

[\(Click Here For Table Of Contents\)](#)

# A Debate

On

## Total Hereditary Depravity;

THE POSSIBILITY OF ALL MEN, WHERE THE  
GOSPEL IS PREACHED, BECOMING CHRISTIANS,  
THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM  
AND THE  
POSSIBILITY OF FALLING FROM GRACE

BETWEEN

**REV. JOEL HUME, OF PASEY COUNTY, IND.**  
OF THE REGULAR BAPTIST CHURCH, AND  
&  
**ELDER BENJ. FRANKLIN, OF CINCINNATI, OHIO**  
OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

**Commencing Nov. 14<sup>th</sup> and ending Nov. 17<sup>th</sup>, 1853: Containing  
four hour-speeches and twelve half-hour speeches on each side**

MT. VERNON, IND.  
PUBLISHED BY LARKIN DUSOUCHET & CO.

1854

TABLE OF CONTENTS  
(Electronic Version by Bennie Johns)  
[\(CLICK SPEECH FOR TEXT\)](#)

CORRESPONDENCE ..... 3  
INTRODUCTION ..... 9  
PRELIMINARY RULES OF DISCUSSION ..... 11  
PROPOSITIONS ..... 12

**FIRST PROPOSITION:** "The doctrine of Total Hereditary Depravity is taught in the Holy Scriptures."

HUME'S FIRST ADDRESS ..... 13  
FRANKLIN'S FIRST REPLY ..... 21  
  
HUME'S SECOND ADDRESS ..... 35  
FRANKLIN'S SECOND REPLY ..... 42  
  
HUME'S THIRD ADDRESS ..... 50  
FRANKLIN'S THIRD REPLY ..... 59  
  
HUME'S CLOSING ADDRESS ..... 66  
FRANKLIN'S CLOSING REPLY ..... 74

**SECOND PROPOSITION:** "Where the gospel is preached as first delivered by the apostles, any unregenerate person of adult years and sane mind, can believe, repent, confess the Lord Jesus Christ, turn to God, and be finally saved."

FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS ..... 81  
HUME'S FIRST REPLY ..... 95  
  
FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS ..... 110  
HUME'S SECOND REPLY ..... 118  
  
FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS ..... 128  
HUME'S THIRD REPLY ..... 137  
  
FRANKLIN'S CLOSING ADDRESS ..... 146  
HUME'S CLOSING REPLY ..... 154

**THIRD PROPOSITION:** "The immersion of a penitent believer, by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is for the remission of past sins."

FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS .....	164
HUME'S FIRST REPLY .....	178
FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS .....	193
HUME'S SECOND REPLY .....	201
FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS .....	211
HUME'S THIRD REPLY .....	219
FRANKLIN'S CLOSING ADDRESS .....	228
HUME'S CLOSING REPLY .....	235

**FOURTH PROPOSITION:** "Any saint in the church of God can apostatize from the Christian faith, and be finally lost."

FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS .....	243
HUME'S FIRST REPLY .....	258
FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS .....	273
HUME'S SECOND REPLY .....	281
FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS .....	290
HUME'S THIRD REPLY .....	298
FRANKLIN'S CLOSING ADDRESS .....	307
HUME'S CLOSING REPLY .....	315

MODERATORS:

JUDGE GREEN, of Mt. Vernon, Ind., *President*  
MR. NEAL, of the Baptist Church, and  
MR. ANNIBAL, *of* the Christian Church.

---

T. WRIGHTSON AND CO., PRINTERS,  
*Cincinnati, Ohio.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

MT. VERNON, IND., Sept. 11, 1853.

Elder Joel Hume — *Dear sir:* —

Having been somewhat importuned of late, in common with several of my Christian brethren, by one or two members of your congregation, claiming to have authority from you to get up a debate between yourself and any person whom we might select, on some or all of the doctrinal points of difference between us; by authority of the Elders of the Christian congregation in this place, I venture to address you upon, the subject, I deem it hardly necessary to say to you that it would be unadvisable to enter into any arrangement in regard to the matter, till we had first obtained from *you* a written expression of *your wish* to enter into such a discussion, together with the proposition which you wish to discuss. If, therefore, *you desire* to have a debate upon any or all the points of difference between us, you will please, at as early a period as may suit your convenience, communicate the fact to me, in writing, at the same time stating the proposition *you* wish to discuss, and I am authorized to say, by the Elders of the congregation of which I am a member, that every effort will be used to meet your wishes. Believing that we teach the truth, we are, at all times, willing to enter into a friendly discussion of our doctrines with any or all of those whom we believe to be like ourselves, honest.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain, dear sir, with sentiments of respect,

Your friend and ob't serv't,

**P. S. DUSOUCHET.**

(Answered Oct. 14, 1853. Answer enclosed herewith.)

NEW HARMONY, IND., Oct. 14, 1853.

Mr. P. S. DUSOUCHET—

*Dear Sir:*—Yours of the 11th September was received in due time, but my absence from home has prevented me from addressing you until the present. I hope, sir, that this apology, will prove satisfactory to you.

It is true, sir, that I authorized my friend, Mr. Charles Graddy, to say to your preacher, or any of his members, that, if they wished a public discussion on the doctrinal points upon which we differ, they could have it, provided they would furnish a *gentleman of good moral character and acknowledged abilities, in whose hands they were willing to risk their cause;* and I now say the same to you, believing that by a friendly, honorable discussion of those doctrines, the cause of truth would be advanced; and I will now say that any arrangement that my friend Mr. Graddy may make with you, on this subject, I will stand up to.

—Or, if you prefer some propositions from my own hand, I will name the following, to wit:

1st. Is the doctrine of total hereditary depravity taught in King James' version of the Bible. (Hume will affirm.)

2nd. Is the doctrine of universal conditional salvation taught in the same book. (Hume denies.)

3rd. Do the scriptures teach the doctrine of immersion, in order to the forgiveness of sins. (Hume denies.)

If the above propositions should meet your approbation, please inform me immediately; or, if you would prefer some others, so that the points of difference between us are embraced, I have no objection, FOR TRUTH IS WHAT MY SOUL DESIRES TO KNOW.

"I hope, sir, that you will not for one moment believe that the remarks which I made a few days since, at Bethel Meeting House, were intended to apply to you, for I assure you such was not the fact. Hoping to hear from

you soon, I shall close my remarks for the present, and subscribe myself

Your sincere friend and well-wisher,

JOEL HUME.

---

*Reply to Elder H.'s letter of the 14th October, 1853.*

MT. VERNON, IND., Oct. 20, 1853.

MR. JOEL HUME—

*Dear Sir:*—Your esteemed favor of the 14th inst., in reply to mine of the 11th ult., came to hand on the 17th; and having carefully noted its contents, after as little delay as possible, I sit down to reply thereto.

Your apology for not writing sooner is altogether satisfactory.

My brethren and myself had but little doubt that Mr. Graddy was fully authorized to make the proposition which he made to me and others, but we felt that we should not be warranted in making the requisite arrangements for a discussion, till we had something tangible to act upon—"a written expression of your wishes" in regard to the matter: thus precluding the possibility of any misunderstanding.

I now have it in my power to inform you that Elder Benj. Franklin, of Cincinnati, is the gentleman whom we have selected to debate with you. He has been chosen not because one could not be found *here*, who would in every respect come up to the standard which you have laid down, if it had been consistent with the demand of his secular profession and agreeable to his feelings, but he was chosen because, upon inquiry, it was thought that it would probably suit his convenience *at this time* better than that of any other person whom we might think it advisable to select.

Herewith, I hand to Mr. Graddy eleven Rules, which it has been thought advisable to draw up for the government of both parties in this discussion, and four Propositions. Of the latter, two are yours, somewhat modified, and two are submitted for your consideration.

By examining Rule 9, of the accompanying, you will perceive why the words "King James' version" were left out of your first proposition. Your second proposition, I think you will perceive, is embraced in the second herewith submitted. If you should think any modification necessary, in either the propositions or the rules, you will please suggest it at as early a period as practicable.

It is proposed to have the discussion commenced on Monday, the 7th day of November, next, and, if agreeable to you, in this place. If these arrangements should meet your approbation, you will perceive that it will be necessary to expedite the matter as much as possible, in order to consummate all our arrangements in time to give notice to those of our friends, at a distance, who would like to be present on the occasion.

Although, I believe, there were some who heard your remarks at the Bethel Meeting House, who thought they were intended for me, *I* could not be persuaded that such was the case. I knew that *I* had not "challenged" you to a discussion, I was not a "Mouce" nor a "Campbellite." But enough. I feel assured, from the tone of your letter, that you entertain for me none but feelings of respect and friendship. I hope that you will not suffer yourself to believe that this correspondence originated in any other, feeling on my part.

Your early attention to the matter herein contained will much oblige your friend,

Respectfully and truly,

P. S. DUSOUCHET.

---

*Mr. H.'s letter to D., in Answer to his of 20th October.*

MR. P. S. DUSOUCHET—

*Dear Sir:*—Your propositions and rules are fully satisfactory, except the tenth rule. If you feel disposed to erase that rule, the debate shall commence at the time you propose.

