chosen few could be benefitted? Why did he promise salvation to those who would believe and be baptized, when only the elect could be saved? Indeed, even they had been saved from before the world began; hence salvation could not be promised those who were already saved. Why did he threaten with damnation those who refused to believe, when all who are lost

had been lost before time began, and were bound to remain lost, believe or not believe.

But the theory of conditional salvation requires the agency of a second party. Well, your theory did not even require the sinner himself, for it was fixed up four thousand years before he was born. If my friend had been away back in the days of the Jews, when a clean person had to officiate for the unclean, he would have said, "Not so, Lord; we want no second party. " When the angel appeared to Cornelius, saying, " Send to Joppa for Peter, who shall tell the words by which you shall be saved, " he would have said, "Stop! though you are an angel fresh from the throne of glory, there must be no second parties in this business. " When the Lord appeared to Saul, who cried, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" the Lord said, "Go into Damascus, and there it shall be told thee what thou must do, " my friend would have objected stoutly, for he would have been alarmed at the introduction of second parties.

He wants to know if belief is a cause or an effect. Well, it is the effect of testimony, but may be the cause of salvation. Effects become causes in thousands of cases. Faith is the belief of testimony. God given the testimony, but it is man who believes it; hence faith comes by hearing.

But he thinks if man has to do anything, it robs God of the glory. Does my friend think himself robbed of parental glory, when his son trustingly, promptly, and faithfully obeys him?

He went to John vi.: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. " But does this say anything about whether they were given conditionally or unconditionally? Not a word. But let us read further: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. " That is the way men are taught of God. The gospel is preached to the people; they hear and learn of Jesus; they accept salvation on the terms stipulated, and God's way come to him.

He scoffs at the idea that man is a free moral agent. Well, I insist if man is not free, he is not responsible. He can not be responsible for that in which he has no agency. God would cease to be a just God if he were to damn a man for not obeying him, when he never had a chance to obey him. If a man is not of the elect, is there any chance for him to make himself elect? Will my worthy opponent answer? If a man not elected should give all his goods to feed the poor, do everything in his power, even go on his knees three times a day, is there any chance for him to be saved? All,

but you tell me he has not the requisite love. Well, who is to blame for that? Is there anything he can do to change himself, or make God love him, when God, before the world began, determined he would not love him or he loved by him?

The very fact that Jesus commanded the gospel to be preached to all, offering salvation to all who would believe and obey, is evidence, high as heaven, that man can accept the salvation offered; and this evidence is made certain by the fact that he is threatened with punishment if he refuses to believe it.

He quotes Acts iv. 32: "For there is none other name under heaven given, among men, whereby we must be saved, " that is, no other than the name of Jesus Christ. He insists that if the sinner has to do anything, he is saved in his own name. To make the matter *conclusive*, he says, "Until I find a man without a name, there is no chance to find a man who can be saved on conditions. " Paul, Cornelius, Crispus, Gaius and Lydia all had names, and were saved by believing and obeying the Lord. The name of Christ gives authority to the commission under the New Covenant; the blood of Christ fills its place; Jesus Christ as the Saviour, fills his place. The idea that because a man is saved by the name of Christ, that nothing else has anything to do with it, would annul the blood of Christ, and every other agency connected with man's salvation. The man who thus reasons has a cloud over his eyes, sure enough.

He quotes: "Beside me, there is no Saviour. " In a certain sense there is no Saviour but God. God alone has the power to forgive sins. Certainly, but does he forgive sins conditionally or unconditionally. God saves through Jesus Christ, his Son, who died for all men; but when he assumes that he saves unconditionally, he assumes the whole question in debate. He assumes what he ought to prove. Just a few scintillations of truth from the word of God would be in order along here.

"But there is no other name given among men, whereby we can be saved. " But how do we get into the name of Christ? (Acts x. 48). This man had a name, and was saved through the name of Jesus Christ. Peter said: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. " "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts xix. 5). Thus we come in contact with the name of the Lord Jesus where there is salvation.

But he says man can not save himself. In the sense of pardoning himself, he can not; in the sense of instrumentality, he can. He asks: "How many saviours does he have?" He makes everything connected with salvation a saviour. Had my friend been in

the house of Cornelius when they were about to baptize him, he would have said, "No, Peter; there is but one Saviour. " And, worse still, had he been in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, when Peter exhorted the people to *save themselves* from that untoward generation, he would have brought charges against Peter for talking about men saving themselves. James says: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death" (Jas. v. 19, 20). Take care, James; Eld. Herod will get after you for talking about any one saving a soul.

"We get salvation without the name of Christ. " He says I said so. I never said that a man could be saved without the name of Christ in this world, and I have never been in another yet. The gentleman makes *inferences* for which I would not like to be responsible

But he goes to I. Cor. ii. 1-5: "And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God." The apostle was able to confirm what he preached among the Corinthians by miracles and diverse gifts of the Spirit, that their faith should not stand in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God. And now what has all that to do with conditional or unconditional salvation? Had he quoted, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, " it would have been just as appropriate. But he talks about the crucifixion of Christ, and his paying the debt. If all the elect were saved before the foundation of the world, what good did the crucifixion of Jesus do? And if he paid the debt, where does the grace, mercy and forgiveness of God come in? If Jesus paid *all*, then God forgives nothing; and away goes this much-talked of grace. He has wiped it all out at one brush.

He says, "When those who accept the terms get to heaven, they will sing a while to their own glory, and then awhile to the glory of God." Well, he will not be able to give glory to anyone for saving him, for he was never lost. He can not give glory to Jesus Christ as his Saviour, for Jesus came to save the lost; and if he were *eternally* and unconditionally elected to salvation, then Jesus never came to save him.

But he says none will be lost for whom Christ died. Paul says: "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died" (Rom. xiv. 15).

And again: "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died" (I. Cor. viii. 11).

Now here is a square issue between my friend and the apostle. He says that none can perish for whom Christ died. Paul was of a very different opinion, it seems.



I propose to show that he has gone squarely into universalism. He says none will be lost that Christ came to save, or for whom Christ died. We read: "And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again" (II. Cor. v. 15). "That he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man" (Heb. ii. 9). "And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (I. John ii. 2). See also I. Tim. ii. 4-6; II. Pet. iii. 9; Titus ii. 11, and Rom. v. 31-18.

The gentleman says that all for whom Christ died will be certainly saved. I have shown that he died for all men; therefore all men will be saved, and Universalism is true, according to Mr. Herod. I turn him over to Universalism. This is quite an improvement on the position he has been occupying. God is not willing that any should perish, but that all come to repentance and live. The only reason why all are not saved, is because they *will not* obey God, that they may be saved. But if God is not willing that any should perish, why will not all be saved, if there is nothing required of anyone. *(Time expired.)*

---

### **Elder Herod's Second Reply.**

BRO. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — It has again fallen to my lot to present myself before you. I arise with the same astonishment that I did this morning. I had all the time been expecting that pretty soon after we had defined our proposition, our worthy friend would have come right down to business, and showed some conditions for salvation from sin. Not a single one who has listened will fail to remember perfectly well that he has been playing off in the bush about conditions and free agency. Free agency may exist, and his proposition be not true at all, for the reason that he avers that he is proving conditions. Why don't he read where Christ has laid down the same rule that he has been attempting to find by zig-zagging it around? I was about to call his attention to water. He says that water sustains the same relation to salvation that repentance does. I call his attention to it. I will put the Saviour and water together (Ephesians, chap, v.) The admonition is to the husband as to what Jesus Christ has done. "Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it." Past tense. After you have gone through and built up by faith and repentance, you have not learned much. What was the object of giving himself for the Church? "That he might sanctify and cleanse it by the wash-

ing of water by the Word. " Does he mean that the sinner is cleansed and sanctified by the washing of the word, or does he mean that Christ will do it? I am quoting the language of the inspired apostle to the Gentiles, and I want everybody to take the force of the language that he has left on record, addressed to that church: "Even as Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it. " Could he love that which did not exist? We'll see soon who is the Universalist. I am flattering myself on dumping him over into Universalism directly. The same apostle says; "He has given him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." It was a universal Christ. I am willing to accept that universalism.

He fixed up a kind of temporary relation after the acts of obedience are performed. Listen to the apostle as he gives a description of the relation as it exists between Christ and the Church. That body is made up of many members — what is the real relationship existing? Members of his body, of his bones and flesh. Members one of another. How near is the relation? So near, that if one member suffers, they all suffer; if one is in pain, they all are in pain; if one rejoices, they all rejoice. Now I have got the object of his love. If my friend wants to know how they are brought to Jesus Christ, in the 31st chapter of Jeremiah, the prophet answers the question: "Yea saith the Spirit, I have loved them with an everlasting love, with loving-kindness I have drawn them unto myself. That was flesh of my flesh, and bone of my bone, and no man hates his own flesh. " Now he tells why it is that he gave himself for that church, and the object that was communicated by the gift, and by the death of Jesus. If I don't show the Church clean without the assistance of a washerwoman, then I will confess I am wrong. Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water, by the word. Was that cleansing it by the hands of a Herod, or the hands of my worthy opponent? Does the sinner cleanse himself, or does Christ cleanse him?

He makes a great deal of fun of a man's being saved by the Christ, who is a full and complete Saviour. He shall have the pleasure of answering this passage, and unless he can do it, he must acknowledge that he has swamped his own proposition. "Even as Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, " to give it a chance to sanctify and cleanse itself by obedience! Now, my friends, what do you think such a Bible as that would be?. Suppose it says he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word, then he says Jesus Christ will wash them if they obey, or do something to hire him. They can't be free without the act of Jesus Christ, and I insist that his proposition has no Jesus in it. It is no more

than the women who held the clothes of the man, saying, "We will eat our own bread, only let us be called by thy name. "

You look astonished. I do n't wonder at it. He says the Bible contradicts itself if my position is true. If he acknowledges what he did acknowledge, that Christ is the Saviour, he contradicts *himself*, and what is the use of discussing this question. Answer the passage, and tell whether it was water that came out of the throne of God. or Adam's water beneath the sun. The waters above the firmament were divided from those beneath. This is the point. I will consider another passage. A great many blessings depend upon conditions— we are arguing the question of salvation or freedom from sin. Is it the result of a condition? A plain paragraph in King James' translation. I want everybody to listen to this question. Eleventh chapter of Romans. Brother Brents just wasnts to read what Paul said, and if the apostle Paul had been in the place of my brother, he would not have said this, with all duo respect; for I have not got down below the platform of a gentleman, and I do n't want to get above.

I now introduce and read a paragraph out, and then I am willing to leave the question to this respectable congregation, to see the force when connected and compared with this proposition and argument. "So then it is not of him that willeth, or of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. " Is that true? Why, Paul, did you put in these words if it is conditional? How in it? When the sinner gets salvation, does he get it as a reward of his labor? Did you buy your salvation? [pointing to Dr. Brents] Now again I quote from Paul's letter to his son (Second Timothy). Decide this question as to whether the affirmative is true or the opposite. What did you say, sir, to the eldest son? "Be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel... who has called us with a holy calling just as soon as we complied with the conditions.

Where is your Bible? You profess to be book folks; I want to know whether it is in there or not. I now read the passage without transposing. See that every body gets the benefit of the wording before he gets done. I will know about the conditions of salvation.

I now call your attention to the first chapter of Second Timothy, second and third verses: "Be thou a partaker of the afflictions of the gospel, according to the power of God, who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given unions in Christ Jesus before the world began. " This is the best place in the world to have settled this matter in favor of my brother's theory, and we would not have been here to-day discussing this question. "Saved us and called us just as soon as we believed and obeyed. " I have heard that ever since I was a little boy. When was it? Let us de-

termine as to the period. Let us read the passage and see if there is a clue to the answer of the question. "Not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, given to us in Christ Jesus, " but manifest in these last times by the appearing of our Saviour, if we obey him. Is that there? Why preach it then. I will have to read it again—they have shaken their heads at me. I do n't mean any harm by *transposing*. I wish to get your minds on it, and then you will get the substance. Now I read the passage, and read it right, and dismiss it, and call your attention to another: "According to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ. " Is it true, or is it false? I am in no hurry. I came here to stay four or five days with the people. That Bible is a terribly big book. I have the credit of keeping to the subject. I never turn out of my way for another. I am too old for that. I want to get all that is in this passage, and get you to see that if the Bible is true, the theory of my friend is false. "According to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

I must invite your attention to the fifth chapter of Romans, and then I call your attention to the presentation of the question on legal grounds, and carried out as any legal question would be. "Moreover, where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; " if you will obey. If there is a doubt on the mind, we have a right to the benefit of the doubt. Let me read what is there, because by this process your attention is directed to the fifth chapter of the Roman epistle. Moreover the law entered that the offense might abound. " Why not read that salvation from sin is conditional? It has not a particle of Jesus Christ in it; and he cannot go into the waters of baptism without a second party. I want you to see the force of the language, for the honor and glory of Jesus Christ our Saviour. I want you to determine tire question. This will settle it.

I now appeal to the fifth chapter. I am perfectly willing that everybody note it. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so also by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. " Now I want every sinner in the house to look at it. Allow me to read it again, and then take it home with you and consider it till tomorrow morning at nine o'clock. "By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. " Do you believe it now? Is it by the obedience of everyone for himself? It ought to read that way to suit my friend's proposition.. Is it not by the righteousness of Jesus Christ imputed to many that the many were made righteous?

I know by your bright smiling faces that you all see that now. Did you ever know that the Book read that way before? If you did not, it is a good thing that you have learned it now.

*(Time expired.)*

---

### **Dr. Brents' Third Speech.**

MR. PRESIDENT: — I come before you this morning to resume the discussion begun yesterday. My opponent has not yet deigned to notice my introductory speech of yesterday. He is indeed a singular respondent. He says he is in the defensive. It is well he has told us that. I am sure no one would have found it out had he not told us. No one from hearing his speeches would have concluded that he was here to reply to me. He has not noticed a single passage introduced by me—not one. He has said I introduced not a single passage of Scripture to prove conditional salvation. This, no doubt, made a strange impression upon those who heard my opening speech. I am glad that he has not the privilege of deciding that question for you, but each one who hears us has the privilege of deciding for himself. From yesterday's experience I have lost all hopes of converting him — he can't see anything. He can't see that I have introduced a single proof of my proposition yet. I need not restate my arguments—they are as yet unassailed. All I have to do is to follow him and show up the absurdities with which his speeches abound. He says I can't draw him into the bushes away from the proposition. Well, the people will decide as to who goes into the bushes. It is his duty to follow me and answer my arguments if he can. Has he attempted to do this? Who, then, has been beating the bush? He has learned a few passages that are in a groove in which he runs; and there he sticks. I wish I could get him to answer me in some way.

There were some things in his first speech which I wish to notice. He quoted Matt. i. 21: "He shall save his people from their sins. " What does he want with this? It says not a word about conditional or unconditional salvation. He shall save his people from their sins! Yes, certainly, but how? That is the question. Has he forgotten it? Who are the people that he saves? I showed yesterday that he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him. Not another one. He talks about "*transposing*. " That is a new name for it; but let me try my hand at it. He became the author of eternal salvation to the elect, whether they obey him or not. How does he

like that? He is the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him, elect or not elect. He is able to save to the uttermost all who come to God by him, but he does not propose to save any others. Hence salvation is conditional.

But he quotes: "He bore our sins in his own body on the tree." Yes, but how did he bear them? "He died for our sins according to the Scriptures" (I. Cor. xv. 4). For whom did he die? He tasted death for every man. He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. He is just as much the propitiation for every man as he is for any man — he bore the sins of every man just as he bore the sins of Elder Herod himself. We got back about nineteen hundred years yesterday. I suppose he will get back to creation, or beyond that, soon. I want to say now, once for all, that BO far as this discussion is concerned, it does not matter when the plan of salvation or scheme of redemption was fixed up, whether before the foundation of the world, or yesterday, unless we look at its bearing on the question of conditional or unconditional salvation. The time of its conception will amount to nothing. We want to know whether or not its provisions were conditional. This is the question. And I defy him to show any provisions made for his own salvation, either before time began, or at any other time, which are not as free to any man who will comply with the conditions as they are to Elder Herod himself.

He says I have talked about Christian duties, but Christian duties never save anybody. John says if we confess our sins, he is just and faithful to forgive us our sins. Was that said to the Christian? Yes, certainly. "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him A liar, and his word is not in us." The purest Christian on earth needs pardon for his sins every day he lives; and thank God provisions are made in the plan of salvation for such pardon; if not, there is no hope for the salvation of any one who lives. There is nothing in my proposition confining it to the *alien*. I have a right to examine the subject of salvation, or freedom from sin, anywhere in any class to whom salvation applies.

But he says he could make a Bible with conditional salvation in it. The gentleman need give himself no trouble to do that. Here is one, of which God is the author, with conditional salvation streaming through it from one side to the other. He says he could make a Bible with conditions. I would like to see one he would make — it would be a gem, I'm sure.

I come now to notice his yesterday evening speech. He was astonished that I did not put in one passage to prove conditional salvation. I have scarcely ever had a debate in which this stereotyped phrase does not open every speech. The people will decide this for

themselves. I let it go for what it is worth, and it is worth nothing except to fill up time. I suppose he used it as tilling, for I am sure he did not expect any one to believe it.

He introduced Ephesians v. 26, 27: "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. " He ought to have kept away from this passage surely. He asks, "Did Christ love the Church before it was a Church?" Did you love your wife before you married her? — before she was your wife? He thinks Christ loved and saved him before the foundation of the world, and if he is part of the church he must have loved his part a good while before it was a Church. He asked me if the sinner cleanses himself, or does Christ cleanse the sinner. I answer that Christ cleanses the Church by cleansing the material that is put into it. And how does he cleanse it? "With the washing of water by the word. " That is, with the washing of water authorized in and required by the word. Ananias told Saul to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord. Here is the washing that cleansed Saul from sin, and I suppose (the same kind of washing cleansed the Ephesians.

He says he understands my position. I don't think he does; but whether he does or not, I am here to state my own position, and if he would allow me to do this, he might be able to put in his time profitably in answering my arguments.

In connection with the washing of water by the word, he dropped a thought that ought to have been further developed. He talked about Adam's water and Christ's water. If they are as *muddy* as his exegesis of this passage, they are unfit for use, surely. What kind of water floated the ark and covered the earth? What kind of water was it that John baptized Jesus and the multitudes in? What kind of water was at Enon near to Salem, where John was baptizing? In what kind of water did Philip baptize the eunuch? What did he mean by Adam's water and Christ's water? and what has that to do with conditional or unconditional salvation?

He made a most singular remark to this effect: If Christ is the Saviour, and my proposition is true, then the Bible contradicts itself. Is not that strange? Christ is the Saviour, but how does he save?— conditionally or unconditionally? He gave the commission saying, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. " Are not these conditions? He is the author of eternal salvation to all that obey him. Will he also save those who do not obey him? If not, then is not salvation by Jesus Christ made to depend on obeying him? I am

glad to know, my dear friend, that this people can see things that you can not see.