Yours, respectfully,

JOEL HUME..



*D.'s letter to Mr. H., of no date.*

MT. VERNON, Oct. 26, 1853.

Mr. Joel Hume,

*Dear Sir;* I was very sorry to learn from Mr. Graddy, and from your note appended to the "Preliminary Rules" sent you, that you objected to the tenth rule. I am persuaded that there is nothing in the rule which can *reasonably* be objected to by any one who is disposed to enter into a discussion for the sake of *truth*. But every arrangement has been made for the discussion, and the discussion we will now have. As you will perceive, that rule is now crossed off, and as Mr. Graddy informed me that that was the only difficulty in the way, I consider it now certain. I would say, however, that in accordance with the suggestion of Mr. Graddy, it has been agreed to have it commenced on the 14th of next month, instead of the 7th, in order to give more time for a general notice to our friends at a distance.

I informed Mr. Graddy that it was desired to have the discussion published, and, if you had no objection, we (I mean me and my brethren) would go to the expense of getting a reporter to take it down and write it out, if we could have the control of the proceeds. Of course you will be expected to examine the manuscript, and make whatever verbal alterations you may think necessary and right, confining yourself as nearly as possible to the same number of words. If this arrangement suits you, please advise me of it, immediately, by Mr. G. If it should not suit, please suggest one that will, as we want it published upon some condition or other. I write in great haste.

Very respectfully and truly yours,

**P. S. DUSOUCHET.**

## INTRODUCTION.

---

But little need be said, by way of introduction, in bringing this volume before the public. Mr. Hume stands at the head of a large body of Calvinistic Baptists, styling themselves "Regular Baptists," in the section of country adjacent to Mt. Vernon, Ind., where the debate was held. In the same section of country there are many Christians. There being several points of direct issue in the doctrines of these respective parties, they were frequently introduced in the sermons of the preachers. These collisions, owing to certain circumstances which cannot be explained here, became very frequent, and in many respects disagreeable. This created a general desire in the community, that an honorable discussion should take place between Eld. Joel Hume and some one competent, selected by the disciples. As the correspondence will show, Eld. Benj. Franklin, of Cincinnati, Ohio, was selected by the disciples to meet him.

At the appointed time the debate commenced, and lasted four days, and was listened to with the deepest interest, not only by the friends of the parties but by the community generally. There was a mutual understanding that the debate should be published. In accordance with this, three gentlemen were appointed to make as full a report of the speeches as possible. This was done. At the close of the debate it was mutually agreed, that each of the disputants should have a copy of the report, and that Judge Green should have the remaining copy, and that the parties should write out their speeches and submit them to the inspection of Judge Green, with the privilege of striking out anything that should be added, or making correction of any important departure from the oral

speeches. Agreeably to this arrangement, the speeches have all passed his inspection.

The whole is therefore submitted, by the publishers, to reading and intelligent community, without attempting to bias the mind of the reader to one side or the other; but simply requesting him to compare the reasoning and arguments with the holy scriptures, and judge for himself which side conforms nearest to the Bible, in doctrine, temper, spirit, kindness, and morality. We believe the volume is calculated to do good—to enlighten the public mind, and relieve many persons from serious difficulties; and knowing such to be the general opinion of a large majority of those who heard it, we cheerfully commend it to the world.

## **PRELIMINARY RULES OF DISCUSSION,**

1. The Debate shall commence at such time, and be held in such place, as the Debaters shall decide upon when they meet.

2. Each Disputant shall select a Moderator, and these shall choose a third, who shall act as President.

3. The Moderators shall call to order; invite some person present to open each session with prayer, and close it with the benediction; see that the rules of decorum are observed by the Disputants and the audience; decide all questions of order, and attend to such other duties as usually devolve upon presiding officers.

4. In the opening of each new subject the affirmant shall occupy one hour, and the respondent the same length of time—each subsequently shall alternately occupy half an hour till the subject is disposed of.

5. No question shall be discussed for more than three days, nor less than one day, except by consent of the Debaters.

6. The Debate shall open at precisely half-past nine o'clock and close at half-past eleven, A. M., each day—and in the afternoon commence at precisely one o'clock, and close at four.

7. On the final negative no new matter shall be introduced.

8. The Debatants agree to adopt, and be governed by the rules of decorum found in "Hedge's Logic," page 159, a copy of which work shall be upon the Moderator's desk, for reference.

9. King James' translation of the Holy Scriptures, generally known as the common version, shall be the umpire on all Biblical questions.

10. The rules of interpretation laid down in the 17th

chapter of "Hedge's Logic," shall govern the parties in their Biblical criticisms; but either party may refer to other translations, commentaries, and writings, to prove the correctness of his interpretations.

11. The following propositions shall be discussed, agreeably to the above rules:

**PROPOSITIONS:**

1. The doctrine of Total Hereditary Depravity is taught in the Holy Scriptures.

Mr. Hume affirmed. Mr. Franklin denied.

2. Where the gospel is preached as first delivered by the apostles, any unregenerate person of adult years and sane mind, can believe, repent, confess the Lord Jesus Christ, turn to God, and be finally saved.

Mr. Franklin affirmed. Mr. Hume denied.

3. The immersion of a penitent believer, by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is for the remission of past sins.

Mr. Franklin affirmed; Mr. Hume denied.

4. Any saint in the church of God can apostatize from the Christian faith, and be finally lost.

Mr. Franklin affirmed. Mr. Hume denied.

## MR. HUME'S FIRST ADDRESS.

---

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—

We have now met for the purpose of discussing and having discussed, some of the most prominent features of the doctrine of Christ, as we believe them to be taught in the Sacred Scriptures. We deem it wholly inexpedient to trespass upon your time and patience with a detail of the circumstances which have led to the present discussion; suffice it to say, that propositions were submitted, and the time appointed, by a very respectable gentleman of this town, which was concurred in by myself. The time appointed has arrived—the speakers are both present, and they are honored with a respectable audience; and it becomes my duty, having the affirmative of the first proposition, to open the discussion, for which purpose I am now before you; and I do sincerely hope that this debate will be so conducted as to honor the great head of the Church, instruct the people, and increase the ties of friendship between the contending parties. With those prefatory remarks, I proceed to affirm that the doctrine of total hereditary depravity is taught in the Sacred Scriptures. In the first place. I will proceed to show what I mean by the terms Total Hereditary Depravity. Total means or signifies, whole, full, complete, not divided. Hereditary signifies, that which has descended from an ancestor, that is or may be transmitted from a parent to a child. Depravity signifies corruption—a vitiated state of the heart—wickedness—corruption of moral principles destitution of holiness or good principles. Now, if I have arrived at a proper conclusion with regard to the meaning of those terms, I think we shall find no difficulty in sus-

taining the affirmative of our proposition. We therefore remark, in the first place, that Adam, the father of man-kind, became a corrupt and depraved being by violating God's holy law, in consequence of which he subjected himself and his posterity also to all that was threatened in the Law; for, said Jehovah to man, in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.— Genesis ii., 17. Now it must be acknowledged, that when Adam transgressed the law of his Maker, all his posterity were in him, and consequently a part of him; hence, his act was their act, and the consequences the same upon them all, which consequences are clearly set forth in the following declarations of Holy Writ, Genesis, chap. iii. vs. 17, 18, 19: "And unto Adam he said, because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee saying, thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also, and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

Let it be remembered that we are governed alone by the Bible upon this subject, and upon the testimony here introduced, we might let the matter rest; for if the above Scriptures prove anything, they surely prove that the first of men was defiled, corrupt, and polluted by sin, and consequently depraved; but, as we intend to make this point strong, and render it impossible for our opponent to gainsay or overthrow it, we invite the attention of the audience to the language of the Apostle, recorded Romans chap. v. vs. 12, 17, 18, 19: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. For it by one man's offence death reigned by one," etc. "Therefore, as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation," etc. Now hear him in the 19th verse: "For as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so, by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous." Now we

maintain that the foregoing Scriptures are directly in point, and fully establish the truth of man's proposition so far as Adam is concerned; and surely it must be admitted, and cannot be denied, that from him has descended the whole human race; and if he, the fountain head of the human family, be corrupt and depraved, his posterity cannot be otherwise, for it is an acknowledged truth in sound philosophy, that if the fountain be corrupt, the streams are corrupt also; or if the tree be corrupt, its fruit is also corrupt.

We have shown by the foregoing scriptures, that because man violated God's holy law, his Maker declared he should suffer its penalty. That sin entered our world by this one man, and that in consequence of his disobedience, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, and also that by his disobedience many were made sinners, consequently, it must be admitted by this audience, and by all intelligent, reflecting minds, that we have fully sustained our position, that the first man, (to wit, Adam,) became corrupt, degenerate, defiled by sin, and consequently depraved, as an effect flowing from his disobedience. We would here add, that had not this been his condition, death never could have preyed upon him or his posterity. We will now proceed to show that this depravity is hereditary—that it has been transmitted from the parent to his offspring. It is said in the fifth of Romans, v. 12, that death passed upon ALL men, for that ALL HAVE sinned—in the past tense. Not that they shall or will sin after they have crossed the line of accountability, as some tell us; no, BUT HAVE SINNED. Now, if they did not sin in Adam, their federal head, when did they sin. We hope our worthy opponent will be very particular in answering this question, for much depends upon a correct answer here; for if he admits that ALL men sinned in Adam, he admits the truth of my proposition. If he denies it, I call upon him to tell me when and where they did sin, so as to allow the Apostle to throw it in the past, and not in the future. I hope we shall have something definite upon this subject. But again we are told in the 18th verse, same chapter, that judgment came upon ALL men to condemnation by the offense of one.



Who are these "ALL men" but the human race; and if we are so to understand it, then judgment has come upon the race to condemnation. This is also in the past tense, and not in the future. The Apostle tells us in the 19th verse, same chapter. That by the disobedience of one, many were MADE SINNERS. Now we ask, what is the difference between the MANY in the 19th verse, and the ALL MEN in the 12th and 18th verses? Surely there can be none. Hence, we have proven clearly, beyond a doubt, the doctrine of our proposition, that depravity is hereditary—that it has descended from the natural father of mankind to all his race; and consequently all men are depraved.

But perhaps the gentleman will feel disposed to acknowledge the doctrine of Depravity in some sense, but TOTAL Depravity. "We have shown you that total means whole, full, complete, not divided; we will now see how near we can approach this point, according to the Bible, Genesis, chap. vi., v. 6: "And 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." Also 11th, 12th verses, same chapter: "The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence; and God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth." Now it must be evident to every candid, honest mind, that the depravity here presented, is total, whole, full, complete, not divided; for it is said in the above quotation that every imagination of the thoughts of the heart is ONLY EVIL CONTINUALLY—that the earth was full of violence. The earth here evidently means the people; hence the following language in the text: For all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. Now, if the critic is disposed to say the "all flesh" here has reference to beasts and birds, we would remark that man is evidently embraced here as the character who has corrupted his way, and if so, the depravity is total and complete.

We have a confirmation of the truth of this doctrine in the 8th chapter of Genesis, and 21st verse. Jehovah here declares that the imagination of man's heart is EVIL from his youth. Hence we maintain, that depravity is TOTAL

and complete, even from youth to his conversion to God; but we will not stop here, for the Bible abounds with testimony to sustain this doctrine. We are told in the 14th Psalm, 2d and 3d verses, "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside; they are all together become filthy; there is none that doeth good: no, not one." Here we remark that this investigation took place among the children of MEN, consequently the descendants of Adam; and we are here told that they have all together become filthy; there is none that doeth good: no, not one.

We now ask, how much does "all together filthy" lack of being total? We feel assured that this intelligent audience are now fully prepared to say that the doctrine of Total Depravity is taught in the Sacred Scriptures. In the 63d Psalm, 1st, 2d, and 3d verses, we have a repetition of the language above quoted, consequently we will not transcribe it, but remark that it strongly confirms the doctrine we are contending for.

We will now invite your attention to Jeremiah, chap. xvii., v. ix., where the Lord God declares that the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it? I wish the audience to bear this text in mind, as it has to do with the heart, for we intend to examine the remaining part of man directly; and, for that purpose, we call your attention to Romans chap. iii. from the 10th to the 18th verses inclusive. We shall not give the whole quotation, but we give the following. It is here said, "There is none righteous: no, not one. They are together become unprofitable; their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace have they not known; and there is no fear of God before their eyes." Is not this truly a lamentable condition to find the whole human race involved in. Here we have the heart, the throat, the lips, the mouth, the tongue, their feet, the ways, and the eyes, and we would inquire what language could be used more fully to represent the deep-rooted depravity of mankind. Even an open sepul-

cher, the most offensive thing that the mind of man can conceive of, and the asp, one among the most poisonous reptiles that infest the earth, are here introduced to represent the awful and deplorable condition of the children of men, in consequence of sin and transgression, while the heart is declared to be deceitful, and above ALL THINGS DESPERATELY WICKED. NOW if all means all, what is more desperately wicked than the heart?

If there has heretofore been a remaining doubt on the mind of any with regard to the doctrine of Total Depravity we feel assured that that doubt is now removed, and that the audience is prepared to say, It is enough—the doctrine of Total Depravity is true; and we ourself feel perfectly satisfied, that the testimony here introduced never can be set aside. But we are determined, God being our helper, to put this doctrine to rest in this place, if Bible testimony will do it; for if the Bible proves any one point clearly, it is the doctrine of Total Hereditary Depravity; and if this is proven, then the gentleman's proposition for tomorrow falls to the ground; for if the doctrine of Total Depravity be true, then conditional salvation is not true, as admitted, by the gentleman himself this morning.

We will now introduce Romans, 1st; chapter, 29th and 30th verses, where the Apostle is describing the wickedness of man. He says: "Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder; backbiters, haters of God," etc., etc, Now we maintain, that when a thing is full it can hold no more. Well, mankind is filled with ALL unrighteousness, FULL of envy and murder. Now here is whole, FULL, complete depravity, not divided, and it cannot successfully be denied We will now show from two quotations from the Psalms of David, the extent of this depravity upon the offspring of fallen man. Psalms il, v. 5: "Behold! I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Also Psalms lviii. vs. 1, 2, 3. Here it is said that the sons of men in heart work wickedness; that they are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born; speaking lies, and their poison is like the poison of a serpent. Now, friends, how much

further back could the Psalmist have gone to have proven to you that depravity is hereditary. He has even gone back to the conception, and tells us that it was in sin, and that the sons of men go astray from the womb, speaking lies. Here the doctrine of infantile purity is completely uprooted, and shown to be untrue. According to the Bible, if these children did not inherit the DISPOSITION to go astray, speaking lies, from their parents, how did they become possessed of it at so early a period? We think our friend will have use for Hedge's Logic, or some other logic, in order to give a satisfactory answer to this question. Indeed, it will require such eloquence and logic as we have no expectation of finding during this discussion, to explain away the vast amount of positive Scripture proof that we have introduced, to prove the doctrine of Total Hereditary Depravity.

The Sacred Scriptures are so fall, plain, and pointed on this subject, that we might suppose the inspired writers anticipated the objections that would be raised to this doctrine. Hence the great care they have taken in the selection of such words as would convey the idea the most forcibly, so that the basest inquirer after truth could not possibly be mistaken with regard to the ideas intended to be conveyed; and we frankly confess that we can not see how any honest believer in the divine authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, can for one moment deny the doctrine of Total Depravity. It must surely be for want of an experimental knowledge of the corruption and depravity of their own wicked heart.

This doctrine of depravity eclipses the doing powers of the human race, and puts their future salvation entirely in the hands of another. This human nature never did love—hence its great opposition to the doctrine, and its powerful exertions to overthrow it; but, notwithstanding the mighty roar of the enemy's artillery, and his loud shoutings of success against it, it stands the thunders of them all, like a golden bulwark of eternal truth, founded upon the authority of God's Holy Word, against which all the mighty host of the enemy never can prevail.

We could multiply quotations upon this subject almost without end. Only a few more, however, will we trouble you with at this time: Matthew chap, vii., vs. 17, 18—

"But a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit, neither CAN a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Here we have the plain language of our blessed Lord Jesus, that a corrupt tree CANNOT bring forth good fruit. Now if it be admitted that Adam was a corrupt man after the fall, then our proposition is clearly proven. Hear the declaration of the Apostle James, 3d chap. 12th verse: "Can the fig-tree, my brethren, bear olive berries, either a vine figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh." Now what is the burden of the Apostle's argument here? It is this: that like produces its like—if the fountain be sweet, the streams will be sweet also; but if the fountain be bitter, the streams will also be bitter. But the same fountain CANNOT send forth both. This has been our argument from the start, and Job testifies to the same truth, chap. xiv. v. 4. He says: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? NOT one." Now, if Job tells the truth, the matter is forever settled, that out of unclean fountains, nothing clean can ever come.

We will give one more quotation, and stop for the present. Galatians, chap. vi., vs. 19, 20, 21: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, licentiousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like." Now is it not evident, that the inspired Apostle, in this connection, has displayed both his wisdom and eloquence in describing the effects that flow from a depraved heart; for surely, by the word FLESH here, is not meant that mass of matter which decomposes after death, but must necessarily mean that wicked, depraved, and fleshy mind, which is averse to God, and encourages our race to commit acts of cruel debauchery and prostitution, which disgrace the human character.

Is it not passingly strange that any sane wind, in the face of such an array of plain scriptural testimony as we have already introduced, should still cling to the doctrine of total hereditary depravity. But still it is done, and in so doing, is clearly manifested the fact that unconverted men and women do not believe God's holy word, and are utterly opposed to his divine sovereignty.