He says if man can obey or not obey as he chooses, then he is a free moral agent. Yes, and if he is not a free agent, he is not responsible. If he is not free, who is responsible for his damnation? If he has power to choose life or death; if when the gospel is preached to him, he is a free agent, and can accept or reject salvation as he chooses; then I can see sense, reason. and justice in the punishment of the sinner. But if the sinner is not free, and God punishes him for what he could not avoid, then is he a monster, and not the God of the Bible. Suppose a father to chain his son to a post or pillar with fetters that the son can not break, then the father very kindly invites the son to come to him. The son replies: "Father, I can not come. I am bound by this chain. Please loose me, that I may come. " The father knows the boy has told the truth, but still he commands him to come. The boy more earnestly pleads with his father to loose him, that he may come; instead of which the father tells him: "If you don't come to me. I will kill you" The boy says: "Father, I respect your authority, I have always obeyed you, and would now if I could. Oh, loose me, that may honor your authority and. come to you. " The father raises his gun and kills the boy. What would you say of such a man? You would say he is not fit to live, but ought to die, and if there be one place in the infernal regions hotter than all others, he ought to be consigned to that place.

Now, what does my friend think of this for the character of the God he worships? Before time began, God, Jesus and the devil seem to have had a confab in eternity. As yet there is no world, no man—no anything. God reveals to his Son and the devil his purposes of making the earth, and making the human race to inhabit it; and that in some form, after they are once created, they will forever exist. Their destiny becomes matter of concern, and God agrees that he will give his Son a select few for his inheritance; and they are personally designated to be his, on condition that he will give his life for them. But these are only a small portion of the number of persons God intended to create; what destiny is provided for the larger portion? The devil becomes heir to them without any conditions whatever, and they are personally and definitely known, each one of them. Time is born, and man is created as contemplated. The devil's party begin to remonstrate; but there is no remedy. God never loved them; Jesus never died for them; there is nothing but a home in hell that awaits them, let them do as they may. Now if this is not substantially my friend's theory, he will please correct me; I do n't want to misrepresent him, and he has not fully developed his theory yet. I repeat, his theory makes God a *monster*.



If all the cruelty of earth were boiled down into *one item*, it could not equal the cruelty of God in this picture. This is *his* God, *not mine*.

But it is not of works. What is not of works? The plan of salvation was not of works "By grace are ye saved." Certainly: but upon conditions, or without conditions? The system of salvation WAS conceived in infinite wisdom. The means were provided; Jesus consummated them; and man accepts them, and is saved; or he rejects them, and is lost. If not saved, His because he will not be saved; and his unending wail will be, *God is just, though I am lost*. — "The grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men. " Though man is saved by grace, salvation is none the less free to all who will accept it. God had a right to stipulate the terms, and it is not our business to debate the question as to why he did not save us this way or that way. It is our business to accept salvation on any terms upon which we can get it.

But my friend quoted 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 renewing of the Holy Ghost. " "Not by works of righteousness which we have done"—well, then, it was some other way; "according to his mercy"—yes, it was an exercise of great mercy to save us on any terms. But according to Inn mercy he saved us—how? By the washing of regeneration an\*1 renewing of the Holy Ghost. What is the washing of regeneration? First, what is regeneration? Generate means to beget; *re* as a prefix, means again; regenerate, then, means to beget again. Man has been begotten once; he must be begotten again—and this is regeneration. The gospel is the incorruptible seed with which man is begotten; he believes, and is begotten—regenerated; but he is not saved yet, for he is saved by the *wishing* of regeneration, that is, the *washing that follows*, or grows out of, regeneration. The baptism of repentance—that is, the baptism that belongs to, or follows, repentance. Very well; the washing of regeneration is that washing that belongs to or follows regeneration that saves us. Perhaps Peter knows what washing it is that saves people. After telling us that in the days of Noah eight souls were saved by water, he says: "Baptism doth also now save us. " Baptism is the washing of regeneration by which we are saved according to God's mercy, and not by any works of our own devising. Surely this is an unfortunate proof-text for our friend. It proves my proposition exactly. He should have kept away from it, by all means. He need not tell us that this is spiritual washing, for the renewing of the Holy Spirit is mentioned in addition to the washing.

The plan of salvation could not have been devised by man—it was

through mercy. Man could not have conceived the plan, and furnished the means for the production of bread; but, according to his mercy God gives us bread by giving the soil, the light, the heat, the air, the rain; and then we prepare the soil, plant the seed, cultivate the crop, and the result is we get bread; but he that refuses to work, and expects God to fill his pantry with bread, will be likely to go without bread, unless it be given him by some one more wise than himself.

*(Time expired.)*

---

**Elder Herod's Third Reply.**

BRO. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: —I am again permitted to be before you for thirty minutes, and I am still somewhat astonished by my venerable old brother.

*(Brents: I am glad my wife is not present to hear that; it would be bad for you if she were here. )*

*Herod:* He labors strenuously to show that the passage of Scripture he refers to proves that salvation is the result of conditions performed by the sinner. He has owned up to it; it was by grace. He has made that noble confession. He complains that he has introduced passage after passage to prove conditional salvation, and that he has time and again invited my attention to them, and asked me to reply. I have replied to every passage that had an immediate reference to the facts stated. I am well apprised of that, and so are you. You quote from the first four books of Moses as though they had anything to do with this proposition. What kind of a dispensation was that? Was it a gospel dispensation, or a law dispensation?

I repeat again, did that law covenant promise eternal salvation? or did it furnish a single threat of eternal damnation? I want to notify him that we are not under law; for by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified—cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them. But he hangs the salvation of this entire audience on his conclusion that we are still under the law of Moses. I blush at it. There are some things in his speeches that I propose to reply to. Listen at the next record given by the apostle in his letter to the Galatians. In this epistle he asks if life could be gained by the law, and if it could, why was it not by law? And yet my worthy opponent has proposed salvation to one and all upon the legal principle; and just says; "If you accept terms and comply with conditions, you can have life; and without complying with them you can not. " The inspired apostle says it can not be.

He's got some conditions, though. I believe yesterday evening he was willing to admit that belief was the effect of a cause, and that the cause was the testimony. Does the juror control the testimony, or the testimony control the juror?

He afterward said that "an effect may become a cause. " It can't reach back, but it may reach forward; therefore it can't be a cause of salvation. I give the answer, and that without any trouble. I will give him something to reply to. What is the product of an effect? The apostle tells you so plain, that there can be no mistake about it. He says: "Created in Christ Jesus unto good works, that we should walk in them. " Belief is the product of faith, and faith is produced by evidence, and evidence by the existing facts. Every one sees that belief is a result of causes produced by the existence of facts. That is a settled conclusion to that subject. If I can read his position out of the Bible, I will reply to it; I never try to reason it out.

Sixth chapter of John—I don't want to turn to it; it don't make a bit of difference to me; I know it. I may miss a citation, but I never miss the words. I call attention, now, to the sixth chapter of John. What is the question? It is about the cause of belief—yes, the cause of belief. Sixth chapter of John's gospel: "They said unto him, What must we do to do the works of God?" My brother would give half a dozen conditions. What did God say? I am addressing myself to an intelligent audience. Do you want a Bible solution to the problem between myself and my opponent? Are you ready to read a plain answer to the inquiry. Listen: "This is the work of God, that you believe on him whom he hath sent." He says it is volition of your mind. Now he turned right round, a moment ago, and said: "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. "

I remember to have asked as old a minister as my friend about this once; he said it was the act of the creature. He said, in his remarks, that faith was not the gift of God. I now call your attention to a passage that will settle it—Heb. x. If he will read the Bible, he will find that my little groove spreads over the whole Bible between this and to-morrow night. "Lay aside every weight, and the sin that doth so easily beset us, and run, with patience, the race set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, " Listen to the apostle in this same letter to the Hebrews, in the next chapter: "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. " Faith is what produces the evidence, and the evidence produces the belief.

Now I raise another question in connection with this language. I have been calling your attention to the question, What is faith, when

it is entertained by the sinner—where he got the substance? Is it original with him, or does it come from somewhere else? Listen to a Bible answer to the question. It is called the faith of Jesus Christ—not the faith of Brents or Herod—the faith of Jesus Christ; and hence it is the "substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. " He will not say any more that I don't reply.

I was astonished about him going to Mark. He went there for the commission, and he has labored on it to show you that there are conditions in it. I am going to read it, and I want the people to see the conditions. Listen to the language of our Lord Jesus Christ. I will show the report of that committee, and show that Dr. Brents or Herod can nor labor under that commission in the present age of the world. Go into all the world, and if the truth is preached, he says that he that is not baptized will be. They had received the baptism of John. You see he can't keep away from the water. I will now read the commission till I come to the finality. He may sift it with all the ingenuity and skill that he may have on that subject. "And these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. " Do you reckon Dr. Brents could take a dose of strychnine and survive it? I call your attention to his own passage, and before we get through with the discussion he will not complain of my not replying to him. Believers and those that were baptized could do these things—why? Because miracles were with them, but they have ceased.

"Elder Herod failed to show that salvation is unconditional!" Is a man to prove himself not guilty of anything? I thought he was here to prove that salvation is conditional. He even went far enough to tell you how to get it. He ought to be able to prove it—it can not be his way and mine both.

The answer to his great question is to be able to show salvation consummated by Christ without a condition performed by the sinner (second chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians. ) I am now going to read to you for the purpose of calling attention to the work performed by the Lord Jesus Christ, the eleventh verse of that chapter. I am sure I am correct when I say second chapter, eleventh verse: "Wherefore you being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who were called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at the time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. "

Were they not recognized as sinners? Everybody says they were. How were they recovered from that condition? He says by acts of obedience—faith, repentance and baptism. Now read to where, the apostle says: "At that time you were without Christ, and strangers from the covenants of promise, without God, Now ye are in Christ Jesus, who sometime were far off; but are now nigh. " How did they get nigh? By the blood of Christ. That brought them up. If it was sufficient to bring them up to a state of election, the act of belief could not affect that. Look at the conclusion that the apostle has arrived at: "Who hath broken down the middle wall of partition and made of twain one new man. For by him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. " There is a volume, but not a condition.

In the Colossian letter we see that the Saviour performed the work there. I have heard of a people who had a form of godliness, but who denied the power. "For in him dwelt all the fullness of the godhead, bodily, and ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ. " If it is baptism to be understood here, then it must be done at the hands of the Lord Jesus Christ, and not at the hands of Brents or Herod.

We read further: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through faith in the operation of God. " I want him to note that, and read the passage that has water in it, and what the Saviour has done. Water baptism will be right in its place. The last chapter of Luke I want next. If you are saved from your sins, it is the result of your industry—I protest against that.

I want everybody to listen to the plain and forcible words on that occasion: "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Remission of sins in the name of the Saviour. He has insisted that you can choose, even to the defiance of God himself. Your bright faces show the interest you have in this issue. I have *transposed*—he do n't seem to like the term, "that remission of sins should be preached in the name of the sinner. "

*(Time expired.)*

### **Dr. Brents' Fourth Speech.**

MR. PRESIDENT:—Before replying to the speech just closed, I propose to finish up the advance argument left off yesterday. If I do not present it now, and wait until my next speech, then he can reply, when I will have no chance to. reply to his reply.

I was speaking on the subject of obedience and calling on the name of the Lord for salvation, and I had taken the position that no man need call on the Lord until he is willing to obey him. In support of this, I read Heb. v. 8, 9: "Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. " According to the gentleman's position, obedience has nothing to do with the eternal salvation of which Jesus is the author. He says he believes in Christian duties as much as any one does; but what good does all the duties he preaches to saint or sinner do, in securing his salvation? Just none at all. Indeed, if his theory is true, his preaching can do no one any good, and the world would do just as well if he and I and every other preacher were to slay at home; and if I believed as he docs, I would stay at home. If I did not believe I could be instrumental in turning men and women from sin to righteousness, that they might thereby make their calling and election sure, I would never leave my home to get into a pulpit again. James says: "Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death." But Elder Herod is afraid to try that, lest he makes another Saviour. He would be alarmed at trying to save a soul.

Jesus says, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Luke vi. 46.) And again, "Not every one that earth unto me, Lord; Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. vii. 21), None but the *saved* can be citizens of the kingdom of heaven, and none but those who do the will of the Father can enter the kingdom; hence we conclude that doing the will of the Father is an indispensable condition of salvation. Will my worthy opponent say that a man can be saved without doing the will of the Father, either as saint or sinner?

But we must be willing ourselves. Jesus said to the Jews: "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me; and ye will not come to me that ye might have life" (John v. 39, 40).

Life was set before them, but they would not come to Jesus, through whom alone they could get it. When beholding the daz-

zling splendor of Jerusalem, and contemplating the desolation to which it would be reduced in consequence of the wickedness of the people, Jesus says: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate" (Matt. xxiii. 37).

Does not this show that the wickedness of the people brought destruction upon themselves and their city? And they would have been saved had they heeded the oft-repeated admonitions of the Saviour. Their own obdurate *if in* prevented them from accepting the salvation offered them. So it has ever been. If men have not been saved, it has not been because they *could* not be, but because they *would not* obey God, that they might be saved. If men are not saved to-day, it is not because they can not be saved; but because they *will not* comply with the *conditions* upon which God proposes to save them.

But why are men condemned? We have already heard Jesus say, in the plainest terms, that "he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God; " and "he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him. " But we will hear him further on the subject of condemnation.

"Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation" (John v: 28-29), Does this need comment or explanation? They that have *done good* shall be resurrected to life, and they that *have done evil* shall be resurrected to condemnation. Was ever language more plain? They that have *done good*, either in coming into the kingdom, or as citizens of it. Why do not all do good? Simply because they *will not*.

On this subject Jesus further says: "I was a-hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee a-hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? or when saw we thee sick or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, into ever-

lasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels; for I was a-hungred, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee a-hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto thee, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not unto me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal" (Matt. xxv. 35-46). Here again we learn that obedience to the will of the Lord gives entrance into life eternal, and neglect of duty sends them into everlasting punishment, whether it be with regard to entering the kingdom or the discharge of duty in it. Then are not rewards and punishments conditional?

"And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and love admired in all them that believe" (11. These, i. 7-10). On whom will he take vengeance when he comes? Those who know not God and obey not the gospel. In whom will he be glorified? His saints who believe on him, and have obeyed him, and thus escaped his vengeance.

Finally, we propose to show that the final *judgment* will be based upon the very principle contained in my proposition. Indeed, we have already seen that the *wicked* will go away into everlasting punishment, and the *righteous* into life eternal; that they that have done *good* shall be resurrected to life, and they that have *done evil* will be resurrected to damnation; and that Jesus Christ will take vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel: and we insist that these Scriptures are sufficient to settle this question forever. But our resources are ample, and we can afford to be liberal. We therefore invite your attention to Rom. ii. 4-11: "Despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasures! up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; 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 unto 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: for there is no respect of persons with God. " This is too plain to need comment, God will render to every man according to his deeds, not according to the eternal decree of election which settled his destiny before time began. Paul enters into specifications—to them who patiently continue to do well, He will render eternal life; but unto them who are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, He will render indignation and wrath; and it matters not whether he fails to obey the truth in coming into the church or after he is in—the principle is the same.

John says: "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man, according to their works" (Rev. xx. 12, 13), Every man was judged how? According to the eternal and immutable decree of election? What a ridiculous farce such a judgment would be! But they are judged according to their works. Those who have obeyed the gospel will enter upon the enjoyment of eternal life in a glorious immortality; but those who will not obey the gospel will go into everlasting tire prepared for the devil and his angels.

Once more John says: "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last 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. 12-14). The Lord says my reward is with me to give to every man *as his work shall be*. They who do his commandments here will have right to the tree of life, and be permitted to pass through the pearly gates into the city where God, Jesus, angels, and all who have washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb, will ever be. *Will they who have not done his commandments enter in as well?* If not, salvation from sin is conditional, the condition or conditions to be performed by the sinner, in order to salvation or freedom from sin.

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil" (Eccl. xii. 13, 14).

Having closed our advance argument, we come now to notice the

speech of the gentleman to which you have just listened. He introduced Luke xxiv. 45-47: "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures; and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. " He ask. ?, "Did he say that remission of sins should be preached in the name of the sinner?", He can get but one idea into his head at a time. I may ask, Did it require remission of sins to be preached in the name of Christ, without repentance? Is not repentance a condition upon which remission depends? But, according to his idea, there WAS no use preaching remission to any but the elect, for it could do others no good: why mock them by offering them that which was never intended for them?

Where was this preaching to begin? At Jerusalem. Then let us go there and see how it began. Peter was inspired—filled with the Holy Spirit sent fresh from heaven; preached the wonderful things concerning Jesus Christ—that God had made him Lord and Christ. When the people heard this, they were cut to the heart, and cried out, "What shall we do?" "Do for what? For that remission of sins that was to be preached here in the name of Jesus. My friend would have answered, "Do nothing—just nothing at all. Remission of sins is not conditional. " But the inspired preacher did not understand the matter that way, and hence did not answer that way. He said: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you. in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. " That is the way repentance and remission of sins was preached at Jerusalem in the name of Jesus. [Then turning to Elder Herod] Do you preach that way now? [Elder Herod—" Yes. "] Beautiful consistency! What is the use of telling them to repent and be baptized for remission, if remission is not conditional?

He says I went back to the first five books of Moses as if we are still under that law. I went to those books and to the Old Testament to show the *principle* upon which God has always dealt with man—that he blessed and saved him when he believed and obeyed him, and cursed and punished him when he rebelled against him. I stated this plainly when I introduced those passages, and all understood it but Elder Herod, He can not understand anything.

He next introduced Eph. ii. 8-10: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, " etc. Why does he not read the twelfth verse? Does it ever occur to him that the Bible is not a book of contradictions, especially that it does not contradict itself right in the same connection? Let me put in the twelfth verse for him. "That at any time ye were without Christ. " When were

the eternally elect without Christ? This is the last passage in the Bible to which he should have gone. "Being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. " When were the eternally elect *aliens*? "And strangers from the covenants of promise. " When were the eternally elect. strangers from the covenants of promise? "Having no hope. " When had the eternally elect no *hope*? "And without God in the world. " When were the eternally elect without God in the world?

But he says, "Faith is the gift of God, " and he quotes this passage to prove it—that is, the eighth verse: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. " Yes, what is the gift of God? Elder Herod says the *faith*. Then it should have read, "This is the gift of God, " for *the* refers to that which is last introduced. By grace are you saved through faith, and that *salvation* not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. As further evidence that faith is the gift of God, he quotes: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John vi. 29). Let us lead the preceding verse: "Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" What was the question? Did they want to know what God was to do in or for them? No, but what must *we do*, that *we may work*? This is the work of God, that who believe? That ye believe. If a man does a work for another as instructed and commanded by him for whom he works, it is not his own work, but the work of him for whom it is done. So it is the work of God to believe on Jesus because God has commanded it. Paul says faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. That is enough to settle that. He introduces Col. ii. 11: "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. " Did Christ's literal circumcision put off I heir sins? Surely not. The circumcision of Christ is the circumcision authorized by Christ to put off their sins. How was it done? "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. " "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. " These were buried with him in baptism and were risen with him, and thus had put off the sins of the flesh by complying with the conditions ordained for that purpose.