## MR. FRANKLIN'S FIRST REPLY.

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLE MEN

It is due to this audience and myself to state, that I had no instrumentality in getting up this debate. I have no particular delicacy about instigating debates, or even giving challenges, but in this instance I am entitled to no credit in giving rise to the controversy. It was thought by my friends, that the circumstances in this section of country demanded a full and fair investigation, in a friendly and Christian manner, before a public assembly, of the principal points of difference between us. The large audience that has assembled here at such an early hour, and listened with such interest to the speech of the worthy gentleman whom, by the situation in which we are placed, I am to call my opponent on this occasion, furnishes an additional evidence of the demand in this community for the investigation.

As to the worthy gentleman, Mr. Hume, I can say but little. I have but little knowledge of him, never having heard of him till quite recently. From what I have been able to gather since arriving in your beautiful town, I am led to think we shall have an agreeable, interesting, and profitable interview. Especially am I led to this conclusion from the able and deliberate manner in which he has opened this discussion. He appears to be in good earnest, and, I have no doubt, sincerely believes the doctrine he has endeavored to prove this morning. I am satisfied from what I can gather, too, that his brethren most honestly think he can sustain his position. I calculate, of course, on his making a complete failure. We are, therefore, happy to test the matter.

Our first and second propositions should have been discussed in one. They relate to the same subject, and will

be discussed in the same way. It is simply the question of ability and inability, in another form. Both these questions involve the agency of man. If his affirmation of total hereditary depravity is true, man has no ability to believe the gospel, to repent and turn to God, and is not a free agent. He is not an accountable being, and cannot rationally be held accountable for his actions.

This doctrine is at variance with all government, both moral and civil. There is not and never was a law that was not based upon the principle that man was a free agent, or that man was a volition or power to determine his own actions. There cannot be a clearer truism, than that man cannot be held responsible, in reason and justice, for actions over which he has no control. I allege, then, that the doctrine of total hereditary depravity destroys man's ability to determine his own actions, annihilates every idea of volition, subverts the very basis of all accountability, and therefore makes man a mere machine, like the mill-wheel, only acting as he is acted upon. It reduces man to the same position maintained by Robert Owen in his debate with Mr. Alex. Campbell, in which he denied agency and accountability, alleging that man was compelled, by the circumstances that surrounded him, to do what he did, be what he was, and that he had no ability to do or be anything else. Calvinism, Universalism, and Infidelity, have all grown out of this same false basis, however they may vary their manner of expressing it, viz: that man cannot control his own actions.

But, to approach a little more nearly to the subject. I shall invite your attention to a text of scripture as my motto and the basis of my argument. Peter says: "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 of him."—Acts x: 34, 35. The sentiment contained in this harmonizes with the whole volume of God. Up to this period, Peter was a Calvinist, but here he perceived that God was no respecter of persons, but that he regarded the characters of men, and promises to accept those who fear God and work righteousness everywhere, or among all nations. The doctrine contained in this passage cannot be true, and the doctrine

of my friend's proposition also true,—for the latter makes God a respecter of persons. His doctrine makes all wholly corrupt, thus placing all upon the same level; and represents God as irresistibly saving some and equally irresistibly damning others, which makes God respect the persons of men where there is no difference in their characters.

In calling attention to the speech of the worthy gentleman, in which a considerable flourish of scriptures has been made, I invite attention to an important rule of argumentation. That rule is, that the proof introduced to sustain any proposition, must contain the terms of the proposition, or others equivalent to them. No passage of scripture can be a proof of the gentleman's proposition, unless it contains the terms of the proposition, or others of the same import. This I shall hold Mr. H. to, throughout this discussion, and to it I am willing to be confined myself.

It probably has not occurred to him, while he was reading his proof-texts with such an air of certain triumph, that the main terms in his proposition, or any others of the same import, are not found in his array of proof-texts. We have often listened to Calvinists, in running over the passages which with them have become stereotyped texts, and wondered how they could think they were proving their doctrine when its leading terms, or others of the same import, could not be found in a single passage quoted, and when it was as manifest as day that no such, subject was before the mind of any inspired person when writing any of these passages. I have not the least hesitation in asserting that the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, in its fair, popular, and legitimate import, is not a doctrine of the Bible at all, and not one of the passages quoted has the remotest reference to it.

Which one of the gentleman's proof-texts contains the word "total"? He not only applies this important term to the race, but to the condition of the race. Which one, then, of his proof-texts declares the race totally depraved? He has not even found this important leading term of his proposition in one passage, so far as I have perceived.. How, then, does he find the proof without this word, or



any other of the same import? In which passage did he find the word "hereditary"? Not any one, that I observed. Where, then, is the proof? There is no proof in a single passage. This important term of his proposition is not found in any passage he has quoted, or any other of the same import. Even the word "depravity" he has not found in any passage! Now, if these words could be found, one in one place and another in a different place, upon other subjects, there still might not be the least proof of a proposition composed of these words in their combined form, as in our proposition. We ask, then, upon what is this doctrine predicated? He may find it in the writings of Augustine, among the unwritten traditions of the Romish church, and afterwards resuscitated by John Calvin. But certainly not a passage quoted by him has any reference to such a question as that involved in the issue between us.

Mr. Hume appears to make no distinction between moral and physical ability and inability, moral and physical power. Physical and spiritual power are not the same by a long ways. He appears to make no distinction between the mere temporal injuries we have received in consequence of our being in a land of death, and spiritual injuries. I do not doubt, that in consequence of our relation to Adam, we are injured in our animal constitutions. But even here, man is not wholly corrupt, or the animal machinery would not act as it does even during the short lifetime since the fall. If the animal nature, or the mere physical organization, were wholly corrupt, it could not, in any degree, fill its original intention while alive, and could not become any more corrupt at death.

The gentleman claims, if I understand him, that in consequence of the Adamic sin, Adam not only involved himself in total depravity, but involved the race in the same predicament, only with this difference: that Adam brought it upon himself and his descendants forever, by a voluntary action, whereas it came upon all his descendants without any voluntary action on their part. He claims that this depravity, thus brought into the world by the disobedience of Adam, is a depravity in body, soul, and spirit. It is total, in body, soul, and spirit. It is hereditary,

descending from parent to the child to the latest; generations, without their own volition. By it man is so disabled that he cannot believe, repent, or render any act that is acceptable to God. The race is but a mass of sin and corruption, in body, soul, and spirit. Yet, according to this doctrine, we are to believe that God loved a part of this mass of corruption—of total depravity—so that He gave His only-begotten son, full of grace and truth, to die for and redeem this mass of sin, or a part of it, and save it!

According to this doctrine the penalty for the Adamic sin, to express it in the shortest possible way, is total hereditary depravity. This is what was sent upon the race on account of the Adamic sin! Now, is this true? Is this the penalty threatened against Adam? Let us see what the penalty was that the Lord said he would send upon Adam. He said, "Because thou hast harkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it was thou taken; for dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." Here is the sentence passed upon Adam. Which one of these terms contains the doctrine of total hereditary depravity? Here is the sentence of condemnation sent, in consequence of the Adamic sin, and I defy any man to find the doctrine of total hereditary depravity in it, or the condemnation in the world to come, of one soul of Adam's race. The grave is the end of the penalty of the Adamic sin. No man can show that there is a threat or intimation in the whole Bible that Adam, or any of his descendants, will ever be condemned in the world to come for the Adamic sin. Those who will be punished in that world will be punished for their own sins.

My worthy friend is right in making the condemnation Rom, 5th chapter the same as Gen. 3, 17, 18, and 19. It is precisely the same. The Adamic sin is had in view in the latter passages, and the condemnation, with the punish-

ment for that sin, is found in latter passages. 1 Cor., 15:22, refers to the same thing; and if Mr. Hume makes the sin here referred to mean the actual sins of the world, he is bound to run into Universalism. Paul says, "Asin Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." In this short verse we have the work of the first and second Adams. In Adam the first, all die; in Adam the second all shall be made alive. The "all," in the one instance, are precisely the same as the "all" in the other; or, in other words, the number and the persons in one case are precisely the same as in the other. The death they die in the one case, is the same from which they are made, alive in the other. The first Adam was the progenitor of our race. The second. Adam is the Lord from Heaven. In, through, or by the first Adam all die. In, through, or by the second, all, the very same all, shall be made alive.