He told us yesterday that he had a Saviour without water. He then spoke of Adam's water and Christ's water. Did he not Fee his inconsistency? If Christ has water, he has no Saviour without water. Then he has a plan of salvation without any water in it. Then he has a Christ and a plan of salvation not known in the Bible. Jesus Christ was baptized in the Jordan, and he commanded every creature in all the world who would be saved by him, to be baptized.

I did not put water in the plan of salvation. If I had made the plan of salvation I might have made a bungle of it, as he does in applying Scripture. I am a child of mortality, needing salvation by the blood of Jesus, and I am willing to take salvation through his blood on any conditions he will offer it to me.

He says the commission by Mark is not applicable to us now. Does he not know that it is Mark's record of the same commission he quoted from Luke? He asks me if I will take a dose of strychnine; and in the next breath he answers his own question by saying there were miracles with that commission once, but they are done away now. Does it follow that because the miracles are done away, the commission is done away also? He says it had reference to those baptized by John. Did John go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature? I thought John's mission was confined to the Jews; but does he intend to give up the question as to John's ministry by admitting that he that believed and was baptized was saved in John's day, but is not now?

*(Time expired.)*

---

### **Elder Herod's Fourth Reply.**

BROS. MODERATOR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: —I arise to respond to the last half hour's speech of my worthy opponent. I remember where I was when my time expired. I was upon the last chapter of Luke's record of the Lord Jesus Christ. I came down to the point where it says repentance and remission of sins are to be preached in his name among all nations. My brother says he accepts that. The very moment he accepts the language of the Lord Jesus Christ himself, that moment he forever puts a lock upon his own mouth. If you were a jury, I would be willing to take this to you. If my brother transfers the name to a second party, then the first party is responsible for the second party. It is under the control of a poor, fallible sinner. Jesus got just so far, and he could get no further.

Peter had fully recognized all that was involved in the proposition in the second chapter of Acts. Sinners, on Pentecost, asked, "What must we do?" Repent. Why, that's a condition; if you get that away, stick a pin right there, and step right back to where we get that question answered so plainly. Where did they get the promise of repentance? Do you remember? John says. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to

bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Now I submit as to how many promises that were to be consummated, the promise of three things—repentance, baptism of the Holy Ghost, and of fire.

Repent—you have the promise of repentance. But we take it to the eleventh chapter of Acts: "Then hath God granted unto the Gentiles repentance unto life. " Where did repentance come from? From the same source that remission of sins comes from. The Lord Jesus Christ has incorporated this, and he [Brents] has not yet learned it. I want him to study it before he commences the discussion of another question like this. "Granted repentance!" When did he do that? Before Peter went over there, or after? After he went there and obeyed! I intend to sift till everything that ought not to be there is driven out. "When they heard this they held their peace and glorified God, saying, Then hath God granted unto the Gentiles repentance unto life. " I will be with him to the edge of the water, and if he do n't find it, I want him to acknowledge it.

I now call your attention to Cornelius. The angel came and told him to send to Joppa; some one should tell him words. What did the angel do? Told of the experimental relation that had been made down there, and I would be glad if you would go down. Says Peter, "I am not going; the Gentiles are heathens; they sue unclean. " He did not know that God had been there—he has got to get in before God! Let us see what the narrative discloses. I have read every chapter and verse in regard to the question of baptism. I call upon him to answer the question, or say that I have been noticing it all the time. Tell Peter to go down. Peter was on the house-top, hungry. He fell into a trance, and there appeared something like a sheet, with the corners joined, and all manner of unclean beasts were in it; and he heard the words, "Rise, Peter; slay and eat. " The Lord can't do anything for them till the preacher gets there and tells them the conditions of salvation! He says that a man has his part to do, and will be lost if he do n't do it. A man was crossing a river once; the ice broke, and he slipped in; the ice pushing against him, he commenced to pray one of his shortest prayers, "Lord, help!" The ice moved off, and he said, "That will do, Lord; I can get out myself now."

See the force of the argument? It makes the preacher the viceregent of God. It puts you into the hands of my brother, and not one of you can enter the kingdom of heaven without the preacher there. He has failed, surely. "Got to discussing *election*"—what do you mean by that? That death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. I am answering now the point I was upon about the vision of Peter. "Rise, Peter; slay and eat—go down to Cornelius. " "Have

you obeyed the gospel down there? Can't come, unless you have. " That is just simmering it down to facts. "Can't come, unless you have obeyed!" No preacher had ever preached a sermon in that country; and there is no chapter and verse that he can quote that I have not read time and again. What was the voice? "Rise, Peter; play and oat. " What did Peter say? "Nothing common or unclean hath at any time entered into my mouth. " "What God hath cleansed call not thou common or unclean. " God cleansed them before a minister ever went amongst them.

My friend has spent his time wandering about in the law. The moment we come to the real issue of the case, he comes back to the second chapter of Acts: "When they heard this, they were cut in their hearts. " "What shall we do?" Peter answered them—that was his business. He says that baptize and repent was in order to remission of sins. He says that you ought to understand that he has thoroughly established his proposition. Perhaps you have got better light than I have; it don't look that way to me, however.

I have submitted a question as to whether repentance and baptism were in order to, or because of. If it is in order to, I want him to answer a number of questions as to the meaning of Bible words. *For* is the word. He says it means in *order to*; I say it means *because of*. What did Peter tell them—because, in the rendering of this passage he holds his entire theory. Peter said, in addressing himself to the brethren (I. Pet. i. )—I am going to read out till I get to the plain question, and then go back to Pentecost; sinners are redeemed, every one can see that—"not with corruptible things, as silver and gold. " How, then, were they redeemed? By the precious blood of Christ. He was their Saviour before the foundation of the world, by their belief in Christ, whom God raised from the dead. They were saved—was it *for* or *because of*? If it was in *order to*, God could not have loved those people without two things—Dr. Brents or somebody to administer baptism, and a pool or branch in order to baptism. Was there a minister to administer baptism that day? Was there a Jordan, or branch, or pool? If it is there, read it to these people, and let them see it, and let them not go away mystified about the question.

Wouldn't it be a miracle? Dr. Brents holds a meeting of a week, and he immerses a hundred, and no one ever said a word about Dr. Brents, or the branch, either

I was amused when he got to Titus. You see how a man will read a passage, and leave out the subject at issue. He introduced it as though I had introduced it as a proof-text. He has assumed that Elder Herod has to prove that his proposition is true. In Titus, I will see why there is no baptism there. If he will show me where

it is, or where the preacher is mentioned, I will give him a *ten* dollar Bible. I want him to establish it. Titus iii: 5: Tell him you are not going. Dr. Brents said you could do an you pleased about it. I can bring out his own weapons, to break his own head with them. He attaches something to it that I say is not in it. He says that unless you do something, you will be damned. Titus says it is not by works of righteousness. I would never have got that up. He has told us that baptism must be administered. He finds this passage just in accordance with what he has preached all the time! Read it out, sir! "Not by works of righteousness which we have done. " He wanted you to believe that a little grace was there. He reminds me of a Katydid—one says Katy did, and the other says Katy didn't. The recovery of sin! I criticize the remarks of my worthy opponent. I have no doubt I will always esteem him hereafter. "I say it is not by works of righteousness. " He got down to the mercy of God then. He wanted you to believe that there was a preacher down there who *checked* them in. I wouldn't want to be in a dry country where there is no water, if his theory is true. There is no plan to save them in parts of this continent.

You will all see how you have obeyed. The fact is sent to Paul's son Titus, "who saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shod on us abundantly, through our Lord Jesus Christ. " He was the washer-woman. "Adam's water, " he says I call it; when Christ operated with water, and it came out of the throne of God.

There is a reference to the apostle Peter in the tenth chapter of Acts, at the house of Cornelius: "And while I yet spake, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the words. " And can any man forbid water? What for? To save these people by water! We put a poor sinner in our hands, and your souls are in our hands. We've got you, and we could get all the money you have, at that rate.

What puts away sin? His blood cleanses from all sin. He has passed out of death into life, John says, because he loves the brethren—because he believes. That don't militate against your duties. I am honoring the Lord in this. Water is found, and I am speaking on this question—you can't mistake it—in such a miraculous affair as this on the day of Pentecost, if you had been administering baptism and could find water enough to baptize them; and you would say it was for the remission of sins.

Freedom from sin is a part of his proposition. I am now going to get the word, and show you how freedom comes. I will cover the entire ground.

*(Time expired.)*

**Dr. Brents' Closing Speech.**

MR. PRESIDENT: —Elder Herod says if Jesus proposes salvation to a sinner on conditions, he transfers the saving power to a second party, and is himself no longer *responsible* for the salvation of anybody. He freely, graciously, and mercifully offers salvation to the whole world on conditions. Transferring, indeed! Is that transferring any thing? I can see no transferring about it. If the elect were saved before the world began, I would like to know if there is any responsibility to transfer. Repentance is a condition. Yes, Peter commanded the Pentecostians to "repent and be baptized" (Acts ii.: 38). "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted. " What for? That your sins may be blotted out (Acts iii. 19). But he attempts to evade this by quoting Acts xi. 18: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life. " Does he propose to show by this that Peter was wrong in *commanding* persons to repent? If these passages *antagonize* each other, how shall we decide which is right? The apostles glorified God because he had granted to the Gentiles the *privilege* of repenting. They had long been aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world, and it was quite a source of joy to be allowed salvation on any terms. But Peter told the Pentecostians to repent *because* their sins were pardoned! In his next discourse he told the people to repent, that their sins *-might be blotted out*. Did he preach one doctrine one day and another the next day? Jesus said to the wicked, "Except ye repent, ye shall all perish?" Does that look like a gift? If repentance is a gift from God to man, directly, and man never repents because God has failed to give him repentance, who is responsible for his not repenting? Will God punish man for his own neglect? But John baptized the people unto repentance. Well, does that help him any? Does the fact that two conditions change places, if such were the fact, prevent them from being condition?? John baptized with the baptism *of* repentance, and also *unto* repentance. He baptized with a baptism growing out of a resolve to amend the life, and unto a life in keeping with that resolve; and all this was for or in order to the pardon or remission of sins.

But I am not done with Acts ii. 38 yet. I fully analyzed this passage in my opening speech, and I need not repeat it here. Every child capable of parsing a preposition knows that *remission of sins* is the object of the relation created by the preposition *for*, and to obtain which they are commanded to repent and be baptized. *That your sins may be blotted out*. If the wisdom of heaven were concen-



trated in a single sentence, it could not be more plain—"repent and be baptized"; not that they are, but that your sins *may* be blotted out. We have a similar sentence in Matt. xxvi. 28 to (he one in Acts ii. 38: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. " I claim nothing for it, but without a violation of our agreement I may say it is exactly the same in the Greek. Was the blood of Jesus shed because the sins of the world, for whom he died, were already remitted? Perhaps my friend may think so—he may have them remitted long before the world was. Then for what was the blood of Jesus shed? If this is true, there is no such thing as pardon now at all. Will my friend tell us whether there is any such thing as remission of sins now, or not? We would be right glad to have his position on this subject, if he will give it to us. I believe in the blood of Jesus. It was shed for the remission of sins; but we get the benefits of that blood in his own way, and we have no right to debate the question with him stall. We are baptized into his death, or into the benefits of his death, from which we arise to walk in newness of life.

But to get rid of baptism as a condition of pardon to the Pentecostians, he took the long, threadbare dodge that there were no administrators, nor water in Jerusalem to baptize the converts. This was indeed rich, coming from a Baptist, and one of the strictest sect at that! The record says, "As many as gladly received his word were *baptized*. " Does he believe it? "And the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. " Does he believe that? Had he taken the trouble to make the calculation, he could have proved, by absolute calculation, that they could have been baptized in half the time. Had he examined the testimony he could have found *acres* upon *acres* of water there. But he can make *grimaces* and *frowns*, and tickle the audience half to death; and he thinks the people are laughing at his shrewdness, when they are really laughing at his antics and pretty looks. [Here a point of order was raised, and it was decided that any good-humored pleasantry was admissible. ] We are discussing questions that have to do with the eternal destiny of man, and there is no reason why we should not discuss them with the same seriousness and dignity that would characterize a sermon in the house of God. I have not tried to create any mirth, nor do I think I will. I want my argument to stand or fall on its merits. I do not need such clap-trap to support my proposition. Nor does any man resort to such things as long as he has anything else with which to support him.

He says Cornelius was a Christian man, and worshiped God before he ever heard a sermon, from Peter or any one else. If he was he was *not a saved* man, for the angel told him to send.

for Peter to tell him words by which *he should be saved*. He says if I had been there I would have told him *conditions*. I would not know how to tell him conditions without using words. If Cornelius was saved before Peter went there, he was saved without hearing the gospel or having any faith in it. Peter alluding to this very matter, said: "God made choice among us that the Gentiles, by my mouth, should hear the word. of the gospel and believe. " Then up to that time he had not heard the gospel or believed it Peter began with their own prophets, and proved that Jesus was the Son of God—in short, told the words by which he was to be saved, not by which he had been saved. Suppose I go to see a neighbor, and find him very sick. I tell him to send for the doctor, who will give him medicine by which he shall be cured. The sick man shouts, "I am well, I am cured I" Cured how? "Did you not tell me the Doctor would give me medicine by which I should be cured? Yes, you did, and I know I am well. " You would think the man crazy—demented; and you would apply ice to his head and hot applications to his feet to create a diversion of blood from the brain.

lint my friend says, according. to my teaching Peter would have said to the men who went after him, "Have you obeyed the gospel down there? If not, I can't go with you. " No, sir; Peter was sent for to preach the gospel to them, that they might obey it. The gospel is the power of God to salvation, and it was that Cornelius and friends might hear, believe, and obey the gospel, that Peter was sent for. We send for the doctor to cure the sick; and the doctor never inquires if they are welt down there—if they are, they don't need the doctor. But now, my dear sir, if Cornelius was a Christian man and was saved unconditionally before he sent for Peter, what did he want with Peter? The gospel was then, as it is now, God's power to salvation to every one that would believe it. It was necessary that Peter go and preach it to them, that they might have a chance to believe and obey it. But if Cornelius, and every one else who was or is saved at all, was saved from eternity, then the gospel had nothing to do with it—there was no gospel when that arrangement was made, nor has there ever been any use for it. If Cornelius was saved before he ever heard the gospel, he did not need the gospel, and every one else can be saved as he was; and hence the gospel is of no use to any one, and the gentleman may go back to Indiana, and no longer trouble himself to preach a gospel that is of no use to any one, even admitting that he preaches the gospel.

But he quotes, "What God hath cleansed, call not thou common or unclean; " and he says the Gentiles were already cleansed, and he

makes cleansing mean salvation; and hence he proves that they were saved before Peter went there. But if he is right, the angel was wrong when he told Cornelius that Peter would tell him words by which he *should be saved*. There is no dodging this. This expression was undoubtedly to show Peter that the Gentiles were no longer to be denied the privileges of the gospel. If he is correct, they were saved, and yet without hope and without God in the world. They were saved, and not a people of God. This was strange salvation.

But we are redeemed by the blood of Christ. Yes, his *chosen few* were redeemed, but no one else. I say all were redeemed alike. He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. We are saved by grace, by Christ, by his blood, by his name, by faith, by works; and even baptism saves us. His idea is a very strange one—if the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin, nothing else can have anything to do with it. Suppose I say I live by breathing, by eating, by sleeping, by exercise—it is all true; but it is not true that I live by any one thing to the exclusion of everything else. Salvation by the blood of Christ excludes nothing else connected with salvation. If a man is saved at all, all the elements of salvation are presumed to be present, whether mentioned or not. A place for everything, and everything in its place. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life; " and in this sense we may say we have no chance of salvation but by grace—God through Christ provided the means. We are saved by the blood of Christ. The blood of animals could not take away sins, hence Christ died for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, as well as for our sins to-day, and through his blood we have the only sin-offering that could forever take away sin. But we are saved by the name of Christ. In his name there is power and authority. By his authority salvation is proclaimed to the world—in his name, demons and evil spirits were cast out. Paul said to the spirit of divination, in the name of Jesus Christ, "Come out of her," and he came out the same hour; and there is no other name given by which we can be saved. We are to do all in his name; but does that exclude human agency? Every thing we do as obedience is done in his name—that is, because he commanded it; hence we are laved by grace, by the blood of Christ, by his name, and by obedience to the gospel, but by no one item to the exclusion of other things commanded by divine authority. "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God; " and my friend insists that faith is the gift of God. Faith comes by hearing—hearing the testimony. "These things are written that ye

might believe, and that believing, ye might have life through his name. "

He goes to Titus iii. 5 again. I have already explained this, so that I suppose every one here understands it except Elder Herod. He has a false theory in his head, and he must have a false construction of this and many other passages to sustain his theory. If he would shape his theory by the Bible, in place of making the Bible bend to suit his theory, he would perhaps see things very differently. As long as he looks at the Bible through a perverted theory, he will not be likely to understand it. According to his mercy he saves us. Certainly not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy. No man can *deserve* salvation. It is only according to his mercy he saves us; but how does he save us according to his mercy? By the *washing of regeneration* and renewing of the Holy Spirit. This beautifully chimes in with John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God. " I have invited him to tell us what this means, but he has not done it. Now it is too late for him to tell us, As I could not reply to him. It has been my custom to present, in my last speech on a proposition, a *resume* of the entire argument; but he has not noticed or attempted to reply to my affirmative argument presented in my first speech. He has not taken up a single passage presented in that speech and attempted to show that it does not prove what I claimed for it; hence that speech stands unimpeached, and it was wholly unnecessary that I should repeat it. On this proposition we have really *had no debate*, except as I have taken up his proofs and replied to him. He has not replied to me, or tried to do it; and I think he has had good reasons for not attempting it. He could not reply, for the reason that my positions are true and admit of no reply. My arguments have been founded upon the rock of God's eternal truth, and he saw very clearly that it would be mad-ness and folly to hurl the shafts of error against them, to be broken into atoms in his hands; hence he very shrewdly kept away from them.

(*Time expired.*)

---

### **Elder Herod's Closing Reply.**

BROS. MODERATOR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: —I am again before you, according to the rule, to close the discussion of the first proposition. The custom has (generally been that the affirmant should have fifteen minutes at the close to sum up the testimony, but he has no right to introduce new matter.

*(Brents: "I never heard of such a custom, nor was I ever at a debate—my own or any other—where such a custom prevailed. There is no such custom where I have been. "*

*Herod: "Owing to the rule by which we have agreed to be governed, it becomes my duty to make the closing speech upon the present proposition, and as a matter of course I need not introduce any new matter. Much more has been introduced to review than I could review, were I permitted to do so in two hours. ")*

I expect to commence about where I closed in last speech. I want to call the attention of the congregation to the utter failure of my friend to do what he promised to do—to establish, by testimony, that there was a single proof of the baptism of the Pentecostians. I know that there was water there; and he finally said that he had abundance of historical proofs that there was water there—that he could establish the fact by living witnesses. If that is the way we are to prove or to determine the question, it would do; but I think if he called certain ones, it would be seen that the proof must come from King James' version. I do not object to the opinion of a lady or gentleman; but we do n't propose to determine the question by their opinion. His word is that water baptism was administered there, and he showed that its many as gladly received Peter's words were baptized; but there was a baptism promised for that occasion that did not have any water in it I tell you that, if water baptism was in order to the remission, then remission of sins was because of baptism; now can you tell me what use the blood of Christ would be? Just ponder that in your minds for a time. Please find a place for it.

Every one can see, because my Brother would readily acknowledge what I introduced yesterday from the epistle to the Hebrews, that" without the shedding of blood there is no remission. " You are independent of the blood of Christ. You can go to hell or heaven, which you please; and i! you are free agents, as he says, you need not go to either place. I am summing up now. If you are a free agent, you need not go. We should look to the force of a conclusion. I speak to the ladies and gentleman—it would be deleterious to your best interest. He says you can just go to heaven, or you can let it alone. The way to go there is to do good. Do you desire me to show you the result of your proposition? "There is none that doeth good; no, not one. " I take the position that he occupies—if you want to go there, do good; then I turn right around, and read, "there is none that seeketh after God. There is none righteous; no, not one. " Here a deluge comes on every one of you.

I am not mistaken. I said that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses

in from all sin. It will, if we will let it! You have to get up and apply it! Your God is an utter failure. You see the cause of it yourself. He died to save you, and if you are not pardoned you will be lost. I now submit the force of such an argument.

In the ministry of the grace of God (Acts x., xi. ), he said Bro. Herod ought to have got them up. There was not a gospel sermon preached over there, you see. Just to see where the force of the proposition would be by the force of the passage upon which he relies, he said, "Send now to Peter. " Now, was it my acts that you me to do? If you will repent, and get some one to baptize you, I will save you I I recognize this question as having more importance connected with it than any other in the city of Franklin to-day. Is it the purpose of God, or not? That is the issue. I try to honor God and glorify him. I have had passage after passage up here that has not been answered. Then he comes to Acts ii. He turns round in a personal attack on my beauty—I have never heard it called in question before to-day.

I love gentlemen and love ladies, and I will never inflict the judges with the painful necessity of calling me to order for personal insinuations. I want to get your minds off this to the proposition.

Let us carry out the argument further. I will remember the rule that it governing my action in this matter. I call your attention lo some other facts now. We have had up almost every passage now that would seem pertinent to this point. The conclusion I have just referred to, that repentance and remission of sins shall be preached in his name. He advances and translates them, and comes down to Ads ii. It implies that they were baptized with water! It can't be settled with that kind of logic.

He said that Peter said that baptism was to save. I will tell what he did say, that be commanded them to be baptized at the house of Cornelius. He commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. We have that up again. I want Peter to give the exposition. It was the first accession ever made from the Gentile world. In the third chapter of his first letter, he says: "When once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water, the like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us. " Where does the sin lie?

*(Brents: "I introduced this passage an I made my argument on it in my first speech; he has not attempted to answer it until new. Under our rule, I submit that be can not do it now unless be gives me time to rejoin. "*

The moderators decided that he might quote without comment.

I will therefore only quote the passage as I have introduced

it. Peter said it saves; I am only calling it up to look at it in the light in which it has been raised. "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. " That is it. Every one can see it, and I am satisfied to let it pass off in the matter that has been in review on this occasion.

We next propose to show that the passage in Timothy is to show that to save from sin, no act that we can perform will serve. To Paul's son Timothy, on the question of getting rid of sin, he says, "Who gave himself for us." Now, what for? Every single one of you answer the question alike. If he gave himself for us, he had an object in doing it: and that raises the question as to what that object was. I repeat the language of the apostle to the Gentiles —if I can't show you why, then it was useless—"That he might redeem us from all iniquity. "

Yes; but he says you can't get the benefit of that unless you go to work. I want everybody to listen to the force of the argument that is found in the verse of his own passage—" Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us. " Now, if God did that, is it left for you and me to do? And he says you can't show where God saved any one, without that one doing something for himself. 11. Timothy: If he had n't challenged me in his last speech, I have no idea I should have referred to it. To his Son: "A partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God; who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began; but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ. "

Now I submit the question, Did salvation take place before it was revealed, or afterward? The answer of everyone is, It could not have been revealed unless it had been an existing fact; and I read the paragraph showing the object and the end to be accomplished by the epistle. "Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began. " Was any thing done before that? No; nothing til) you do it! Now, my friends, I know that I have not much more time; I must make a few brief remarks, and close. "The Scriptures teach that salvation from sin is conditional, the conditions to be complied with by the sinner, in order to obtain salvation or freedom from sin. " Has one passage out of fifty had any reference to salvation from sin?

I have introduced more *than forty* passages to show that Christ is the Saviour; and I repeat, and have done so all the time, that the

proposition must fail for want of Scripture testimony. It is a struggle between human salvation and the salvation of Jesus Christ.

I want to know the conclusion. How are we to go away from here with nothing but a sneer for Jesus Christ? You come to us in our sins, who have never saved any one at all. Contrast it with your experience, and I will be satisfied with the conclusion.

The brother has endeavored to prove his way of salvation. I have submitted the finality of the question. Take it, and ponder it; try it by the Bible; and if you have come to the conclusion, by Scripture testimony, that it is no longer true that Jesus Christ is the way to heaven, or that he is the way to hell both, I fall by the testimony of the Bible, "Neither is there salvation in any other name given among men, whereby we must be saved. "

If by the acts of all these men everyone saves himself, why didn't the Lord stay in heaven and enjoy the communion with his Father, instead of suffering, and dying, and rising a victorious conqueror? These are the conclusions to be settled by the Bible. If I was convinced that his theory is true, I would never name the Lord Jesus Christ again. I would tell you that it is in your own hands, and if you ever get to heaven it will be, not unto Jesus be all the glory, but unto man—poor, frail man. He will be entitled to the glory of his own salvation.

*(Time expired.)*

---



## **SECOND PROPOSITION.**

The Scriptures teach the unconditional election and salvation from sin, by Jesus Christ, of all his seed or generation.

### **Opening Speech of Elder Herod.**

BROS. MODERATOR AND JUDGES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN!—I am before you this morning for the purpose of attending to the affirmative argument, and in presenting myself before you as an affirmant to-day our portions have changed. For the past two days my worthy opponent bus been affirming and I have been defending; to-day and to-morrow I am to affirm and he is to defend. And I frankly confers that I am to affirm what is taught in my proposition. I am to prove my proposition by the Scriptures. No other proof is admissible here. I want no other, for I need no other; and I shall not introduce any other.

It would hardly be worth while for me to announce the proposition, but I will read it:

"The Scriptures teach the unconditional election and salvation from sin, by Jesus Christ, of all his seed or generation. "

Not a lady or gentleman that has heard this proposition but readily sees my duties upon this occasion. And I am fully aware that this great subject under discussion is of vast importance. You all see its importance, and the expressive anxiety on your faces shows that you are all intensely interested in a subject of so much importance as the one under investigation this morning.

1. Is salvation a fact?
2. If salvation is a fact, is there a Saviour?
3. If there is a Saviour, who is it?
4. Who is to be saved, and from what are they to be saved?

All the passages I shall introduce shall be upon the subject. I intend to stick to the subject under discussion. I will not ramble about like my worthy opponent has been doing on his proposition. I intend to confine myself to the subject, and then I shall not have time to introduce one-half of the testimony that might be introduced on this occasion. I acknowledge that I ought to give chapter and verse for all my proof. This is right, and I always want to do right.

With this I now proceed to introduce my proof, and I will begin with the twenty-third Psalm of David. I will read it all, and I want

every body to give attention to the reading, for it is just what I want, to prove my proposition. Now listen—let all listen:

"The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake." Was it for the sinner's name's sake? or for the Lord's name's sake? I know you all see this now. I will read on: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

Is not this the truth? Do you not believe it? Respond in your own hearts if David did not tell the truth. This is the most solemn thought I ever contemplated. I never saw a people more attentive than you are at this moment. If David told the truth, and God followed him all the days of his life with mercy, then I ask if he did not have a God without *conditions*.

I now proceed to introduce additional proof from the same author. Psalm xxxiii. 11-13. Every body listen to the reading. I will not be in a hurry. I will begin with the 11th verse I could read all this without looking at it, and read better than I can with one eye, for that is all I have.

Psalm xxxiii. I can n't read it all, it would be too tedious: "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations. Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance. The Lord looketh from heaven; he beholdeth all the sons of men." Here we find a people chosen by the Lord for his own inheritance. When did this choosing take place? I turn to Eph. i. 3-11, and I find the answer to be *before the foundation of the world*. I will read it to you. Now listen everybody to the reading:

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world." Now stop right there. Does the Bible read that way? Yes. I will read it again: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world." Well, I never knew the Bible read that way before. Well, it reads just that way whether you knew it or not. "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good

pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved; in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he has abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him: 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."

I now submit this question. By whose purpose—by the good pleasure of *whom*—by the counsel of *whose* will, was all this accomplished? Now, is this all done by the good pleasure of the sinner's will? No, it is done by the good pleasure of *his* will, the Lord's will, and is not the result of any act performed by the sinner, either directly or indirectly.

We now call Peter to the stand. What do you know about it, Peter? Whom are you going to talk to? and what are you going to talk about? Let us read. Now listen, everybody, to the reading: I. Pet. i. 1, 2: "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, elect according to the foreknowledge of God, the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ; grace unto you, and peace be multiplied."

Now I want everyone in this house to know that I am for obedience. I believe in obedience; but I want to know when the obedience comes. Does it come *before* or *after* election. Election produces obedience. Peter says we are elected unto obedience. Obedience has nothing to do with the election.

I now go to I. Pet. ii. 9: Why do I want this? Because Peter is talking about just what I am talking about. Now this gives him good time to note it down. Now, then, listen to the reading of the passage:

"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 now have your attention upon these words, "chosen generation," "a peculiar people," "a holy nation." Now take these in connection with what the Psalmist David said, as quoted before:

"The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations. Blessed is the nation whose God is the

Lord; and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance."

I now want to call your attention again to these words—what are they? The royal, chosen generation of Christ Paul says that they were chosen in Christ before the world was, and David says they were his inheritance; will he get them? My friend says, "Yes, if they will let him;" as if God were going to let a little stub of a sinner about three feet high, capsize God, take him prisoner, and thwart his purposes as easily as a man can change the hands on the face of a clock. I would scorn to worship such a God as this. God has a chosen generation—an inheritance; and it docs not take the efforts of Herod or Brents to go about administering the ordinances to bring them to him.

They charge me with being a Calvinist. I am so far from believing the doctrine of Calvinism that I despise it—I scorn it. But my opponent will say that these, in time past, were not a people. Well, where did they come from? Where did this long race of Adam come from? One will say, "I make myself." Well, if I were to say that I made myself, you would think me a fit subject for the lunatic asylum. But what was I talking about? I stay with the subject. Where did all these bright and smiling faces come from? I want you to take all this down; I want you to take it all home with you. Where did they come from? They came from Adam. We were all once in Adam. Let us read Gen. v. 1, 2. Listen to the rending:

"This is the book of the generation of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam in the day when they were created."

Did God say anything to them about getting religion, or about multiplying or replenishing heaven or hell? I will get some to hell before I am done—you need not be uneasy about that; many will go there. Adam was to multiply and replenish the earth—not one word about heaven or hell.

Now let us see. I call your attention right over to the New Testament—Matt. i. 1. Now you have it all fixed in your mind about Adam. He came from the dust of the earth, and will go back to dust. Can any one return to that in which he has never been? But what are the words of this book? "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ." My opponent has, for the last two days, been talking about *men* and *women* going to heaven! Jesus was the product of the angel; men and women are the product of Adam. Now, if the product of Adam be like him, will not the product of Christ be like him? Did they not come from where he came from?

Peter says, "Ye are a chosen generation"—not Adam's generation, but the generation of Jesus Christ. Now we go to Isa. xlvi. 9-11: "For my name's sake [not the sinner's name sake] will I defer mine anger, and for my praise will I refrain for thee, that I cut thee not off. Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver; I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction. For mine own sake [not the winner's sake], even for mine own sake, will I do it; for how should my name be polluted? and I will not give my glory unto another."

Now I ask you if I would be justified in getting up here and saying, "He will do it, if you will do something?" He said it was for his own sake, and not for the sinner's sake, or for the sake of anything done by him. If you had to do something, it would be, "I have hired the Lord to save me." I have read of some who made merchandise of the gospel, going round peddling it out as you would sell *patent medicine*; and when you do it, you make the gospel contemptible.

Now I want Rom. xi. 27-29: "For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins." So I have the words, "take away sins." This means salvation. The next has reference to the *elect*; and I call the attention of everybody to the leading. Listen, now: "As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes; but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes; for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

I call attention of everybody to the conclusion of the last paragraph, for it is an exact refutation of everything that has been presented by my worthy opponent for the last two days. Paul says the gifts and calling of God are *without* repentance—not BOUGHT by repentance.

Let us now go to Rom. xi. 1-8: "I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. 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 grace: otherwise work is no more work. What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for: but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded (According as it is writ-

ten, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day."

Ho reserved seven thousand to himself, and even so at this time I have reserved a remnant according to the election of grace. A remnant reserved, how? According to what you have done? That is the way my opponent would have it. It is by grace, and Paul says if it is by grace *it is not by works*. Which will you believe, Herod, or Brents, or the apostle Paul? I would ask you to believe the apostle. He talks of freedom of will—free agency. Their wills did not exist then, find had nothing to do with it. They had no agency in the matter.

Now I want Romans ix. 6: "For they are not all Israel which are of Israel." Note this, for it has the whole proposition in it. Now, I want you to tell me just what that seed is. Well, I will read it to you in the seventh and eighth verses of the ninth chapter of Romans. All listen to the reading: "Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Well, that is plain enough about the seed; now we want to know about the *promise* and the *election*. "For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son. And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; (for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated."

You talk about the children of Adam being the children of God ! Paul says the children of the flesh are not counted for the seed, but in "Isaac shall thy seed be called." My proposition talks about a *teed*, do n't it? and about an election? Here I have them both, all plain and easy enough, and no trouble about them.

Now, I want a little more from Romans xi. 5, 6. "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant," not according to the election of grace, but according to what they do. Does it read that way? It ought to say that, to prove my friend's position; and if it had said that, we would not have been here to-day in this debate.

But let us read it as it is, without transposing it. "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace: otherwise work is no more work."

Strange and astonishing that all this was addressed by the apostle

to a church, and still it means by works, just the opposite of what the apostle so clearly teaches. "So, then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy" (Rom. ix. 16). Now, does everybody believe this? My friend thinks that the sinner must *will* and run, too, if he is ever saved. His will must be consulted, and he must get his own consent, and then he must run to the pool or branch and get a second party to shew mercy by putting him in, or there is no salvation for him !

I now call attention to Rom. viii. 33, and my object in calling attention to this is because the word *elect* is found in it. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." Why can we not complain because of the election? Because it is God that justifieth, and no man has a right to complain at what he does. Has he not a right to justify whom he will? It is not only God that justifieth, but it is Christ that condemneth. He brought them down with him; and he will bring them up with him in the resurrection. If I don't prove that he will bring them up, I will give up the question. To do this, I want II. Tim. ii. 8-11: "Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel; wherein I suffer trouble as an evil doer, even unto bonds; but the word of God is not bound. Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory. It is a faithful saying; for if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him."

My brother thinks that unless they have done something there will be no resurrection for them.

*Brents:* "Will you please give me the chapter and verse again of the Scripture last read? I failed to get it."

*Herod:* "Yes, sir; it is II. Tim. ii. 8-11."

*Brents:* "Thank you, sir."

*Herod:* "You are welcome. That is my pride, to be ready to give chapter and verse at any time")

Now listen, every body, for I am not done with that yet. I now want Titus i. 1-3: "Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ according to the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness, in hope of eternal life, which God, that can not lie, promised before the world began; but hath in due time manifested his word through preaching, which is committed unto me according to the commandment of God our Saviour."

The apostle here speaks of God's *elect*; and his elect had a faith; and they had hope of eternal life; and God, that can not lie, promised it to them before the world began. Now there had to be an

elect people before the elect could have faith or hope either. The faith did not produce the election, but the election produced the faith. The hope of eternal life did not secure the election, but the election produces the hope of eternal life. The election was first; then faith, hope and love followed, as the fruits of election.

My worthy opponent would reverse all this order of things, which had its origin in divine sovereignty. He would try to make you believe that things which man docs secures 'the election; but the inspired apostle did not understand the subject as my worthy friend seems to teach it. Being guided by wisdom from on high, he had clear conceptions of the purposes of our heavenly Father, and could not go wrong. Now, will you believe Herod, or Elder Brents, or the inspired apostle? I advise you to believe the apostle.

Now you see I stick to the subject. I don't beat the bush around, and give you my explanations and opinions; but I read it to you right out of the book. If I had not read it right out of the Bible, you would not have been so interested as you are at this moment. This is a great question, and you are all interested when I read it in the word of God, so that you can all understand it, Herod might make a mistake, but the apostle Paul made no mistakes, he could not make mistakes, as Herod and Brents are liable to do. I advise everybody to believe him.

*(Time expired).*

---

### **Dr. Brents' First Reply.**

MR. PRESIDENT:—I am here to deny the proposition under discussion, and in this attitude it becomes my duty to reply to the speech of the affirmant, to which you have just listened. This I propose to do. I will not treat him as he did me on the previous proposition. He seemed to feel under no obligations to meet a single argument I made, or to show that my proofs did not prove what I claimed for them.

He did not attempt to define his own proposition, or a single term in it. His first proof was the twenty-third Psalm, which he lead entire, and what he read it for or intended to do with it, I was entirely unable to see. There is not a single word in it about election, either conditional or unconditional. He speaks of the marked attention given by the audience to the reading. I guess they were straining their imagination to discover what connection this Scripture had with his proposition. If lie will magnify his argument until I can see it I will with much pleasure attend to it.

He next introduced Psalm xxxiii. 11-13, in which the Psalmist



speaks of a people chosen by the Lord for his inheritance, and then went to Eph. i. 3-11 to prove that this people were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. If I were to admit all he claims for these passages, the admission would do him no good, for he does not pretend to claim, and certainly did not attempt to prove, that the election was *unconditional*. This he must do, or fail to sustain his proposition; and I now challenge him to show any *provisions made cor his salvation, or the salvation of any other man, that were not made for all men* on the same conditions on which he may he saved himself; whether the provisions of salvation were made before the foundation of the world, or at any other time. Does my opponent mean to say that God unconditionally elected a certain portion of the human family to salvation before the foundation of the world?

(*Herod.*—"No, no.")

Then you give up your proposition, for this is just what you are here to prove. But let us read the passage and emphasize the pronouns *we* and *it*, indicating the persons of whom the apostle was speaking:

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed *us* with all spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen *us* in him before the foundation of the world, that *we* should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated *us* unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made *us* accepted in the beloved: in whom *we* have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he hath abounded toward *us* in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto *us* the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in 'heaven, and which are on earth: even in him: 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; that *we* should be to the praise of his glory, who *first* trusted in Christ. In whom *ye* *alto* *trusted*, after that *ye* heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that *ye* believed, *ye* were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. i. 3-13).