Here we have precisely the same idea as in Romans, 5th chapter. The Apostle says, "Wherefore, as by one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sins; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," Here we have the sin of the first Adam, and, in consequence of it, death passed upon all men. Here is the same , sentence found in Gen., 3d chapter. The Adamic sin is, imputed to all, and the sentence of condemnation passed upon all. Now if this sin is what my worthy friend means by total hereditary depravity, I think I can show from his own proof-text that all will be delivered from it. Let us, then, look carefully, and see what condemnation the. Apostle is speaking of, and what the justification from it. Hear the Apostle again: "Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all " men unto justification of life." Now is this "offence of one man," the depravity of which he speaks? and is the condemnation that follows it that which will rest upon; wicked men in the great day? Certainly not; for this, offence, and the condemnation following it, not only came without our choice, but in opposition to all that we can do. It falls upon all alike, righteous and wicked, and even infants. It is, then, simply a consequence inherited

from the first Adam, without our consent, in which we are not personally accountable, and where there can be no personal guilt. Here we have the imputed sins. Now for the imputed righteousness. The Apostle says, "Even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men, unto justification of life." Whatever the sin was of the first Adam, it is offset by the righteousness of the second Adam. Whatever the sentence of condemnation was for the sin of the first Adam, it was removed by the sentence of justification, through the second Adam. Whatever the death was that came by the first Adam, it will be removed by life given through the second Adam, or by a resurrection from the dead. Precisely the same number and the same persons involved by the first Adam, will be delivered by the second Adam. As the evils fell upon us without our choice, or unconditionally, by the first Adam, so will they be removed from us without our volition, or unconditionally, through Christ. No man, therefore, is called upon to believe, repent, or obey the gospel that he may be saved from the Adamic sin, but that he may be saved from his own sins. Nor is any man threatened with punishment in the world to come for the Adamic sin, but for his own sins.

Christ does not propose to take away the penalty of the Adamic sin, but he follows man till he has suffered the penalty, and gone down to the mansions of death, raises him from the dead, and restores to him all that he lost in Adam. Precisely as wide as the breach was made by the first Adam, it was healed up by the second Adam—the Lord from Heaven.

Here is where the old divines have always gone to prove infants sinners. This class include them as well as adults. They are under the penalty of the Adamic sin, and sin is imputed to them, though they have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. But they had no personal action, and consequently no personal responsibility in this sin. They were not under any personal guilt. It came upon them unconditionally, and unavoidably. In the second Adam his righteousness is imputed to them, and through his righteousness they are justified from the Adamic condemnation. The Lord,

looking upon infants as having no personal sins, and no personal guilt, said, "of such is the kingdom of God."

But Mr. Hume, contending for total hereditary depravity, holds infants to be totally depraved; wholly corrupt; nothing but sin; and consequently must devise a system of infant regeneration, or believe in infant damnation, Calvinists are becoming a little cautious of preaching infant damnation. Mr. Hume is in for infant damnation, or he must believe in infant regeneration, and should, to be consistent, practice infant baptism. They all go hand in hand. The first step in this arrangement is to make infants corrupt in spirit—which, by the way, no man can do—and thus contend that they must be regenerated, or that they cannot be saved. Then, of course, you must desire a system of infant regeneration. They cannot be regenerated as adults, and consequently, a different system must be devised. This is the foundation corner stone of infant baptism. When you have made all infants sinners, you must show that there is not only such a misnomer as infant regeneration, but that all who die in infancy are actually regenerated, or else they are lost.

But this is not the worst. Mr. Hume believes that noire but the elect can be regenerated. The non-elect never can be regenerated. Christ did not die for them. For them there is no remission of sins. They came into the world, according to him, totally corrupt, and can neither in infancy nor adult years be regenerated. God never loved them. He did not include them in his promise to Abraham. They always were non-elect persons. When they were infants they were non-elect, as much as when they became adults. All of this class who die in infancy are lost. I do not presume the gentleman will admit this, but the system involves it, and he cannot escape from it. He may adopt the subterfuge of Dr. Rice, and say that none of the non-elect die in infancy! But this has too much the appearance of home-made doctrine for a certain exigency. No man would attempt to produce any proof on this point.

But this is only a difficulty in a system of errors. There is no such difficulty in the Bible. Infants are under no sin but the Adamic sin. The penalty for that is death.

Christ reaches that by restoring them all to life again. As they had never sinned in their own persons, their spirits were not corrupted; and, in view of this, the Lord said, "of such is the kingdom of God," and to the adult persons who were present, he said, "Except you be converted and become as a little child, you cannot enter into the kingdom of God!" Would he, or could he, have said this if he had considered infants as wholly corrupt? Could he have said it, if he had considered them totally depraved? He manifestly would not, and could not. This language is a standing refutation of total hereditary depravity. The Lord would not require adult sinners to be converted, and become as a little child, in order to enter his kingdom, if he considered the little child totally depraved—a mass of sin and corruption.

We have now followed the gentleman till we have ruined one branch of his evidence. The Adamic sin is the only sin supposed to be hereditary, and we have shown not only that no guilt rests upon us for it, but that it will be removed, or that the world will be justified from it as unconditionally as they were involved in it. In other words, the Adamic sin does not corrupt the soul of any of the descendants of Adam, or Jesus could not have said, of infants, "of such is the Kingdom of God;" and as the soul is not corrupted by the Adamic sin, it cannot be said that total hereditary depravity came in consequence of it.

But before I proceed to the other class of the gentleman's testimonies, I invite the attention of the audience to his admission in regard to the word "all;" in Rom., 6th chapter. He admitted that the "all men" who were made sinners in this chapter, are the race. I hope he will remember this, and notice, in particular, that the all men made sinners in or by Adam, are made righteous by Christ. If this is his total depravity, the same race that were involved in it by Adam, will be restored or justified from sin in Christ, and that unconditionally. Indeed, this is not all: but the Apostle says, "Where sin abounded grace did much more abound!" This clause Mr. H. knows nothing about. According to his doctrine, it should read, "Where sin abounded, grace did much less abound." But we are thankful that grace not only abounded to the same

extent, but much more than the original offence, or the Adamic sin, so as to make provision for actual sin, that we may be relieved from our own sins, as well as Adam's sin. This much more is a precious part of this passage, for if grace had only abounded to the same extent with the Adamic sin, we should have been left truly in a horrible dilemma. But grace abounds to wipe out the stain of original sin, and much more to justify him who believes, in Jesus from his own sins!

If Mr. Hume's proposition had been to prove that men were imperfect and sinful, we should have despaired of replying to him. But this is not what he set out to prove. He proposed to show the doctrine of total hereditary depravity! But where is the proof? It is true, he has succeeded in finding in the Bible an account of many great sinners. But there is nothing new in this; we all knew of these sinful men before. To hear him one, however, would think there were scarcely any "saints," any "holy men," any "cloud of witnesses," or "seven thousand men who had not bowed their knees to the image of Baal." Even in the time of the deluge he appeared almost to forget Noah and his family, eight righteous souls, who were saved in the ark. But while I am free to admit that he has proved that many men, an immense number, anciently were great sinners, and that immense multitudes in our time are equally sinful, and deplore it as much as he, I do not admit that this proof establishes his proposition, or that it comes any place in the neighborhood of it. His proposition is vastly different from this. He affirms the doctrine, of total hereditary depravity. Passages, then, which relate to the great sinfulness of certain men, at particular periods, are entirely irrelevant, and fall infinitely short of proving his proposition.

Let us have an example of his proof. He quoted Gen., vi., 6: "And 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." Again, verse 11: "The earth also was corrupt before God; and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth." Here are

strong expressions of the corruptions of the earth, but still the same history informs us that there were some righteous at the same time. Not only so, but this corruption was not hereditary, for the passage itself affirms that "all flesh had corrupted his way." This was not a corruption descended upon them from their parents, or from Adam, but they had corrupted themselves, which refutes the doctrine of Mr. Hume. He believes, and is here to prove, that their corruption descended unavoidably upon them, and, to sustain it, he quotes a passage that says, they corrupted themselves!

The verses preceding those read by him, show how they corrupted themselves. Hear the second verse: "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose." Here it is clear, that, in the place of this corruption descending upon them unavoidably, some of them had been the sons of God, and they had corrupted themselves by taking wives of the daughters of men. The sons of God formed alliances with wicked and rebellious women, and this violated what has ever been a sacred statute of Heaven, in doing which they corrupted themselves. But there is no total hereditary depravity in this. If their depravity had been total, they could not have corrupted themselves, because that which is totally corrupt cannot be corrupted. The corruption was not hereditary, for they corrupted themselves. This passage, therefore, furnishes a strong argument against the very doctrine it was brought forward to prove.

The account of Moses' faithful record refutes the doctrine of my friend from another consideration. It recognizes, on the part of man, the power to control his own actions.. This Mr. Humes' doctrine denies. His doctrine represents man as having entailed upon him total hereditary depravity, without his having any agency in the matter. Adam, as a free agent, entailed it upon his posterity, and it must unavoidably descend upon them to the latest generations. Without their own consent, or action, and in defiance of any consent or action in their power, this total corruption descends upon the whole race of man. This saps the foundation of all praise and all blame. No man can be blamable for corruption entailed upon him by hereditary



descent, any more than he can be blamable for the color of his hair, or the complexion of his skin. This is naked Calvinism for you; and the character it gives the Infinite One! It represents God as entailing, not only mortality, with all the physical evils of the present state, upon all his posterity, but as entailing upon them unavoidably, not merely corruption of soul and spirit, but total corruption in all their parts, or all that constitutes them men, so that they can never have a good thought, will a good thing, or perform a good action, but must think, meditate, design, and perpetrate evil, and only evil, continually, till God interpose, and, by an irresistible exertion of Almighty power, rescue them from the awful predicament into which they have plunged! Yes; and then he passed by a portion of them, without ever putting it in their power to turn to God, and threatens that He will punish them forever with the torments of Hell, for those sins entailed upon them, from which they could not turn away, and for which God "would not grant them repentance! This is the doctrine of grace Mr. Hume vindicates in this section of country!