Now if the *we* and *us* chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world include all the elect, and the entire elect *first trusted* in Christ, then who were the *ye* who also trusted after they heard and believed the gospel? To this question we invite the special attention

of our friend, and we most earnestly request him not to forget to attend to it.

In the 8th, 9th and 10th verses we have a pointer to the solution of the trouble; "Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself." He hath made known unto us the mystery. Yea, and what was the mystery? "That in the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ." Now, then, to whom did he make known this mystery? "By revelation he made known unto us the mystery: as I wrote afore in few words; whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." Then these holy apostles and prophets were the persons chosen before the foundation of the world, to whom God abounded in all wisdom and prudence, and to whom he made known the mystery of his will. But what was that mystery? "That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel " (Eph. iii. 3-6). This shows what he meant when he said (i. 10) that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, and the apostle prosecutes his argument to its culmination in chap. iv.4-C, which we read, and paraphrase as we read: "There is one body," made up of Jews and Gentiles, "and one Spirit," in this one body, which is the temple of the Holy Spirit, "even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." The Gentiles were without hope, but now they have hope in common with the Jews. "One Lord," who died for all, whether Jews or Gentiles; and "one faith, required of all in this one Lord who died for all; and "one baptism," required in the commission to be administered to all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; and "one God and Father of all," whether Jews or Gentiles, for though the Gentiles were once without God in the world, the same Lord is rich unto all that call upon him, and in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him.

In the second chapter, verses 12 and 13, Paul says that the Ephesians were once "without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world; but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ," Now, will my worthy opponent harmonize this language from the second chapter, with his construction of Paul's language in the first chapter. When was it that those elected in Christ Jesus

before the foundation of the world was laid were *without Christ, without hope, and without God in the world?* Please do n't forget to explain this, for this people want light along here.

He next went to I. Pet. i. 1-3, where Peter speaks of persons who were "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ;" and insists that the election preceded the obedience unto which they were elected. Well, we suppose all who are elected at all are elected unto obedience—but is this proof that they had done nothing before election? In the ninth verse, Peter speaks of their salvation as the end of their *faith*; and in the 22nd verse he says they had purified their souls in *obeying the truth*. Does my friend believe that God elects persons to salvation whose souls are not purified? We have a very similar expression from Paul (II. Thes. ii. 13), where he says, "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth." Did Paul preach one gospel and Peter another? We suppose not. Then belief of the truth is something that has to be done by the sinner that he may be *chosen* or *elected* to salvation. He must believe the truth and purify his soul in obeying it, in order to be chosen.

But our opponent next goes to I. Pet. ii. 9: "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;" and he feels strong in the words "chosen generation," though he finds not a word about how they were chosen, whether with or without conditions. This he ignores all the way through.

But he is most unfortunate in the selection of his proofs—every one that bears upon the subject at all is against him. In this quotation he saw trouble ahead, and tried to anticipate me. I asked him a number of questions in my opening speech without anticipating his answers. If he would be kind enough to let me state my own positions, I would be obliged to him. He might find employment in stating his own positions, if he could be induced to take any. If he could be induced to reply to my arguments after I have made them myself, it would be a decided improvement on his past course.

He read, "Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy " (ver. 10). Then he went to Gen. v. 1, and talked about the generation of Adam, as though those who were not a people, and had not obtained mercy, were the seed of Adam, and his chosen generation were not. But we can not let the gentleman es-

cape so easily. The very same persons who were the chosen generation of the ninth verse, were those who in time past were not a people, but then were the people of God of the tenth verse. Now I want to know when the eternally elect in Christ were not the people of God—will he tell us? I want to get close to him here. I am willing to fight it out over this passage selected by himself. Will he meet me in a close grapple over it? It is not enough to say they came from Adam—who did not come from Adam? Did he not come from Adam? Whether these came from Adam, God, or the devil, the *same persons*, the *very same*, who constitute the *chosen generation*, had, in time past, been *not a people*, but then were the people of God; who *had not obtained mercy*, but then had obtained mercy. When had the eternally and unconditionally elected in Christ not obtained mercy? Will he tell us? I predict that we will not hear from him main on this passage. We shall see.

He scouts the idea of *men* and *women* going to heaven or hell, and quotes the first section of the first verse of Matthew, "The hook of the generation of Jesus Christ." He says the generation of Adam — were those generated by Adam. *Men* and *women* came from Adam —were made of *dust* and will go back to *dust*; and he seems to think that the generation of Jesus Christ were begotten by him literally like Adam's generation were begotten by him. I hope he will develop his theory more fully along here, for as yet it is about as clear as well-stirred mud. Because Matthew introduces his gospel with an account of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, and gives the names of his ancestry, that it might be seen that he came of the lineage predicted by the prophets in confirmation of his divine character, he seizes upon the words, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ," and reasons that it means children literally begotten by Jesus Christ *independent of all connection with men and women*. I have heard many perversions of Scripture, but this construction of Matt. i. 1 puts the cap-atone on the climax of all the absurdity I ever heard before. Does he not see the names of men in the generation of Jesus Christ following right along after the words he quotes? Were not Abraham, Isaac and Jacob *men*? and does he not see their names following the generation of Jesus Christ quoted by him? Jesus Christ was *son of man* as well as Son of God. He selected *men* to preach the gospel to *men and women*, and when the Samaritans believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both *men* and *women*. What a waste of labor for men and women to trouble themselves about being baptized, as *they return to dust*, and that is the end of them! How do you know? Elder Herod says so, and he knows.

He says the elect are God's inheritance, and then asks, with a

sneer, "Will he get them? Yes, if they will let him! A little stub of a sinner, three feet high, capsizes God, takes him prisoner, and thwarts his purposes." This settles it!!

Does he mean that God will force salvation on the *elect*, whether they are willing or not? Jesus Christ commanded the gospel to be preached to every creature in all the world, and promise I salvation to thane who would believe and obey it—was he mocking them by offering them that which they could not accept? He threatened to damn every one who would not believe; and yet, if Elder Herod is right, they are sure to be damned, whether they believe or not--unless they were elected to salvation before the foundation of the world. The will of man has nothing to do with it. Jesus says, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Mr. Herod says, "Yes, if you are of the elect; none others can come. God never loved any others; Jesus never died for any others. No others have any interest in his blood or any chance to be saved by it." God says, "Whosoever *will*, let him come." Eider Herod says no little stub of a sinner can be consulted in God's arrangement. Jesus says, "Ye *will not* come unto me, that ye might have life: how oft would I have gathered you together, but ye *would not*;" but Elder Herod asks, "Can a sinner thwart God's purposes?" ALL this is the merest clap-trap. God never purposed to save any one contrary to his will, or a rebel against him. He is the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him—yes, all *who obey him*—but not another one. Jesus is able to save to the uttermost, those who come to God by him; but they must corner—lie is not going to conscript them into his service, that he may save them.

Elder Herod says if the Bible had read in a certain way as he "transposed " it, he would not have been here in this debate with me. Well, why is he here debating with me? If he is right, no heresy of mine can endanger the salvation of any one, nor can any truth he has learned be instrumental in saving any one.

But it seems to me that the devil outsharped the Lord on Elder Herod's theory. God fixed up the matter before the world was or man existed. He gave his Son a *small, select, party*, on condition that the Son would give his life for them; and he gave the devil the far *larger portion* "free," on the ground of pure favoritism. Do you call this *ridicule*? Not so. If it does not, in all earnestness, correctly represent his theory, then I confess my inability to understand him. Why does he go about preaching this doctrine? If it is true, his preaching can do no good, nor can his silence do any harm. The salvation of every *person* (I must not say man or woman) who will be saved at all, was saved before time began, and all others will be damned in spite of any thing they can do; not fur any fault of

their own, but because there never was any provisions made for them—they never had opportunity to be saved.

But he says, "It is God that showeth mercy." Certainly it is. Who else can show mercy? No one expects mercy from the devil; but does God show mercy on conditions to be complied with by man, or does he show mercy unconditionally? This is the issue between us.

My friend represents me as thinking that unless *men* and *women* have done something, they will not be resurrected. Well, he do n't believe *men* and *women* will be resurrected at all, do or not do. He says they came from Adam, were made of dust, and will return to dust—and that ends the Adam man. Paul says, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive " (I. Cor. xv. 22). I believe it; does he?

But I am not quite sure that I understand him. He seemed to imply that I think there will be no resurrection for him who does not obey the gospel. If this is not what he means, I can see no propriety in his reference to the subject at all. I have already quoted Jesus as saying that they who have *done good* will be resurrected to life, and they who have *done all* will be resurrected to damnation. This clearly shows that men will be raised, whether they obey the gospel or not; but it also shows that unless they have done good (which includes obeying the gospel), they can not be saved or raised to life. This crushes into nothingness his whole theory of unconditional salvation.

But he next refers us to Isa. xlvi, 9-11: "For my name's sake will I defer mine anger, and for my praise will I refrain for thee, that I cut thee not off. Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver; I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction. For mine own sake, even for mine own sake, will I do it: for how should my name be polluted? and I will not give my glory unto another "

If he had read the next verse, he would have found that this was spoken of "Jacob and Israel, my called." Not to Jacob personally, for he was long before dead. The first verse in this book shows it to be "The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem." Yea, these Jews—descendants of Jacob—were God's chosen—God's elect; but does my friend intend to say that they were all saved? Paul says, "They did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them: and that rock was Christ" (I. Cor, x. 3, 4). This shows that they were elect at that time- If my friend denies it, I will prove it by a number of plain, unequivocal expressions of Holy Writ. What went with them?

Will Elder Herod say they were all saved? If he will, I will prove that they went to hell by thousands. Let us read further:

"But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people ant down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and Jell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all these things happened unto them for examples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

Now, did all these elect who had drank of Christ, the spiritual Rock, go to heaven? How wariest thou?

" For some, when they had heard, did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom swear he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see they could not enter in because of unbelief" (Heb. iii. 16-19).

Thus we find that God swore that these unbelievers, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, should not enter into the rest prepared for the people of God, their election notwithstanding. And these very people were the seed of Abraham through the line of Isaac: yet we are told that salvation is not conditional!

But we are next referred to Rom. xi. 28, 29: "They were beloved for the father's sake." Yes; is there anything strange about that? Did you never love any one because you loved his father? Who were the fathers for whose sake they were beloved? Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Is there any proof of his proposition in this? "But the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." Will he 'say that a sinner can get salvation without repentance? The gifts and calling of God are without repentance as to God, but not as to the sinner; for the Lord has said that the sinner that does not repent will surely perish.

But we are next referred to seven thousand that God had reserved to himself. Yes; but why were they reserved? For the best of reasons—" They had not bowed the knee to the, image of Baal." If they had worshiped that image, they would have gone as the others went. But why were there only seven thousand of God's elect left? There had been millions of them. When they crossed

the Red Sea there were about three millions; *now* only seven thousand. That is where Elisha made his complaint. The others had killed God's prophets, digged down his altars, and gone into idolatry. But "even so at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace." Yes, a *remnant*—what does that mean? A remnant implies a small part of what once was. The whole Jewish nation were God's elect once; but when God proposed the abrogation of the Jewish polity and the election of a people on the principle of faith in Christ, only a remnant accepted the new arrangement; and they were, by Paul, called the *election*, in place of the notion, as before, and the rest were blinded in unbelief, and for their unbelief were broken off, as the natural branches of the olive tree. Does this prove unconditional salvation? Kay, verily: but just the opposite. The effects of idolatry and unbelief were never more clearly seen than here on God's elect.

He next introduced Rom. ix. 7, 8: "Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Well, what has this to do with *unconditional* salvation? I suppose just nothing at all. The children of Abraham by Hagar and Keturah were born after the flesh as other children, but God gave him Isaac by promise when he and his wife were past age, and it was through him that his seed was called.

But how do we become children, and heirs of this promise? "For ye are all the children of God." How? Unconditionally? No; but "by faith in Christ Jesus," And how are they all children of God by faith? "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." That is the way they became children of God by faith. In faith they were baptized into Christ, and thus put him on. Then "there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus; and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise " (Gal. iii. 25-29). Thus we become *children of God*, the seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise; but this is just the opposite of *unconditional election*, I want my friend to notice this, and show the fallacy of my reasoning, if he can; but I guess he will give it no attention, for I have been most unfortunate in securing his attention to anything.

He reminds us that it is God that justifieth. Certainly; who else can do it? But as God justifies, does it follow that he does it *unconditionally*? *This* is the issue. My friend *assumes* just what he has undertaken to *prove*.

He quotes II. Tim. ii. 10: "Therefore I endure all things for the elects' sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in



Christ Jesus, with eternal glory." Well, he must have quoted this simply because it has the word *elect* in it, for it certainly has no bearing on the subject of *conditional or unconditional* salvation. But any passage seems to be satisfactory to him if it has the word *elect* in it, without regard to *how* or *for what* the parties were elected. May I, with becoming modesty, remind him that unconditional *salvation* is the matter in hand just now?

(Time expired,)

---

### Elder Herod's Second Speech.

BRO. MODERATOR, JUDGES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I appear before you to continue the affirmative argument begun in the forenoon. But before I begin my argument I desire to call your attention to one thing that my opponent said in his speech this morning. I confess it alarmed me some. He said that twenty-four thousand of Adam's race were gone to hell. I thought that the judgment was yet in the future, but he has them already judged and in hell now. If he has any passage of Scripture that says so I hope he will produce it, and read it to us—I have not seen it. I do not think there is such a passage, and I don't think he can prove what he says. If he can not prove it by the Bible, he ought to acknowledge his error and take it back. I would not give much for a religion that has to be scared into the people.

But he says if salvation is not conditional there is no use of preaching, and he asked me what I preached for. And he has asked the same thing two or three times. I will read my answer right out of the Bible, and then I will pay no more attention to it.

I read Ephesians iv. 8-12: "therefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.) And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

Again, I read Isaiah xl. 1,2: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."

This is my authority for preaching. I am commanded by the Lord to comfort his people by telling them what the Lord has done for them.

He seems to be very glad that I referred to Ephesians. Now I want to know which preceded, the hearing the gospel or their salvation? They were chosen in him before the foundation of the world. Hearing the gospel had nothing to do with their salvation. They were first elected—saved—and were God's people, then they heard and believed the gospel.

Now I want to read Matthew xxiv. 31: "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."

And again, Mark says (xiii. 27): "And then shall he send his angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven."

God has elect people in every direction, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven, and he is going to bring them together, and be with them, and rule over them, for they are his people and he has promised to be their God. Now there were none of Adam's race among these elect If I do n't establish that I will give up and quit.

I invite your attention to I. These. i. 4: "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God." Now we see they were elected of God. Elected of God, how? On conditions? No, there is nothing said about conditions. They were *elected*, and they were elected of God too. Who has a right to put conditions where God has not put them? When was this election? Was it when they did something? or performed conditions? We will read again. II. These. ii. 13: "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God bath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." This seems to have been an apostolic doctrine I am preaching. Chosen you from the beginning. I don't care when he makes the beginning if he puts the election before they believed.

I don't want to make the Bible contradict itself. I am not here to do that. It docs not contradict itself. There are no contradictions in it

Now I turn to II. John, and read the first verse, and you will see that there is a lady in it. I love to talk about the ladies. Now listen everybody, for you are all interested in the reading when we read about a lady. "The elder unto the elect lady and her children, whom I love in the truth; and not I only, but also all they that have known the truth; for the truth's sake, which dwelleth in us, and shall be

with us forever." This elect lady represents the church, hence I have found an elect church. And what does this mean? A church of elect material—its members are all elect.

Now we read Psalm lxxv. 4: "Blessed is the man whom thou choosest, and causest to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts: we eh all be satisfied with the goodness of thy house, even of thy holy temple." Here the church is represented by a *man*. First we found it represented by a *lady*, now it is by a man, that takes in both women and men.

Now read Isaiah lxxv. 9: "And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains: and wine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there." Here we have a *seed*, and God's elect, and their inheritance. That talks like my proposition, does it not? Now you all see that I know you do, Your pleasant faces and sparkling eyes show that you are all interested in this great subject.

We will read Isaiah liii. 4-8: "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. Alt we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us oil. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from Judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken."

We are healed by his stripes, not by the sinner's stripes, or by our awn stripes. Healed by his stripes when we do something; when we comply with conditions? God says for the transgression of my people. Jesus was stricken for God's people, and was he stricken for any others? The book says he was stricken for *my people*, that implies that he was *not stricken* for any other's; and that is clear proof that the Lord had a people for whom Jesus was stricken. Does the book say 'that they should be the Lord's people if they would comply with a lot of conditions? It ought to read that way to suit my opponent.

Let us next invite your attention to Daniel ix. 24: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy."

Seventy weeks are specified to take the daily sacrifices out of the way. What for? To get fit more perfect sacrifice. If Jesus undertook the salvation of sinners, and, after living thirty-three years, did not accomplish his work, I doubt the propriety of Dr. Herod or Dr. Brents undertaking the task. I think it A reflection on the Saviour to intimate that he did not accomplish the object for which he came. If he did accomplish his work, then transgression was finished; an end was made of sins, reconciliation for iniquity was made, and everlasting righteousness was brought in for his people.

Now we want to read Isaiah lxxii. 5-9. Listen, everybody, to the rending, for it in the word of the Lord: "And I looked, and there MILS none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold." Therefore the sinner's arm brought salvation. Is that the way it reads? I must rend again, for the brethren are shaking their heads all around. Surely it ought to read that way to suit the theory of my opponent. But I will read it as It is now: "Therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me, And I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth. I will mention the loving kindness of the Lord, according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us, and the great goodness toward the house of Israel, which he hath bestowed on them according to his mercies, and according to the multitude of his loving kindnesses. For he said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie: so he was their Saviour. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the Angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old."

None to help—none, to uphold. IB that true? The Angel of his presence saved them—did they save themselves? If any thing they did, saved them, I ask if they did not save themselves, and not the Angel of his presence? He bestowed on them loving kindnesses and tender mercies because they *were* people, and not to give them a chance to *become his people* if they would perform a lot of conditions.

My brother keeps giving his interpretation of Scripture. Why not rend the book and let it speak for itself. Religious divisions come about by mere cunning and giving opinions. I prefer to read you the word of God and give no opinions. I agreed to be governed by the Bible in deciding this question, and I am not going to deal in opinions. One man's opinion is as good as another, for no man's opinion is worth anything in deciding what God has done, will do or ought to do concerning salvation.

I believe in Christian duties—I preach Christian duties—more

than I can get the people to do; but Christian duties never saved a soul. I am discussing salvation; and Jesus is the Saviour, and the only Saviour, and nothing that we can do will save us, or in anyway induce God to save us. The salvation of every man who will ever be saved at ail was secured through Jesus Christ, before the foundation of the world, and nothing that man can do will change the purposes of him that changes not He is the same yesterday, to-day and forever.

Can man measure arms with God the Almighty, and thwart his purposes? Such an idea is degrading to the character of God. The ransomed of the Lord will give all the glory to God, and none to themselves. If any man glory let him glory in the Lord. The salvation is for the saints, but the glory belongeth to the Saviour.