But this is not the worst. Calvinism alleges that God decreed that Adam should sin, and consequently fall—that He irrevocably decreed that his sins should descend upon his posterity to the end of time—that He decreed that man should be totally depraved—in one word, that He ordained whatever comes to pass. He therefore decreed all the actions of angels and men, and fixed them so immutably that they must cons to pass, and could not, by any possibility, be avoided; and yet that he damns the non-elect forever, for those very sins which they never had the power to avoid, and which God immutably decreed they should commit! The antediluvians could not have done otherwise than they did, if this doctrine be true. God decreed that they should sin. According to the doctrine of Mr. Hume, they were totally depraved, and could not do anything else than what they did! They had no power to avoid the sins they committed! Yet Jehovah sent the flood upon them, and destroyed them from the face of the earth, for those sins which they could not avoid!

Calvin, says, God designed Adam to sin. Adam, there-

fore, simply was fulfilling the design of God in eating the forbidden fruit, and God sent upon him and all his posterity total depravity, for doing what God designed! For doing what the Lord designed, he involved the race in irrevocable ruin, except where he has graciously pleased to interpose, and by irresistible power deliver man from his fallen condition. This, Mr. Hume believes, he has never done only for a part of mankind. All the balance of the human race, he has left without any possibility of redemption. He has made no offering' for them—no atonement, no provision, but passed them by to remain forever in their sins and be punished eternally for them! This is the doctrine my friend is to prove to this audience from the Bible, and this is the doctrine that no man ever did or ever can prove from that book. It virtually nullifies all that book teaches, and destroys all responsibility. This doctrine puts into every sinner's lips an excuse for his sinfulness; in the place of leaving him, as the Bible says, without excuse, it furnishes him with an unanswerable excuse for all his sins. If this doctrine be true, every sinner in the land can shut the lips of all the preachers on earth. He has nothing to do to accomplish this, but to say, "I am by nature totally corrupt. This corruption has descended upon me without my consent, and without any possibility on my part of avoiding it. I have no power to turn to God and do anything acceptable in his sight. I did not make myself sinful, and could not avoid being sinful. I can do nothing but wait my destiny. If I am punished for sins, they are sins that I could not avoid. If the Lord had sent his irresistible power, I might have been converted and made as good as any one else. The reason I am not good, is, that the Lord has not made me such. The cause of my sinfulness is not in me, for I cannot be otherwise, but in God who can make me good but will not do it."

What could Mr. Hume say to such a man? "What could any man say to one who would thus reply? What reason could be offered in the last judgment, for punishing such for sins they could not avoid"? I maintain that no reason can be offered why such should be punished. The Bible reason for punishment is taken away; the Bible

doctrine of rewarding men according to their works, is at an end.;the expression of James concerning the fountain and the water, is the last passage I expected to hear quoted to prove the doctrine of total hereditary depravity. Did James mean here, that Adam was the bitter fountain, and that his descendants were the water? If he did, I confess that I never understood him! I never knew that he had any such subject before his mind, but supposed that he simply was teaching the Disciples that if cursing and profanation flowed from their hearts, the fountain, that blessing, the pure water, could not come from the same source. But in Mr. Hume's far-seeing theology, it means total hereditary depravity! This will certainly be a new wrinkle in theology!

He makes the same deduction from the Savior's expression: "Make the tree good, and the fruit will be good." The application in this case must be, that Adam was the tree and his descendants the fruit. We had always supposed that he simply meant, make the man's heart good, or make the man good, and his actions or fruits will be good. But there is no telling the many strange things this Calvinistic theology will develop, especially when it makes up total hereditary depravity from the words of James and our Lord concerning the fountain and the tree. He appears determined, however, on proving his doctrine. If he cannot do it in one way, he will resort to another; or if he cannot find proof in one passage, he will try and find it in another. He first expends his power upon the Adamic sin, and finding it difficult to make it out from that quarter, he appeals to personal sin and transgressions. But all his proofs fall infinitely short of the work he promised to do.

I hope he will make a little closer application of his proof-texts, and show us how they prove the proposition. At least, I hope he will show that the sacred writer is upon the same subject of his proposition, and show the particular points in his proof upon which he relies for proof, that I may understand how to reply. Time expired.

## MR. HUME'S SECOND ADDRESS.

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS—LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I suppose, from the course the gentleman pursued in his speech, that he has forgotten the proposition. My understanding is, that we on this day were to discuss the doctrine of Total Hereditary Depravity, and that my friend Mr. Franklin was to negative that proposition. But where do we find him? Strange as it may appear to this audience, he commences his speech with an essay on his favorite theory—free moral agency, and tells the people that all men are free moral agents, and that all agents are free. Now, can any man in his senses tell what this has to do with Total Depravity? But the gentleman is wrong in his view with regard to the freedom of an agent, and everybody and gentlemen here present know it; for an agent is bound by certain restrictions, beyond which he cannot pass. So much for my friend's free agency.

But he tells you that our doctrine destroys human responsibility, I wonder how the gentleman found this out. We have said no such thing, neither do the regular Baptists believe any such thing; but we believe that all the race are under the strongest possible responsibility to their Great Creator. But he has also found out somehow, that our doctrine is Universalism—it is Fatality—it is Infidelity. We suppose he has been so informed by some one, or he has made these charges upon his own responsibility. When the regular Baptists want an exponent of their faith, they will not call upon Elder Franklin, for the very best of reasons—Mr. Franklin, we perceive, is wholly ignorant of what they do believe; and, beside all

this, they are of age, and can answer for themselves. Listen then to their answers to these charges: They are not Universalists, because they do not believe that all the human race will be saved. They are not Infidels, because they believe in one, only, living and true God; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, and in one Holy Spirit, and that these three are one. They are not Fatalists, because they do not believe that God fore-ordained and decreed all things whatsoever come to pass.

Perhaps the gentleman came here to oppose a people that hold this doctrine; but he is not now among such, but among a people of a very different faith, as he will find out before he is done with them.

The gentleman has thought of one text at last. It is this: "I perceive of a truth that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted OF him." If my friend had quoted the passage right, I should have been better pleased; for the text reads WITH him, and not OF him. Well, does this passage prove that total depravity is not true? Surely it does not, for it says nothing about it. "We now ask, what does the text teach? We answer—it teaches that certain characters are accepted with God. Well, who are they? We answer—such as fear God, and work righteousness. We prove from the third of Romans, that there is no FEAR of God before the eyes of the unconverted; then who is it that fears God, (for such, and such only, work righteousness.) We answer, it is such as know God, as have been born of God, and taught by him. Well, how many, and who are they? We answer, it is ALL the family of God, in every nation; and this fear of God produces works of righteousness, and nothing short of it ever did or will produce it. The gentleman was gracious enough to develop another sentiment, which he said his opponent believed, (to wit), that God ordained that Adam should sin, and consequently he is a Calvinist. Now we believe no such thing. We believe that God knew Adam would sin, but we do not believe that God ordained he should sin; but the principle that influenced man to sin came from a very different source than Calvin. We no doubt believe, some things that Calvin

believed, but this does not make us Calvinists by any means; but my friend must say something, and having neither Scripture nor arguments to the point, he must play off on something, and it might as well be Calvinism as any other Ism.

The gentleman complains that we have not shown Total Hereditary Depravity in the Bible. We have never affirmed that these terms were in the Bible; but the doctrine expressed by those terms. This we have clearly proven in our first speech, which the gentleman has not attempted to disprove from Bible testimony, nor will he attempt it, for well does he know that it cannot be done. But my friend would greatly alarm the audience by telling them that we said there were no pious men from the fall of Adam to Paul's day. Now, my friends, I said no such thing, neither do we believe any such thing, for we do verily believe there was as much piety among saints before Paul's day, as there has been since. Piety is the same both in ancient and modern saints, and their faith centered in the same Savior that was to come. Modern saints look back to a Savior that has come. Hence, their faith originates in the same great cause, and centers in the same glorious Lord Jesus, as the only Savior.

But my friend has kindly informed us, that none of the race of man is condemned for Adam's sin. I hope our position is not forgotten upon this subject, that all the race of man was created in Adam, and consequently were a part of him. Hence, his act was their act. If this position is not true, we would be glad to be informed why it is that the children of men go astray from the womb, speaking lies. If the gentleman can set aside such hereditary depravity as this, he will possess eloquence far beyond that which he has yet displayed, and will introduce proof from the Bible which he has not yet introduced; and we are sure he will not, simply because he can not.

No doubt my friend will have use for Hedge's Logic many times, before he gets through with this discussion. But my friend is lost again, and is now discussing the doctrine of the atonement. Hear what he says: the atonement is as broad as the Condemnation. We will now

see who wears the Universalian cap. What is atonement? It is, strictly speaking, an acquittal from, guilt. Now, if all the race of men were in a state of condemnation, and that condemnation removed by the sufferings and death of Christ, we ask, were they not acquitted from guilt ? and if so, how or upon what principles will they be finally lost? If Jesus Christ has paid the debt once, will God the Father require a second payment of the sinner ? Most assuredly he will not. Consequently, my friend has endorsed Universalism to its fullest extent. But let us hear my friend's logic a little further. He says, the life lost in the fall, was restored by the death of Christ. We will examine this subject briefly. If the gentleman is disposed to say that the life lost was of a moral character, it is evident that this was not restored; for we have shown that the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth. Yea more, that they are estranged from the womb—they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies. Hence moral principle or life was not restored. But perhaps the gentleman will be disposed to say that it was spiritual life; if so, that life was holy, and as such we needed no more to fit us for Heaven. But we have just shown you that the race of men have no such spiritual holy life about them when they come into this world, but precisely the opposite; hence, they were not restored to spiritual life. Hence" my friend must take the ground, that the life lost in the fall was physical or natural. But we will show the audience that this cannot be true; for men have died from the days of Adam until now, and will continue to die, until the last one is dead, consequently, we see they were not restored to physical or natural life. The truth is, they were not restored at all, to anything lost in the fall, for the sufferings and death of Christ were designed to effect something more glorious than to restore man to his Adamic purity.

But my friend is off upon another subject, as entirely foreign from the proposition as anything yet introduced. Well, let him go, as he is determined not to reply to my arguments or answer my scriptural proofs. I am determined to follow him, and rout him from every place where he may feel disposed to shelter. What has he brought

up now? O, lamentable to tell, we are Calvinists, and of necessity believe that infants go to torments. And the worthy gentleman tells you, that forty years ago the Baptists all over this country preached infants to hell not a span long. Now I was not here forty years ago, neither was Mr. Franklin, but I take the liberty to positively deny the charge, while I challenge the gentleman and all his friends to name one preacher of our order that does now, or ever did, preach it. They cannot produce the man. Why then this base charge that has been so often denied? The motive is obvious to all; it is to effect a purpose, to arouse the sympathies and raise the prejudices of the audience against myself, and those with whom I have the honor to be identified^ But my audience, we will try to set our views fairly before you on this subject, while we will also show you who does teach a doctrine that damns them by wholesale. We do verily believe that such of the human race as die in infancy, are saved through the merits of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. That they are pardoned through the blood of Christ, and made partakers of the divine nature of Christ, without which no human being can be saved. This is truly what we believe, Now, what does Elder Franklin teach? He teaches that outside of the kingdom there is no forgiveness of sins, and without immersion we cannot get into the kingdom; consequently, all, both infants and adults, who are not immersed are forever gone. Now out of this dilemma the gentleman never can get, unless indeed he has one way to save adults and: a different way to save infants. And if he takes this ground, then we argue there must be different Saviors, and of course different Heavens, which would be a foul slander upon the whole Christian system. But what has all this to do with the proposition? Nothing at all. All must see that the gentleman has surrendered the point, or he would say something about it.

The gentleman has just found out, what every one here knew before he came—and what is it? It is that we are so ignorant, that we do not understand good language. Well, we acknowledge the fact, and we are truly sorry that our situation in childhood was such as to deprive us



almost entirely of education. Being a poor orphan, without any means to educate myself, consequently, I never ciphered to the single rule of three, or studied English Grammar a moment in my life; but thank God, I can read the Bible, and by its holy contents is this discussion to be tested. There is one thing that I exceedingly regret, and that is, that the friends of this learned gentleman have so imposed upon him, as to bring him so far to discuss a theological subject with such an ignoramus. I really think there is due him an apology, and should be certain to make it. But we pass.

The gentleman still contends that the human race is restored to life, by virtue of the death of Christ, and ventures to give one more text of scripture to prove it. 1st. Corinthians xv. chap: 22, 23 verses: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; but every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." Now we ask every intelligent mind here, if there is anything in this scripture to disprove the doctrine of total depravity, all are no doubt ready to answer no. "Why then is it introduced? Evidently to lead the mind of the audience, away from the real point at issue. But we are ready to meet the gentlemen on this text; and if it will be any accommodation to him, we will show this respectable audience that this text does not mean what he says it does. In the first place, if all the family of man are made alive IN Christ, they are all qualified for Heaven; for eternal life in Christ, is all that any poor sinner needs to secure his eternal salvation. Here my friend has again clothed himself in universalism, which doctrine he denies. But what is the prime meaning of the text? It is this, that the all in this text is CHRIST, and they that are Christ's at his coming and no more, and I defy the learned gentleman from the Queen City, to show any others brought to view in it. My friend is determined not to meet the issue between us, hence we find him back on the atonement. He says, the Adamic sin only involved men in temporal death, from which Christ redeemed them. Now friends I have already shown you, that if Christ redeemed the race from temporal death, then all the race would have been

now living, because death, could not have preyed upon them, if they had been redeemed from it, hence you see my friends, argument upon this subject will not do, because we all know that men do die, (" for dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return") but the gentleman has found out, as he says, that we are deficient in our proof texts. This is a remarkable discovery; indeed, I presume no other person has discovered it, but himself; and could he have found anything else to have said, doubtless he would have been silent upon this subject. Now the truth is, I have given in my first speech some 32 texts, directly to the point, not one of which has he attempted to reply to, and I suppose it is simply because he cannot; for if he could, he surely would have done so in an hour's speech. How many has my friend introduced to prove his negative? Not one! It is true he has quoted two or three texts, but I have shown you that they have no reference to the subject whatever. But the gentleman tells you that we deny the power of men to live a moral life. This is also a misunderstanding of our views, for we believe that men can live moral, and they ought to do so, because it makes them much more respectable and happy through life; but we say that morality is not religion, and we further add that all truly religious men are moral men, but all moral men are not religious men. I have now answered every argument and text of scripture my friend has introduced, while he has failed to reply to a single one of my proof texts.

Time expired.

## MR. FRANKLIN'S SECOND REPLY.

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I perceive that if Mr. Hume maintains his cause at all, he must do it by works, and not by grace. He seems fully aware of this, and therefore, works manfully. He cannot think his cause is immutably and unchangeably established, or he would not labor so to avoid a failure; but he seems to labor like a man engaged in a cause resting upon contingencies, that might fail through a want of effort on his part. Such is truly his condition but it involves him in inconsistency. What is more unfortunate in his case is, that when he works, and works manfully too, he must still make a failure, for his cause cannot be sustained by either works or grace, or with works and grace both together.

Mr. Hume's Baptistism, is Calvinism, and it is in vain that he tries to escape the conclusion. Calvinism destroys the agency of man in precisely, the same way that he does it. He says, that I "tell the people that men are free moral agents." I do tell them this, and believe it to be true. But he desires to know what this has to do with total depravity. I answer, that total depravity has so much to do with man's free moral agency, that it destroys it entirely, and leaves him nothing but a machine, acting only as he is acted upon. It asserts that all men are totally depraved—that this depravity renders them incapable of believing, repenting, confessing, turning to God or doing any good thing. They can only think and do evil continually. According to his doctrine, those for whom Christ died, he irresistibly calls and saves and they cannot be lost. Those whom he did not die for, cannot possibly be saved. "With him, one class cannot possibly serve God

and be saved, and the other class cannot but serve him and be saved! Where then, is their free agency? They are not free agents at all. They have no choice between heaven and hell. The decision whether they should go to heaven or hell was not made by themselves, by anything they did or could do, but by the Almighty before the world.

He says, I am mistaken about a moral agent, for all agents are bound by certain restrictions. I am not mistaken. I knew that all agents are under obligations and restrictions—under certain laws of their agency. But they have the power to disregard all the obligations of their agency, to transcend the restrictions and violate the law, thus defeating the entire object of their agency and changing the results.' Hence we speak of a good agent or a bad agent. But, with Mr. Hume, an agent can do what he was appointed to do and nothing else. The question is not what an agent, has a right to do, but what he can do. His doctrine is that the sinner is so totally depraved that he cannot come to God, and the saint cannot apostatize from God. The question is not whether the sinner has the right to come to God, nor whether the saint has the right to apostatize, but whether he has the power. I say, the sinner has the right and can come to God. He says, he cannot come. In this, he destroys the agency of man, and thus destroys accountability; for if the sinner cannot come to God he cannot be punished for not coming. This destroys all idea of law and penalty. Where God gives a law, man must obey the law or suffer the penalty.

I desire to understand him, and desire this audience to understand him too. I would ask him then, if the non-elect can avoid sin, can they avoid disobedience? According to his doctrine, they cannot, and yet the Lord punished them for the sins they could not avoid. He sends them to hell for the disobedience, from which they could not turn away. The God of Calvinism punishes men for ever for corruption which they never had it in their power to avoid. The doctrine of Mr. Hume does the same thing, and therefore he is a Calvinist.