*(Time expired.)*

---

### **Dr. Brents' Second Reply.**

MR. PRESIDENT:—My opponent says the gifts and callings of God are without repentance, and applies that to the conversion of the sinner. A greater perversion could not be imagined. These gifts and callings were not for the benefit of the called, but were intended to benefit others through them. He introduced the cases of Jacob and Esau, and made Paul say that God loved Jacob and hated Esau before either of them was born or had done good or evil. The election of Jacob did not secure the salvation of him and his posterity, nor did the passing of Esau condemn him and his posterity. It is certain many thousands of Jacob's descendants were lost, nor can it be shown that none of Esau's posterity were saved—indeed, he can not show that Esau himself was lost True, he was a profane person when he sold his birthright, but his conduct when he met Jacob indicated that he was a better man than Jacob had once been. Paul made two quotations, which Elder Herod throws together as if they were one; and he makes an individual and personal application of what was intended to be national. Gen. xxv. 23: The Lord said to Rebecca that "Two *nations* are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." That is, the elder people shall serve the younger people —the people who shall descend from the elder son shall serve the people who shall descend from the younger son. This was said to Rebecca before the children were born; but the other quotation—"Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated"—was said long after

both men were dead, and referred to the nations, *Israel* and *Edom*, represented by them. See Malachi 1.1-4: "The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi. I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us." Notice the form of expression—the word of the Lord to *Israel*. Wherein hast thou loved us?—not one child. "Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord; yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid big mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness." Esau had no mountains, or heritage either, before he was born. "Whereas Edom saith, We are impoverished," etc. Yes, *Edom* was the nation that descended from Esau, and of that nation this was true, but of Esau *personally* it was not said, nor would it have been true had it been said. This was said, "Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated," nearly fifteen hundred years after they were both dead, and yet Elder Herod applies it to the children before they were born! And still he complains that I *explain* the scriptures and give my *construction* of them, in place of reading them, as he does. Yes, it would be right nice if I would let his perversions go unexposed. He run read, and "transpose," and misapply more scriptures in half an hour than Paul could straighten in a whole day, if he were here; but he takes good care not to attack my explanations when I have made them. If he does not want me to explain his proof texts, he Must quit perverting and misapplying them. He will greatly abridge my labors, and I shall be greatly obliged to him for every improvement he will make in this direction.

But I showed that *twenty-four thousand* of his eternally elect have gone to hell, and he objects to this because the judgment is yet future. Well, this is pretty hard on him, I admit. When we ask where persons are, the answer is, they have gone to town, or somewhere else, when they have only started; so when persons die in the condition these Jews were in, we say they have gone to hell; and it is certain they have made a start in that direction, to Kay the least of it. But I suppose Elder Herod never says any one has gone to a place until he has made the landing. But how about the judgment, on his theory? I insist that the judgment took place before the world began, when his eternal decree of election was fixed up. The only use he will have for a judgment is to separate the sheep from the goats according to that decree.

Herod: "I will have good ground for a judgment."

Brents: Yes, the decree of election will be the only condition of your judgment, and not the works or deeds of men, as the word of God says it shall be. What a ridiculous farce it will be to judge men according to their works, when their destiny was irrevocably

fixed before the foundation of the world! We challenge him to show that this is not the ground of his judgment,

But let us look after those elect that fell in the wilderness, Paul says they "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that rock was Christ." My friend says there was no such thing as preparation for heaven or hell under the Old Testament; and he talks about Adam's water and Christ's water. Look here, my friend, do not you think those persons got a sip of Christ's water when they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ? But what became of those descendants of Abraham through the line of Isaac? "But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness." Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand." Twenty-four thousand died in this plague, twenty-three thousand in one day. See Numbers xxv. 9. "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted and were destroyed of serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all these things happened unto them for examples, and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed, lest he fall." Now, are these idolaters and whoremongers fit for heaven? "For some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom swore he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not" (Heb. iii. 16-18), Now, God swore they should not go to heaven. Elder Herod says they have not gone to hell. I insist that he locate them. Will he say that they have gone, or will go to heaven, when God has sworn they shall not?

Herod: "No, no."

Brents: Then you give up your proposition. They were God's elect—had drank of Christ—were children of Abraham through the line of Isaac, yet you say they have not gone to heaven because they were wicked. That settles the question—knocks the bottom clear out of the proposition. Eternally and unconditionally elect, and will not get to heaven after all that. Well, where are they? I insist that he locate them. Has he a sort of purgatory fixed, in which

he is keeping them until he gives them another chance for heaven? Will he tell us about them? I fear we will not hear from him at this point any more. Come, my friend, don't forsake these elect brethren; they need your help.

But he does not want the Bible to contradict itself. O, no; not he! Yet, when I showed yesterday that they who have done good shall be resurrected to life, he read, when he knew that I could not reply: "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." Then, if the Bible does not contradict itself, and only those who have done good will be resurrected to life—and "there is none that doeth good, no, not one"—then there will be none resurrected to life, and all are lost That is not universal salvation, but it is universal damnation, without remedy.

But he gives us his authority for preaching, and he refers us to where Paul is speaking of spiritual gifts (Eph. iv. 11): "And he gave some apostles." Is he an apostle? I reckon not "And some prophets." Is he a prophet? I thought all the prophets were dead, but false ones. "And some evangelists." Is he an evangelist? Not such as Paul spoke of, I guess. "And some pastors and teachers." Is he a pastor? If so, he only feeds the chosen few. I did not know that they could starve, or even get very hungry. And I am not very favorably impressed with him as a teacher. I think the world would be as well off without his teaching as with it. But he is to comfort the Lord's people. While his preaching might comfort the few, it would be death to the many. It would not be very comforting to tell the people that God had made no provisions for them; that he never loved them; Christ never died for them, and eternal punishment only awaited them, let them do as they might. Even the elect would not be comforted much by such preaching as this; but I never knew any one who believed this that did not think himself one of the elect. Of course, my friend feels sure that he is a chosen vessel. But my friend failed to catch my question. I did not ask him for his authority to preach; but I am curious to know where the people are to be *benefitted by his preaching*. If he can not be instrumental in saving any one, or causing him to turn from sin to holiness, what good does his preaching do any one? If he can not cheat the devil out of a single man, or save a soul from death, or turn a sinner from the error of his way, why trouble himself to preach? This is my point; I hope he now understands me. Will he tell us what good his preaching does? That is what I want to know, and it is what he has failed to tell.

But he tells us God is going to gather the elect from the four winds. Yes, certainly; who doubts that? He goes through the Bible hunting every passage that has the word *elect* in it, without



even stopping to see who the elect were, what they were elected for, how they were elected, and whether or not they were saved by the election. This is downright *tripling* with the subject. Does he not know that it is *unconditional election*, and *that* where salvation was the object of the election that he is here to prove? Is it possible that he is going through the debate without knowing the import of the proposition he is affirming? Who are the elect? I answer, the saved. He will not call this answer in question. Then who are the saved? Jesus said, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." He is the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him. These will be the elect who will be gathered from the four winds? Will he deny it?

The angel of the Lord said to the shepherds in the plains of Bethlehem: "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people; for unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord " (Luke i. 10,11). If my friend's theory be true, this announcement was false. How could the birth of a Saviour be good tidings of great joy for those he came not to save? Yet it was to be good tidings of great joy to *all people*. Then all people may be saved by this Saviour if they will accept salvation as offered them.

But he cites us to II. These. ii. 13: "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth." This is very far from unconditional salvation, for Paul plainly says that *belief of the truth* was a condition through which they were chosen to salvation. But it had the word *chosen* in it, hence he must read it any way.

But he refers us to Isaiah liii. 5: "With his stripes we are healed." Yes, but healed conditionally or unconditionally? Not a word on that subject. Peter, when writing to Christians who had been saved, says: "By whose stripes ye were healed " (I. Pet. ii. 24). That this healing means saved, all agree. Now, Peter, did you mean that we are healed or saved by the suffering of Christ without doing anything ourselves? O, no, for we purify our souls in *obeying the truth* (I. Peter i. 22). And baptism doth also now save us (I. Pet iii. 21). Peter, did you tell those wanting to be saved on the day of Pentecost, to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins? Yes, I told them that. Why did you tell them that? I was speaking as the Spirit gave me utterance, and those were the words put in my mouth. Peter, did you, in your next discourse at Solomon's porch, tell the people to *repent* and be converted, that their sins might be blotted out? Yes, I said that, too. Then you could not have meant that by Christ's stripes we were healed without doing these things.

If God saves without obedience, then he must be a respecter of persons, and nothing but personal favoritism controlled the salvation. But the word of God says, "There in no respect of persons with God" (Rom. ii. 11). "Neither is there respect of persons with him" (Eph. vi. 9). "And there is no respect of persons" (Col. iii. 25). "Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him" (Acts x. 34, 85). Elder Herod has not *perceived* this yet, for he thinks the elect will be accepted with him whether they work righteousness or not. And he thinks those not elect will not be accepted if they work all the righteousness required of any one.

He tells us that the *elect lady* mentioned in II. John i. 1 represented the church, and the church is composed of all the elect; now will he tell us who her children were? The quotation reads: "The elder unto the elect lady and her children, whom I love in the truth." John seemed to love the children about as well as the lady. Then, if the lady represented all the elect church, who were these, her children? I hope he will tell us.

( *Time expired.* )

---

### **Elder Herod's Third Speech.**

BROS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: —We are again present before you to resume the labor of this discussion; and before I proceed to call your attention, and my opponent's, to additional proofs as to my affirmation, I desire to announce it myself. It has already been distinctly read, that I affirm that the scriptures teach the unconditional *election* (I want you to note that it is not *selection*) and salvation from sin by Jesus Christ of all his seed or generation. I want to make an additional remark, by way of an inquiry, as to whether this is not true, or will ever be true, that it is seed or generation that is not only saved, but that enjoys a place at God's right hand?

I believe that my worthy opponent admitted on yesterday that election was a Bible doctrine. As a matter of course, he has his own way of defining and explaining it; but in view of what is involved in the passage that he said had a semblance in that direction, I put a question to him. What was it? When he admitted that election was a Bible doctrine, I put the question as to whether the election takes place in Christ previous to the time that the thing elected knew

it. He has not answered. I want him to give an answer; for the very moment (that he gives it, as I presume he will give it, that it existed before the thing elected knew it, then the knowledge of the fact did not secure the election, no act performed could have constituted the election; nor could any such act have reached backward behind the act to exert any influence in producing it, or bringing it about.

He has also asked me a question, and I might just as well answer it now, as it would not be in place to answer it after a while. He wanted to know whether or not I say it is unconditional. I have said it in my proposition, and I repeat it.

[Brents (from his seat): "I never asked you any such a question as that; of course I did not. "]

I am now ready to continue my affirmative argument, and I call your attention to where I stopped. I can not devote us much time as is necessary to get in the amount of testimony I desire to introduce.

I have already called your attention to the sixty-third chapter of Isaiah I have read one passage and gave the verse, but I now proceed to read further. I will read verses eight and nine. Now everybody listen, in view of the choice before the world was. The prophet says: "Surely they are my people, children who will not lie. He was their Saviour. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them. In his love and his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. " That tells it all. Do you all appreciate the wording of this passage? I have agreed to decide this question by the Bible. I do not give my explanation; that would be my opinion, not the Bible.

I now call your attention to this passage from Isaiah for the last time I will read it during the discussion of this question. I repeat the language and ask the attention of the people to it, for it is very important in settling this controversy. "Surely they are my people, children who will not lie. He was their Saviour. In all their 'affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them. In his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. " That means he is going to *offer* them salvation, does it? I now call attention to it again, as I have just remarked, and I shall then dismiss it and turn to something else. "Surely they are my people. " Now, us a shepherd would have a right to claim and recover his property that was astray, so he had a right to recover them that were his. Now "they are my people, children who will not lie. " In his love and pity—not in their acts of obedience—he redeemed them. He carried them all the days of old.

I now want your attention to Isaiah liii. 10. Every one of you, listen now, because the proof of my proposition lies in this passage: "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands. He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. "

I now call your attention to the fourth chapter and last verse of the letter to the Romans, where the inspired apostle in plain language supports what I have already uttered: "He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification." Raised again for what? Our justification. God never justifies guilty things. He said he would not justify the guilty. Then Christ was delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification; hence we were justified before he was raised from the dead.

I next refer to the last verse of the fifth chapter of the second letter to the Corinthians. Every one listen to this question of justification and the cause of it; and those who have realized themselves as sinners will appreciate the wording. I want everybody to get the sentiment. The apostle says: "For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. " The argument of my friend is to show that your righteousness is the result of your own acts. If he contradicts this, then he denies what he said, and he will not do that. O, my friends, what vast interest is involved in this question! Our Lord was made sin for us. Our sins were laid on him. What did he do with them when he got them there? He bore them in his own body on the tree. And still you tell me salvation is conditional! You bow before me and my worthy opponent! What have we done for you? He, the Son of God, has done all, to whom be glory forever.

How was this accomplished? He was made to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might become the righteousness of God in him, by faith, repentance, and baptism, or any other thing that we can do or have done. This requires me to prove Christ to be the salvation from sin. Is not this proof ample enough? I want these words to sink into your hearts so that they will stay there. That we might be made, not make ourselves, the righteousness of God in him. it is God's righteousness, and not the signer's righteousness.

Psalm xxii. 30. Every one listen now. I have established the proposition. I have called your attention to the twenty-second Psalm and tenth verse. I read in the following plain and forcible language: "A seed shall serve him. " My brother says that God has offered it to you, and you may accept it or not, as you please. This is honoring him very much, is it not? I include the entire

paragraph on the subject. The language is: "A seed shall serve him; it shall be counted for a generation. " I have a seed, a generation, and a Saviour, or I would not have gone into the discussion of this question. It is no matter what I have said, you have got the passage. I presumed he could have turned to it in a moment.

I next call your attention to the testimony of John. Now we begin to talk about who it is that are his subjects. I don't believe the doctrine of *reprobation*. I have a higher and more exalted opinion of God than to believe that stuff. John xviii. 36. One inquired of the Lord respecting the nature of his kingdom. Listen to the response which he gives. He said (everybody listen): "My kingdom is not of this world. " Will you let him tell you what it is? He says children of this world marry and are given in marriage. My opponent preached twenty-four thousand in hell yesterday. I want everybody to come right up to the scratch now, and look at the record in which the Bible has given it.

First part of the paragraph—what is it? "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight. " It would go back to duet, and then Daniel's prophecy that it should stand forever would not be true. I want the serious thought of everybody on this question; and after reading the language just quoted, I call your attention to John xvii. 16: "You are not of the world", even as I am not of the world. " A kingdom not of this world—and Jesus uses language that can not be mistaken— "you are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." Where did Jesus come from? Now, my friends, take all these things together, and think for a moment, and you can not fail to understand the question.

I here call the attention of my friend to Gal. iii. 27. I have no trouble in citing the language I want to quote. Twenty-seventh verse: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" I want my friend to tell who it was. *Men* and *women* has been the cry ever since this debate began. I want the application immediately to what I am discussing. When I go away from here I want it said that I stuck to the question I was discussing. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. " Listen closely now. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. " Down goes the *cob-house*. What kind of baptism was that? Was it water baptism? Did the Bible tell you so? I have traversed that Bible from one end to the other, and it does not say it. He says, after saying there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, "you are. " Is it now or some other time? You are now. You are what? You are all one in Christ Jesus, and "if ye be

Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Now I invite your attention to the first verse of the next chapter of Galatians. I am going to talk about a family—a generation, not about Adam, or about the flesh; they are not the children of God. The apostle said, "Ye are all, " addressing, not *men* and *women*, but the *church*—it was addressed to a *lady*—the *bride*, the Lamb's wife. This refers to the same passage that I started from in the introduction of this question.

"Now I say that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be Lord of all. " He was in sin. How did he get out? By obedience? I must read on, for my time will expire and I will not have Introduced a fourth of the testimony I intended, "But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father, even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world; 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 our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. " This assures us that the Father has given his Spirit to our spirit to bear witness; and the apostle has given another evidence— you should know that you have passed from death unto life because you love the brethren.

Next in order I want to call your attention to John xix. I believe I have failed to note the verse—I see I did not note it. Look at the tenth verse in the nineteenth chapter, I think you will find it. There you will find the Saviour acknowledges the mission for which he came into the world; and the language in which it is made. Listen now: "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost. " Did Christ accomplish his mission? Did he perform the work he came to do? If he did, not one he came to save will be lost—not one. If any he came to save will be lost, then his mission was a failure.

Matt. i. 21. I am putting these in as testimony. I want him to answer what is said in the first chapter of Matthew and the twenty-first verse. The angel said that Jesus should do something. Do you think that that something should or could fail to be done? "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins."

Was Jesus the Saviour? Did he save anybody? If he saved anybody, whom did he save? And from what did he save them? We are hunting for salvation from sin for the elect, and the angel

said Jesus should save his people from their sins. IS this plain enough?

(*Time expired.* )

---

**Dr. Brents' Third Reply.**

MR. PRESIDENT: —My opponent wants to know whether the sinner is elected to salvation before he knows it or after he knows it. This question lifts nothing to do with the many elections of persons to portions for the benefit of others, but to the election of persons to their own salvation. I reply that persons are elected to salvation when they obey the gospel, and are saved; and when they obey the gospel they know it then. His trouble seems to be that he thinks every one was *individually* and *personally* elected to salvation when the plan of salvation was conceived in the mind of God. This is his mistake. Provisions were then made for the salvation of *all* men who would accept salvation on the conditions stipulated, but no one was personally and unconditionally elected then or at any other time. He makes a *personal application to a few without conditions, of that which was provided for all on conditions.*

He again quotes Isaiah lxxii. 8, 9: "For he said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie; so he was their Saviour, In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. " Of this he makes an application to the elect of to-day, when it was said of the children of Israel redeemed from bondage; and the very next verse to what he read shows that they rebelled against God and he became their enemy. Why did he stop there? Was it accidental? Now I must read the succeeding verses to correct his *perversion.* "But they re-belle', and vexed his holy spirit; therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them. Then he remembered the days of old, Moses, and his people, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock? where is he that put his holy spirit within him? that led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make himself an everlasting name? that led them through the deep an a, horse in the wilderness, that they should not stumble. "

Why did he not read this, to show whom the Lord was talking about? Because it would have spoiled his argument if he had. It did not suit his purpose to show that those who were his people, and led by him all the days of old, were the Jews, and that God turned

against them and became their enemy, and destroyed thousands of them for their wickedness; though they were his *elect* people—descendants of Abraham through the line of Isaac. By the way, he has not located that twenty-four thousand of these very people, redeemed by him and led by Moses. He says they are not fit for heaven, and did not go to hell; hence I insist that he locate them some where. They were God's elect, and you have, this morning, claimed them as your brethren in the Lord; now I insist that you tell us where they are? Don't fail to notice this, please.

He next goes to Isaiah liii. 10, 11, and reads: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities. " Then he "translates" this to Romans iv. 25: "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. " Here again, had he read the connection, it would have spoiled his whole theory. Let me read the preceding verses in connection with the one he read. I begin with the twenty-third verse: "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. " Yes, it shall be imputed to us if we believe; but what if we don't believe? Well, my friend is trying to make you believe that if you are one of the elect it shall be imputed to you, *whether you believe or not*. Is it not astonishing that he failed to see the verse right above the one he read, and it part of the sentence only separated by a semicolon?

He next goes to II. Cor. v. 21: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. " This is an elliptical sentence. For he hath made him to be a sin *offering* for us. That this is correct is shown by the passage he quotes in connection with it. "Who his own self bare our pins in his own body on the tree. " How did he bear our sins in his own body on the tree? Shall Paul answer? "He died for our sins according to the scriptures. " And for whose nine did he die? "And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again" (II. Cor. v. 15). "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the stifle ring of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. " "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (I. John ii. 2). Thus we see that he bore the sins of all men in the same sense that he bore the sins of any one. I defy him to show any provisions made for the salvation of a few men that were not made for all men. If he will show how he was saved himself, I will show that every



man in this house may be saved in the same way. I have called his attention to this before, but he has not noticed it.

He next quoted Psalm xxii. 30: "A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation. " He must have quoted this passage because it has the words *seed* and *generation* in it, for it says not a word about conditional or unconditional salvation. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, " would have been just as appropriate.

He says he don't believe the doctrine of reprobation. Why not? It is a Bible term. It occurs six times in the New Testament and once in the Old.

*Herod:* "I believe it"

*Brents:* You do? Converted so soon! You said just a while gone that you did not believe it. But I am glad he is improving. Who are reprobates? Those who refuse to believe and obey the gospel. Those who make themselves such. But he says: "My kingdom is not of this world; if it were, then would my servants fight I! ye were of the world, the world would love its own. " The word *world* is here used to distinguish the *wicked* from the disciples of Jesus. You are not of the wicked. "My kingdom is not of the world; " that is, it is not a political, but a spiritual government, authorized of God. But he uses this expression to prove that the subjects of his kingdom were not of the earth, when he told his disciples that they were not of the world, yet it was to them he was talking, and they were right there with him then.

But he goes to Gal. iii. 27-29: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. " Now he quotes this to show that men and *women* are not baptized into Christ, for in him there is neither *male* nor *female*; and he exclaimed, when he read it, "Down goes the cob-house!" I think so! I have seen many a cob-house fall before its builder got it done.

Jesus said, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God. " When the Samaritans believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, they were baptized, both men and women. Who were baptized? Men and women. Down goes the cob house! The gentleman deserves a patent on his interpretation of this passage, but he need not trouble himself to take it out, for no one will intrude on his discovery, I'm sure. All the children of God, how? By faith. For as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ, and Jew, Gentile, bond, free, male and female, all sustain the same relation to him, and are Abra-

ham's seed and heirs according to the promise. How plain, but how unfortunate for my friend! He ought to keep at far away from such passages as possible.

He seems to have a theory here that he has not developed yet I wish he would bring it out fully. I want to understand him. Now I want to tell the gentleman, and I hope thereby to induce him to develop his theory, that it requires all of a man to make a man, and God intends to employ the whole man in his service. Paul says: "I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, wholly acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service." Had my brother been there he would have cried out: "O, no, Paul; not these bodies of ours!" Glorify God in your bodies and in your spirits which are his. "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I. These. v. 23). Now, I think God made man just such a creature as he is, composed of soul, body and spirit, and he intended to employ the whole man in his service; and that my friend's theory needs to be brought out where we can see it Why does he want to keep it in the background? I have tried to get him to come out and take position, but he moves cautiously. He is like a man walking in the dark when he knows there are pitfalls all around him. He steps lightly; he is exceedingly cautious. I have tried to prise him out; I have tried to twist him out; but I guess I will have to smoke him out There was a covenant made between God and his Son about the destiny of the human race. He agrees that his Son may have a select party by giving his life for them. But there are few who go the narrow way, while the many go the broad road. Who gets them? The devil gets them without even shedding a drop of sweat for them. Who represented him in the arrangement? The covenant was made between God and his Son, yet the devil gets the larger share, and yet he was not represented in the covenant at all. Did God act as the Devil's proxy and secure to him the larger share? I hope my friend will come out and explain the whole matter, so that we can understand him fully.

Paul speaks of the adoption of sons—children—into God's family. If men are adopted into God's family, there is a time when it is done; and before the adoption they are not sons. If men are *adopted* into the family of God when they obey the gospel, it follows that they were not sons before the foundation of the world. The whole theory is shown to be false by the fact that conversion is represented by the figure of *adoption* and by the figure of the *new birth*. Will my opponent tell us how men may be adopted or born again into God's

family, if they have been in it since the foundation of the world. Gal. iv. 4-6.

But he quotes John xix. 10. He did not find it, because he was mistaken in the reference. It is Luke six. 10: "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost. " Well, who were the lost? Was there ever a time when the eternally and unconditionally elect were lost? We read Rom. iii. 9-12. "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. " And again, verse 23: "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. " Then all are lost; hence, if my brother's theory is true that he came to save, and *did save all the lost*, then universalism is true. He has a very flexible theory, truly. Yesterday he proved *universal damnation*, to-day he proves *universal salvation*. Well, of the two positions, I like the one of to-day better; it is more liberal, to say the least of it—but neither one is true. The world WAS lost, and "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John iii. 16). He came to save the lost, "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him *might* be saved" (verse 17), Yes, *might be saved* if they would be saved on his terms; and these terms are as free to *every man* as to *any man*.

He has again introduced the language of the angel (Matt. i. 21): "Thou shall call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins. " I exploded his argument on this once. There is not a word about whether he shall save his people *conditionally* or *unconditionally*. "He became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him" (Heb. v, 9). Here we find *whom he saves and how he saves them. All that obey him*; not another one, but all of these. But as he quoted the angel *before* his birth, we will add the testimony of the angel *after* his birth: "Behold, X bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people" (Luke ii. 10). And again, verses 30-32. Good old Simeon said: "For mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which I have prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel" His birth was a source of *great joy to all people* and prepared before the face of *all people*.

(Time expired. )

**Elder Herod's Fourth Speech.**

BROS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: —I again present myself before you, to renew my labors in the prosecution of the discussion of this question. I am sorry that I trouble my friend so much. I am A sympathizing kind of man. I have not heard him make a single speech in this discussion, but what he complains of the passages I have selected. He says that they are all against me; but I notice in his case just what I have noticed up till now—where he runs against a hard one he tries to get it out of the way. What are you going here for, now? I want everybody to note the complaint, because it has been repeated every time, especially so since I have been introducing proof-passage that interpret themselves; otherwise you had better employ him as a spiritual guide.

He says something about faith. He don't seem to have any use for it I am going to tell you what it is. He has not defined it yet. I quote Heb. xi., for the purpose of getting a Bible definition of faith. Everybody listen to the first verse: "Now, *faith* is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. " Is that his act, or mine? Answer for yourselves.

Now, for the purpose of getting it more closely defined, I ask attention to the tenth chapter of the same, epistle. The explanation of the passage is easy—we can't mistake it. *Substance:* Now I turn back to the tenth chapter, and read: "Laying aside every weight, and the sin that doth so easily beset us, let us run with patience the race set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith. " He has all the time been intimating that you can roll up a bundle of faith for yourselves, and it will furnish you with a passport to heaven. It was our duty to define it. I am going to take a passage from the fourth chapter of Romany and I will step over into the fifth chapter, and he can note that, if he wants to: "He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification. "

Just before he sat down, he became liberal enough to believe that he was saved by grace. I want every one to notice the inconsistency of that admission, and especially when it came from such a worthy opponent as he is.

Fifth chapter of Romans: The word *faith* is there. I have use for it; he has none. Having said, in the close of the preceding chapter, that He was raised for our justification, He says: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God. " Now say it is your act! Tell me where the necessity was for Christ being delivered and raised for the justification of his people? I want thinking men to look at the question, and I am done with it: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Who is the author and finisher of your faith? And

it is through Him that you will realize the joys of your salvation. Look at this passage—you have no use for it.

I want to read a little more. I call your attention to John iii. 3: "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God. " Now I want him to note that. I have a question for him to answer, from the standpoint I have now reached—and everything is to turn on this question: "Except a man be born again, he can not enter the kingdom of heaven." What agency, my brother, has man to employ, in order to his birth? You may just get him ready to push right into heaven—what agency has the thing to employ, in order to be born? Listen and reply, now. What kind of a *modus operandi* is it? Additional I want him to note, What next? The Saviour's exposition of this: "That which is born of flesh, is flesh. " He says you are to go to heaven or hell. Born of the Spirit of God. I want to see! you [looking down at the audience]. You don't look like spirits. Look at the point I have raised. You know where I stand now.

The question is, What agencies are employed by the child to be born, in order to its birth?

Second question: "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit. " Now, what is the difference between a man after he is born of the Spirit and before?

I say to you that the outer man is not regenerated—not born again. You might have regenerated him forty times, and if it was flesh it would still be flesh, and if spirit it would still be spirit.

Isa. xxxi.: My proposition involves the necessity of saving from two things. What are they? Sin and death. He advised, now. Isa., xxvi. 19: I want to read it now, to show the recovery from death by Jesus Christ. You can't get him up out of death by any agencies of the outer man. Is the outer man the subject to be saved? These are never saved. I defy him to show me. Now listen to Isaiah, contemplating death. What does the prophet say? If I don't translate right out of this into the New Testament, I ought to be put to blush for talking about salvation; and yet could not tell what they were saved from? Chop. xxxi.: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake, ye that dwell in the dust. " It must be the men and women of Adam's race. I want to put part in hell and the balance in heaven ! Deliver me from such a conclusion—of such a God!

"Thy dead men shall live. " How shall they come up? "Together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead. "

When did that take place? I will tell you. I am a most accom-

modating man. It was a prophecy. It looked to the accomplishment of salvation—a recovery from death. When? Everybody make a note of this; I don't want you to mistake it. Hosea xiii. 14: "He will ransom them from the power of the grave." Is it not a wonder it did not say *graves*? Preachers have got into the habit of Looking at a hole in the ground, and of praying about the morning of the resurrection. Let me read it as it is: "Will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction. " Can you think of God wreaking his vengeance on a hole in the ground? I am not worshiping that kind of a God. "I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues. " He gays, away back yonder—

(*Brents*, from his seat: "I have said not a word about it. ")

*Herod*: We have got just as far back that way as the third day— the Bible gives no fourth day. I am advised in the Scriptures, and I know what I am talking about; This is in Hosea vi. 2. Everybody listen, now, because I have called your attention as to when it is to be done: "After two days will he revive us. " It will be in the fourth, Herod. To the morning of the resurrection you've got to go, if you get that. Just such blundering as that is astonishing. What is the resurrection? Can you be mistaken as to the fact there presented—" I am the resurrection and the life"? In the morning of Christ! After two days wilt he revive us, and in the last day raise us up!

We are now going to translate to Eph. ii. 1. No mistake about it Everybody listen, and see why he docs what he said he would do by Isaiah. Is it a failure, and nobody saved? "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); and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus; that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness toward us, through Christ Jesus. 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. "

When was the physical organization created? In Adam. Christ

is the head and source of spiritual blessings; and Adam's people have the natural blessings. I know you can see it What else? "Through faith; that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. " "We are his workmanship, created unto good works, which God before ordained that we should walk in them. " What more? It is already noted in the first chapter. The apostle comes to the following point: We get the words *predestinate* and *choice*. I am not going to twist the language, and try to get the passage out of my way.

"Blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world. Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins"—according to our obedience I Now I am over on your side. You see how he tries to explain that away! I must explain that right. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace. " I submit that it is in the blood that we enjoy the blessings in that passage.

Zech. ix. 11: "As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water. " That is where salvation is obtained for his people. You need not be Reared about going to heaven. I reckon that in the dust where I go, there the inner man will be wafted to the haven of eternal rest. You can see something in that: "As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is\* no water. "

I call your attention to John xi. 48. What are you going there for? For proof, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, and the people whom he hath chosen for his inheritance. " Just after the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead! Any miracle about that? The Jews seem to have gone in and taken dinner, and gone out; and the report went out as to the magnitude of the miracle performed. They call the kings and rulers together, and the question comes up, If this man Jesus is left alone, the Romans will come and follow him. Caiaphas said, "You know nothing. It is expedient that one should die, and not the whole nation perish. " He prophesied that Jesus should die, and not only die for that nation, but to gather the children of God together; and he will gather them from the four winds, He will bring them in, every one of them. Not one of them will be lost. He redeemed them with his blood; they are his inheritance; they belong to him; and no man can pluck them out of his hand. A glorious band they will be—the general assembly and church of the first-born—whose names are

written in heaven! Their robes are all made white in the blood of the Lamb, and not in the waters of a pool or branch. Their song will be glory to Him who redeemed them, and not to themselves for anything they have done.

*(Time expired).*

---

### Dr. Brents' Fourth Reply.

MR. PRESIDENT: —My brother says I complain at the selection of passages made by him. He misunderstands me. When I show that his proofs do not sustain his proposition, he must not understand me as complaining at him. Oh, no; I do not *blame* him for not selecting more appropriate proofs—there are none. I would, indeed, be cruel to complain at *him*. The trouble is, that his *position is wrong*, and can not be proved. I do not blame him; he is doing the best he can; there is no doubt of that.

He defines faith as the substance of things hoped for, and then emphasizes the word *substance*, as though it were a *material* thing, and asks, *Is that your act?* It is that which *stands under* our hope— the *evidence* of things unseen.

He quotes Heb. ii. 2: "Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith. " Faith is here, as it is often elsewhere, used to indicate the *system* of faith. Take one example, of many that might be given: "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster" (Gal. Hi. 22-25). Here *faith* is used to indicate the gospel, or system of faith, in contrast with the law of Moses; and of this *system of faith* Christ is the author and finisher. He has had this up before, but I did not think it needed explanation; but he brings it up to show that faith is something manufactured *in the heart* by Christ, independent of any agency of man. Why can not we please God without faith, if faith is something made for, or given to us by God? Is God going to be displeased with us for not having that which he alone could give us? Are we responsible for not having it? Paul says "faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. x. 17). This manufactured faith spoken of by the gentleman, is not the faith that comes by hearing. This faith is the belief of testimony; and when a man



believes all that God has said, and believes it because God has said it, he has all the faith that God requires of any one. When Jesus told the centurion that he would go and heal his servant, the centurion told him that he was not worthy that he should come under his roof, but to speak the word only, and his servant should live. Jesus said to those about him, "I have not found so great *faith*, no, not in Israel; " he then said to the centurion, "As thou hast *believed*, so be it unto thee, " thus clearly using belief and faith as synonymous. Without *faith* it is impossible to please God, for "he that cometh to God must *believe*. " Other examples might be given, but thews are enough to show that belief is faith, and faith is belief; and we have already seen that belief is a *condition* on which *depends eternal life*, and *without which the sinner must be damned*. Jesus said it, and it is so.

He says he has use for faith, but I have not. Well, I don't know what use he has for faith to save a man that has been saved since before the foundation of the world—he wants faith to save a man who never was lost. He quotes John vi. 29: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent, " to prove that belief is something God does. Does he not see that the language is "that ye believe, " not that God will do it for you. Had he read the preceding verse he would have found the question to which his text was an answer; "What shall we do that we might work the works of God?" They did not ask what *God was to do*, but, *What shall we do?* To believe on Christ is God's work, because *he has commanded it, not because he does it*.

In the same connection he quotes Rom. v. 1: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, " and with an air of triumph says, "Now say it is your act!" That settles it; I give it up! But he continues, "Tell me where the necessity was for Christ being delivered and raised for the justification of his people. " That settles it again!! Who could resist such arguments? He used and left both these sentences just that way, without a word of application, as though they settled the whole question. Now I want him to tell us what faith does for a man, and how it does it—where it finds him, and where it leaves him. I say a man must believe in Jesus Christ, and trust in his blood for salvation, or he can not be saved. Every act of obedience to God must be done in faith, for without faith it is impossible to please God. Still he says he has use for faith, and I have not.

But he says just before I sat down I became liberal enough to admit that man is saved by grace. Certainly. Though I said nothing about it in my last speech that I remember, I have never been less liberal than to believe that; and I am more liberal than to restrict God's grace to a chosen few. Paul says: "The grace of God

that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men. " The grace of God moved him to give his only Son, that all men might be saved.

But the gentleman has reached the new birth at last, and he has attempted to separate soul and body before time. He denies that the body is regenerated at all. I would like to know if he can regenerate the soul, and have it born again, without (he exercise of the body in which it dwells? Jesus taught the necessity of a MAN being born again, in order to enter the kingdom; and I respectfully suggest that it takes *soul, body and spirit* to constitute a man While all the change is produced on the inner man, yet all the operations of the inner man are through the outer man. God has made a system of government that was intended to embrace the whole man. I would like to see him attempt to baptize the inner man without baptizing the outer man.

In the phrase, "*see the kingdom*" the word *we* is used in the sense of *enjoy*, just as it is used in verse 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life [that is, my friend would say, if he is one of the elect], and he that believeth not on the Son, shall not see [or enjoy] life; but the wrath of God abideth on him. "

And why does the wrath of God abide on him? Because he was not elected in Christ before the world was! And whose fault was it that he was not so elected? Elder Herod blames Adam with everything; but Adam was not in fault in this election, for he had not come into existence yet. Adam is his scapegoat to bear him out of all his troubles; he lays all our wickedness to the old Adam that is in us. Luke iii. 38, says: "Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, *which was the Son of God.* " This is a pretty good pedigree; I think Adam had some pretty good stock in him. He was the first man, or parent, and in that sense was head of the human race, and Christ is head of the Church, or spiritual family; but that the children of God, through Christ, were not descendants of Adam, but a race separate and apart, and distinct from Adam's race, is a matter that the gentleman has not yet made sufficiently clear to be accepted. And this is not the question in debate here, even if he were to prove it clear as a sunbeam. Why not debate the proposition?

But my friend wants to know how much agency a child has in being born into the world? And because he has none, he reasons that he has none in being born again. By making figures go on all four?, he will destroy all figures. When Jesus is said to be as a *lamb*, he will want to know how long the woo) was on his back? When he is said to be a *lion*, he will want to know how long his mane grew? When a sinner is said to be dead in trespasses and in sins, he reasons as though he were *physically* dead, and could cot

believe and obey the Lord. Death simply means the *absence of life*, and the sinner has no spiritual life; but that does not imply that he can not hear, believe and obey the Lord. Man is regenerated when he receives the incorruptible seed into a good and honest heart. He is then prepared to be born again of water and of the Spirit; and he can not enter the kingdom of God unless he is so born. Every day that he lives out of it, he lives that day a rebel against God. Now I have a question for my friend. He has the children of God, children before the foundation of the world—will he tell us how they are to be born again; and if they could be born again, as they are children of God before born again, and were so from eternity, *what are they after they are born again?*

But he cites us to Isaiah xxvi 19: "The dead men shall live, with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cant out the dead. " Now I would like to know what this has to do with unconditional salvation. The prophet is talking about the resurrection of the body; and he says that dead men shall live, and arise with his dead body, I believe this; but Elder Herod does not believe there will be a resurrection of the body. But he can not draw me away from the subject in debate to discuss a resurrection of the body, unless he can show that it bears upon salvation.

Oh, but he "*translates*" it over into Eph. ii. 1: "Dead in trespasses and in sins. " No, sir; this is a very different matter. Isaiah speaks of the *dead body* arising. Paul says plainly, "*dead in trespasses and in sins*"—simply the absence of spiritual life, as already explained. "You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and in sins. " There is not a Christian here to whom this is not applicable. There was a time when you were destitute of spiritual life—simply dead in trespasses and in sins, wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world. Now I want to ask my friend when the eternally and unconditionally elect were dead? Will he tell us? And if they were dead, how did they come to life? Will he quicken them for us who never were dead? They walked according to the course of this world—according to the prince of the power of the air. Once they served the devil; once they obeyed him; and among his subjects these had their conversation in time past in the lust of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, even as others. "But the Lord, 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 are ye saved. ) Yes; but saved by grace conditionally or unconditionally? This is the point. My friend can not see how we are saved by grace if we have to do anything. He can't see how God

gives us bread, if we have to do anything to make it. Man had violated God's law, but God loved him, and he devised a system of salvation by which man might be saved. The wisdom of man could not devise a system of salvation for himself—God did it for him. It was unmerited on the part of man; it was therefore purely of grace. "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son to die, that man, through him, might live." Hence the grace of God came by Jesus Christ. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men"—not to a chosen few, but to all men. Man could not devise a plan of salvation for himself—God did that for him. Man could not die for his own sins—Christ tasted death for every man. The blood of animals could not take away sins—"the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." The name of man could not even give authority to cast out a devil—there is no other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must or can be saved, than the name of JESUS Christ. But man can believe and obey the gospel, and we will be lost if we do not.

We could not give ourselves the soil, the rain, the sunshine, the atmosphere, the strength and intelligence to make bread, hence our kind Father in heaven has graciously provided these for us; but we can prepare the soil, plant the seed, and cultivate the crop; and we will starve if we fail to do these things—yet by God's grace we get bread.

We need no clearer proof that God fixed up no such partial theory of salvation as Elder Herod has been advocating, than that God *willed* the salvation of all men. Paul says (I. Tim. ii. 4-6): "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth; for there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."

Again (II. Pet. iii. 9): "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

Here we learn that God willed that all men should be saved, and he willed not that any should perish. Hence if any perish, it is because *THEY* will not be saved and God proposes to save them. His will was that all should be saved.

We insist that God would not mock man by inviting him to be saved when he did not intend to save him. God says (Isa. xlv. 22): "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else." Jesus said (Matt. xii. 28-30): "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and

lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls; for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light. "

Rev. xxii, 17: "The spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst, Come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely. " Here is what my friend calls Christ's water, offered freely to *whosoever will* partake of it

*(Time expired. )*

### **Elder Herod's Closing Speech.**

BROS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: —I am proud of the opportunity of presenting myself before so large, so intelligent and respectable an audience as I now appear before. I am before you for the last time during the present discussion; and it will be well understood, that by the rule by which my friend and myself have agreed to be governed, I will have no right to introduce, new matter that he has had no opportunity to reply to before this speech. I expect, therefore, to confine myself to this rule, that when I leave the people of Simpson County and the City of Franklin, I may take the report with me that I have demeaned myself as a gentleman.

*(limits: "I arise to make a suggestion for the benefit of my friend. I do not understand the rule to prevent him from introducing new matter, if he chooses to do no. It applies to the final negative—not to the affirmant. He can introduce anything he pleases. Being in the negative, I can not, but he can. Of course, however, I am not in the least interested, myself, in what I have suggested. ")*

*Herod:* I am glad that my venerable brother has made the suggestion that he has. I want to call attention to a few points. I want the attention of my brother to one or two passages, after which I shall cease to offer any new matter.

Matt. xxiii. 8: "Be ye not called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. "

I submit the passage that I have introduced for the purpose of showing just what has been admitted by my opponent in his hist speech. He admitted that Adam represented his natural family, and was the head of that family; and in the same connection he admitted that Jesus Christ represents the spiritual family; and that presents Adam and his race as one family, and Jesus Christ as another race. "Call no man upon earth father, for the reason that one

is your Father, and all ye are brethren. You have one Father, and that is God. " I now submit, as a conclusion, as to whether the divine Saviour would have come into the world teaching that these ladies and gentlemen, and boys and girls were to be advised to disown their parents, and refuse to recognize their sires.

The very moment you say that it win an improper course, you admit that he is advising a heavenly family. I was glad of his admission. I regarded it as equivalent to any argument that I could have made. God is your Father. Listen to one of the grandest conclusions that we could refer to, for a moment: "Little children, ye are of God. " The apostle goes further, and says, "If children, then heirs of God, and joint heirs with the Lord Jesus Christ. " I submit to the intelligence of this audience as to what constitutes a *joint heir*? Having the same father and mother—joint heirs. They are the offspring and heirs. Are Adam's children to have the inheritance of God's children here? Why? I am willing to settle it by the acknowledgment of my brother. He says it is the inner man that is born of God; and that's the thing that I am presenting in this argument in this discussion.

I now want I. Cor. ii. What good would spiritual blessings do a *natural man*? I go where the Bible talks about something that has reference to it: "For the natural man receiveth not the things of God; they are foolishness unto him; they are spiritually discerned. "

I now turn my attention to another sublime idea that has been presented in the latter clause of I, Cor. i. 15, II. Cor. iv., and a verse or two that I will present I have been talking about two sets of children. "Call no man your Father. " The apostle says: "Though your outer man perish. " Look here, now—suppose that had been different; and suppose, in place of that, the apostle had said the *outer part perish*, and the Inner part is renewed day by day; that would have brought this conclusion—the one-half would have been dead, and the other half would have died, too. I am representing the seed of Jesus Christ—the spiritual family that came from heaven. We see, in the ninth chapter of the letter to the Hebrews, that heavenly things had to be purified with bitter sacrifice. Notice, now, it is a man; "Though our outer man perish" —die. We see our bodies on beds of languishing; they sink lower and lower; their hearts cease to beat; that physical organism that we used to love is conveyed to the tomb, there to rest with its mother dust—is that all? Why would we stand here and wear out our lungs, after we have passed our threescore years and fen, if there was nothing that concerned us more than this? I would not do it for a single moment.

The outer man is dead; what about the other man? "But the inner man is renewed day by day. " How pleasingly I look to the anticipation! One falls back, the other ascends, escorted by angels to the celestial city. There is the home of the seed of Jesus Christ, This is the last speech; I am willing that you take it, and I shall go to Indiana reconciled with your verdict.

Brother Herod, you have left me in a bad fix. My house is falling down; where am I? Where is the Christian now? I want everybody to be contented with the Bible, without telling you something else. I am now approaching the grand Rubicon I have been approaching for the last half-hour. God has always been beforehand with his word, and made everything necessary for our comfort and perfect happiness. Now, where do they go? Let us step right out of the fourth chapter, and into the fifth chapter of Second Corinthians. He gives us the solution of the question. There is not one in the house that can not appreciate the sentiment that comes from the divine inspiration of God: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God "—the home of the Christian, where your brother is. God is your Father, Jesus your Elder Brother; there they meet; there they enjoy the fruition of grace given them in the Lord before the world began.

My opponent said I called upon him to answer, me by what agencies they were born, and in a moment he was over into another chapter. He turned right round, saying it is the spiritual man that is regenerated and born of the Spirit of God. So he stepped upon the broad plank of my platform, and I pull him up on my Baptist platform. Now, my brother never thought of the trouble he involved himself in. I am not taking advantage—I am going to argue it out from his stand-point; you can judge.

If it was the spiritual man that was born again—he said the fleshly man was not changed at all—when will that fleshly man ever see the kingdom of heaven? It is the most serious thing that a Baptist preach one to heaven and the other to hell—it is ridiculous.

Jesus Christ is representing the whole nation—the family.

I refer to Luke xx., and if you have any trouble I have it noted here; I can not turn to the verse. Now, what was the trouble there? It was the very question that is before us—what is it, now? One born of Adam's family going to heaven, and the other to hell. And then he says some go to heaven because they do something to go there for; a portion goes where his twenty-four thousand went— that's to hell. The Sadducees deny that there is any resurrection of the dead; and they asked him, saying, "Master, Moses wrote unto us, if any man's brother die, having a wife and he die without

children, that his brother should take his wife and raise up seed unto his brother, There were, therefore, seven brethren; and the first took a wife, and died without children; and the second took her to wife, and he died childless; and the third took her; and in like manner the seven also; and left no children, and died; last of all the woman died also. Therefore in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. And Jesus answering said unto them: "The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage, but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. "

Who are given in marriage? You want to be in heaven—the Saviour taught it so plain. Heaven wouldn't be a place for us if this physical organism went to hell and the other part to heaven. "Neither marry nor are given in marriage. " You are, are you not? [pointing to an old man]. That's plain. "Neither can they die any more, but are like the angels. " I answer in the language of Christ— they are the children of the resurrection. "I am the resurrection and the life. " Oh, how plain that is!

Rom. iv. —a great passage of Scripture that is left a matter of record to us. I introduce this to settle the question that salvation is of the Lord Jesus Christ What is it there, now? "It is therefore of faith that it might be by grace, to the end that the promise might be sure to all the seed. " Not a part of it! That settles the question as to the road on which they go.

Isa. xxxv. 8: If my brother requires me to furnish the verse I will, without any trouble; I can not afford time now. Listen at the description of the way that leads to heaven; and if we find anything else but Christ in that, I shall confess I fail to understand language: "A highway shall there be; it shall be for the way-faring man"—the man who lives by the way, who relies upon the way, the way which is described by the prophet Listen, and see what a grand idea is presented there in chap. xxxv.: "A highway shall there be, and a way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those; the way-faring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there; and the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion. " How can they return to where they never have been? How? "With songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away. "

Look at what a grand idea is presented. After saying, "Neither can they die any more, " "they are equal to the angels, " "being children of the resurrection, " that the dead are raised up, was



showed to Moses in the burning bush when he said, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; " "as I live you shall live also. He has abolished death, and brought light and immortality to light through the gospel. " The Jew comes to my thoughts.

Second chapter of the Roman letter: I call attention to the following conclusion, and you will see its pertinence to the question on the subject. He says: "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly" —that the outward circumcision was the work of hands. Doest thou make a Christian or a Jew? I want every one to note, and see where it gets to he, "But he is a Jew who is one inwardly, whose circumcision is of the heart in the Spirit, whose praise is not of men, but of God. "

There you have a heartfelt doctrine—circumcision without hands, and without the use of a knife.

*(Time expired. )*

Dr. Brents' Closing Reply.

MR. PRESIDENT: —My friend stretches what I said of Adam beyond legitimate bounds. I did not say that Adam *represented* the whole natural family, but that he was the *original parent*, or head, from which the whole family descended. He also represents me as admitting that Jesus Christ *represents* one family and Adam represent! another. He puts into my mouth a word I did not use. I believe Adam's descendants become Christ's family by obedience, adoption, or the new birth. I did not admit that Adam and Christ *represented different* families. Not all of Adam's family become Christ's family; but it is their own fault if they do not.

But I must not complain, for he serves Jesus Christ and the Apostle John worse than he does me. He can not see how a man— the *same man*—may be a child of an earthly parent and a child of God at the same time. I can not afford to trifle away the time of my last speech in replying to the like of this. He must excuse me; I can well afford to leave it to the intelligence of the audience. His whole argument amounts to this: George Jones can not be the son of John Jones, because he has become a child of God and a member of his family. The audience may reply. I am ashamed of this, but I am not responsible for it

He represents me, again, as admitting that the spiritual, or inner man, is born again, and the outer man not. Oh, no; I said no such; thing as this. God has a system of government that brings the

whole man into his service. While the inner man is the seat of all *change* produced by the new birth, still the inner man can do nothing as service to God or man, except through the outer man. What is the *inner* man? Paul says (Rom, vii. 22-25): "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity *to* the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin. " Here we see clearly that the *mind* is the inner man. He thinks that in the future life they neither marry nor are given in marriage, hence only the *inner* man has anything to do with the service of God on the earth. When he married his wife, did he marry a woman without a mind? I suppose he married a woman with mind and body. I am sure I would not want one destitute of either. But what has this to do with the question in debate? Just nothing at all.

But he asks what good would spiritual blessings do a natural man? And he goes to I. Cor. ii. 14: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. " Here is another of his miserable perversions that I must consume time in correcting, that I wanted to appropriate otherwise. He wants to separate the outer and inner man, and make the *outer* man, or *body*, the natural man, a thought that was not in the mind of the apostle at all. There is not a man here to-day that is not a natural man in the sense that Paul used the term. He was talking about revelations made by the Spirit to spiritual men, and says: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him; but God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." Us who? "Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit. " Then these spiritual things were revealed or made known to the "holy apostles and prophets by his Spirit" "For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. " That is, the Spirit of God knows the things of God, but the spirit of man does not, except as the Spirit of God reveals them to him. "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God; which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing

spiritual things with spiritual. " Now we spiritual men, *apostles and prophets*, have been doing this. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolish unto him; neither can he know them, " until they are revealed by spiritual men, "because they are spiritually discerned. " Thus we see that the natural man was simply the uninspired man, and hence all men are now natural, or uninspired men. The wise men of Egypt could not interpret the king's dream—why? Because they were natural men; but Joseph could Interpret it, because he was a spiritual man—a discerner of spiritual things. The wise men of Babylon could not interpret Nebuchadnezzar's dream, because they were also natural men; but Daniel could interpret it, because he was a spiritual man—a discerner of spiritual things. Now, what a perversion to make the natural man the *body, or outer man!* The body, without the mind, can not discern *anything*, whether it be a spiritual thing or a natural thing.

He quotes Paul (II, Cor. iv. 16, 17): "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day; for our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, " Now what has this to do with conditional salvation? It simply shows that when the hand of affliction is laid upon us, we contemplate the uncertainty of life and realize our dependence upon God, and become more devoted as we become weaker in body. But did my friend think of the fact that it was connection with an afflicted body that gave spiritual strength? Separate from mind, the body can not suffer at all, nor can there be a single mental function without the exercise of body. Eider Herod can not separate them.

His last speech had no more to do with the question in debate than if he had not made it. We are talking about how men are to be saved, not about what they are. Not one passage did he produce that bears upon the subject of conditional or unconditional salvation. Is there one in this audience that remembers such a passage? All know he did not produce one—not one!

He sneers at the idea of one of Adam's race going to hell; he despises such doctrine! I told you he was a Universalist; but I did not expect him to so boldly avow it. He has just backed his ears and swallowed the whole thing, horns and all. This book says "they that have done good shall be resurrected to life, and they that have done evil shall be resurrected to damnation. The wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. " The same word in the original qualifies the duration of the punishment of the wicked that qualifies the duration of the life of the righteous. If the punishment of the wicked will end, the enjoy-

ment of the righteous will have an end. The idolaters, whoremongers, thieves and murderers are just as sure of heaven as the purest saint on earth. He asks, When will these bodies get to heaven? I answer, When they are *immortalized*. But suppose they never get there at all—does it follow that unconditional election and salvation is true?

Now I want to call your attention to some things I have urged upon the attention of the affirmant, without being able to get a word from him in reply. I asked him to tell us when, where, and between whom the covenant of grace was made, I have asked him to show what provisions were made for one person, or class of persons, that did not embrace every person, or class of persons, who would accept it on the same terms. I have called his attention to this as a most important matter; but he failed to give it any attention. I have asked him time and again to tell us just how he was saved, with the promise that I would show that every one in this house could be saved in the same way; but he would not reply in any way. I have tried to get him to locate the beginning in eternity past, in the garden of Eden, in the days of Abraham, in the time of Christ, or at any other time; but not a word of reply have I been able to get I have affirmed that God proposes to save all men on the same terms; and he can not denied this.

I showed that twenty-four thousand (and there were thousands more) of God's elect, who were descendants of Abraham through the line of Isaac, after having drank of Christ, the spiritual rock that followed them, fell in the wilderness for their wickedness. I showed that God swore they should never enter into his rest, and my opponent agrees that they were not fit for heaven; he sneers at the idea of their going to hell. I have tried in vain to get him to locate them; he will not answer. If these elect fell, who may not fall? Their fall is recorded as a warning to us.

I asked him, just before dinner, *when* it was that those elected to eternal life before the foundation of the world were dead in trespasses and in sins. He has since closed his argument, but did not answer my question.

When I was speaking yesterday, he said, from his seat, that there was an everlasting Father, and eternal children. I asked how these *eternal children* could be born *again*, or enter God's family by the *new birth*, or by *adoption*. He has not answered. He is dumb as an oyster; yet Jesus says, "Except a man be born again, he can not enter the kingdom." His eternal children are out of the kingdom, and have to stay out He can not get them in. When we consign our children to the grave, so small as never to have had an evil

thought, we must be in interminable doubt as to whether they are elect or non-elect—saved or lost.

I called on him for an explanation of Heb. v. 9: "He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him; " but if he has ever thought of it, he has not revealed his thought. Was it unworthy his attention?

I showed that "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him" (Acts x. 34, 85; Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi, 9; Col in. 25; I. Pet 1. 17). If God is no respecter of persons, and men are elected to salvation before the world began, on what principle were they elected? You say, on the principle of grace and love; then what was there to love before the world was?

I showed that his chosen generation, royal priesthood, holy nation, peculiar people, in time past, were not a people of God, "which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained merry; " and I called upon him very earnestly to know when his eternal children were not a people of God, and had not obtained mercy; but he failed to tell us. Why did he not tell us? I think this was a matter of sufficient importance to be worthy of notice.

I called attention to Eph. ii. 11-13: "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, find strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world; but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. " I tried to get him to tell us when these eternally and unconditionally elect were without Christ, without God, and without hope; but he paid not the slightest attention to this request. I give him credit for shrewdness in one thing —when he sees danger, he is as careful to keep away from it as any man I ever met. I do not remember that he has attempted to answer a single question I have put to him, or answer a single argument I have made, or give a different construction to any passage I have introduced, since the debate began. In one or two instances he called up passages that I had used—several speeches after I had. introduced them—but did not attempt to construe them. If he did, I have forgotten his construction.

I called his attention to the doctrine of a future judgment—that we are all to be judged according to our works; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. See II. Cor. v. 10; Rev. xx. 12, 13; Rev. xxii. 12. That, if his doctrine be true, the personal destiny of every

man was fixed before the foundation of the world by the immutable decree of election, and that the line of separation must be just where the election placed it; and hence no man could, or would, be judged according to his *works*. What a sublimely ridiculous farce to assemble a world to judge them according to their work, when their destiny had been unconditionally fixed before time began! Suppose there are five hundred persons in this house; one hundred of them were personally and unconditionally elected to eternal life before the world began; the other four hundred were not provided for, and can not be saved—where will the line of separation be drawn? Will it be drawn according to their *works*? Certainly not—but according to the election that fixed their destiny. From this conclusion there is no escape for him. He turns up his nose at the idea of a man *doing anything*, being *required* to do anything, or *being able* to do anything to affect his salvation or future destiny in any way. Hence man can *have no works* by which to be judged, if he is correct.

*(Time expired.)*