No man has told me that his doctrine is Universalism, Calvinism, or Infidelity, nor do I think he believes either

of these theories in full, but his doctrine when traced to its legitimate result, lands him into the worst features of Calvinism, and into the fatality of Universalism and Infidelity. He has already run his fatality so far, that he no longer preaches the gospel to sinners, or if he does, he admits that it can do them no good. His doctrine, therefore, practically has the influence upon him that the doctrine of the Universalian has upon him. It paralyzes all his efforts to save men. It is true, they both labor assiduously to convince men, but they admit at the same time, that so far as their eternal state is concerned, their preaching does no sinner beneath the skies any good. In this, probably they are as near right as in any matter I can think of.

My worthy friend corrects me in my quotation of the words of Peter: "I perceive of a truth that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." He enlightened my benighted mind, by informing us that it is not "accepted of him," but "accepted with him." I should be truly ungrateful not to acknowledge my obligations to him for this correction! Is it possible that he is so ignorant of language as to suppose this correction makes any difference in the import of the passage? Or did he simply do this to make a flourish—a kind of show off? I do not like to think him so ignorant, as to think there is any difference between "accepted of him," and "accepted with, him!" I do not like to think he did this simply to show off! Be this as it may, every man here who understands anything of the force of his mother tongue, knows that "accepted of him," "with him" and "by him," amounts to the same thing. This is too small a thing for a man of his dimensions!

After his criticism on the word "of," Mr. Hume asks: "Does this passage prove that total depravity is not true?" It does, for it lays down a general principle in the government of God, that "he who fears him and works righteousness is accepted with him." The passage recognizes, on the part of men of every nation, the power to "fear God and work righteousness," which the doctrine of total depravity denies, and bases their acceptance with God

upon their fearing him and working righteousness, thus barring it upon their own action. The doctrine of total depravity bases a man's acceptance with God, upon an irresistible call from God, thus taking from man all responsibility, and finding the cause of his not being accepted in the want of benevolence on the part of God, who had failed to extend to him the irresistible call.

The gentleman says, he does not believe that God foreordained that Adam should sin; but he says, "God knew Adam would sin." If God knew that he would sin, could he have avoided it? Could that which God knew would be, fail to come to pass? Will my friend answer to these matters? Can sinners now avoid sin? Or will they be punished for sins which they never had it in their power to avoid? I wish to show this audience what kind of free agency he believes in.

Mr. Hume says, he never affirmed that the terms "total hereditary depravity," were in the Bible. Did he not affirm that the doctrine of total hereditary depravity is taught in the Bible? He certainly did. But he now gives us the reluctant information that he never affirmed that these terms were in the Bible. Very well; why then make such a noise about his numerous proof texts, if not one of these texts contains the terms of his proposition? As he now concedes that the terms of his proposition are not in the Bible, we should like to know which one of his proofs contains other terms of the same import. He has admitted that the terms of his proposition are not in the Bible. If he will now admit, that no others of the same import are in the Bible, the argument on this point will be at an end. This came very near an admission, that the very doctrine he came here to prove, is not in the Bible.

I wish him to take a cool and logical look at this subject, and tell us, as he admits that he cannot find the word depravity in the Bible, where he finds the word of the same import. Then, I wish him to find the word total or some other word of the same import, connected with depravity. We wish him also, as he cannot find the word hereditary, connected with depravity, in the Bible, to find some word of the same import, and show us how the proof applies to the proposition, I will promise him to give it my special attention

He should not deny that his doctrine is Calvinism, for, I believe, he admits that he never read the writings of Calvin. How does he know whether it is Calvinism or what, if he never read Calvin's works? He has been a little too fast in denying that his doctrine is Calvinism.

My worthy friend quotes the words, "the children of men go astray from the womb speaking lies," to prove the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, and allows I will need Hedge's logic to get over it, I should like to know what there is about hereditary depravity here! There is not a word about any depravity having descended upon them. Indeed, there is conclusive evidence against such doctrine. How could they go astray from the womb, if they had been born, astray? It is only a strong expression, showing that they departed from the path of rectitude very early. There is no charge against them for some sin born in them, but for going astray themselves—their own actions. The passage even specifies their wicked actions. It says, "speaking lies." Mr. Hume brings forward a passage that speaks of the children of men going astray, speaking lies, at a very early period, as a proof that man is totally depraved! This is no proof at all. There is nothing in this passage that can mean hereditary or total—two of the most important terms of his proposition. "Going astray from the womb," is only a strong expression of their early advances in sin. The fact that they "go astray," shows that they must have been large enough to go astray, and the fact of their "speaking lies," shows that they must have been old enough to speak, and speak falsely at that. This is a fair specimen of his proof. Quoting a passage of Scripture shows nothing, unless the passage can be shown to have some bearing upon the question. This passage shows nothing, only that the children of men become wicked very early in life, but not that that wickedness is total or that it came upon them by hereditary descent.

The Lord complains of man on account of his sins, which he could not and would not do, if man were born totally sinful. If man were born totally depraved, the Lord could not complain of him nor attach any blame to him for it. But he recognizes on his part the power to be

better than he is, and attaches blame to him for not doing as well as he is capable of doing. He recognizes in him the power, not unassisted, but with the assistance that he extends to all where the gospel is preached, to turn from his sins and yield obedience to him. Here is where he incurs guilt. He has power to turn from his sins and will not do it. Mr. Hume's doctrine justifies the sinner in continuing in his sins, by constantly declaring that he cannot turn from, them. It is true, he makes the sinner an exceeding great sinner, but excuses him from all blame, by alleging that his sinfulness is a part of his nature and was born with him, and that he cannot turn from it. Mr. Hume puts an excuse into his mouth, by declaring that he never had the power to be or do any better.

The worthy gentleman has quoted Gen. vi; 11, 12: where the Lord says, the "earth was filled with violence" and "all flesh had corrupted his way." Both of these expressions relate to the voluntary actions of men, and both censure and threaten the wicked for their actions, but there is no evidence here that their depravity was hereditary nor that it was total. I know that the wickedness of man was great, and has been in all ages, but not total and not hereditary. His proof falls infinitely short of his proposition, containing neither the main terms of his proposition nor others of the same import.

He has also resorted to Psalms, xiv; 2, 3: where it is said, "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." What did the Lord look down from heaven for? "To see if there were any that did understand." He did then, consider that they had the power to understand! He could not have looked down to see if there were any who did understand, knowing that all were totally corrupt and that they could not understand. He looked down from heaven to see if there were any who did seek God. Did he look down to see if there were any who did seek God knowing that all were totally depraved and could not, seek or find him? Did he say that persons "had become filthy," who were never anything else but



total corruption? If they were born totally corrupt, how could, they become filthy? Did the Lord express surprise, that there were none who did good, knowing that none of them had the power to do good? This is one of the instances in which a proof-text disproves the doctrine it was introduced to prove.

The worthy gentleman, also quoted Psalms, lii; 2, 3. As it is precisely the same as the one I have just noticed, I shall not make additional remarks. But we must make a remark or two on verse 3. It reads as follows: "Every one of them is gone back; they are altogether filthy, there is none that doeth good, no, not one." "Where had they gone back to? Had they fallen from grace? If they were totally corrupt or depraved, I should like to know what they had gone back from! Had they gone back from total depravity? How did totally depraved persons become filthy? This is the last text I should have quoted to prove Mr. Hume's doctrine! The principal words of his proposition are not in his proof, nor any other of the same import.

I did not say that Christ had already restored all that die in Adam, to life again, but has secured to all a resurrection to life. He has not prevented them from dying, but followed them to the grave, and through his resurrection from the dead has secured a resurrection for the race. Whatever we lost in Adam, without our own consent or action, will be restored by Christ, without our volition and action—that whatever has fallen upon us by hereditary descent, without our personal action, we shall be delivered from, through Christ. I have run the parallel through the 5th of Romans, and the 16th of first Corinthians, and precisely as wide as the breach is made by the first Adam, I find the restoration in the second Adam, as I have fully set forth in my first speech.

I have shown that in addition to this, where sin abounded, grace did much more abound, and that tins superabundance of grace was needful, because the Adamic sin is not only to be met, but our personal sins. For our personal or actual sins, we must obtain pardon, as they will come against us in the last judgment. But we will all be delivered from the Adamic sin, without any seeking

on our part. We are solemnly required to repent of our own sins. "In the times of ignorance before the gospel, Gold winked at, but now he commands all men everywhere to repent." Time expired.

## MR. HUME'S THIRD SPEECH.

### FIRST PROPOSITION

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN——

My friend. Mr. Franklin, is determined to have nothing to do with the proposition. Indeed he seems determined to war with John Calvin, throughout this discussion; and would fain make the people here, believe that he was debating with one of Calvin disciples, and if we were not personally known to the greater portion of the audience, he might succeed, but as it is he will find it very difficult. He was pleased to tell us when he was last up, that our doctrine was taught many hundreds of years since, one Augustine, and at a more recent date by John Calvin. Consequently our doctrine is Calvinism, and as such, involves the damnation of Infants. Now our views on this subject, have already been given, and we can see no necessity for referring to it again, we must suppose however, that our opponent is entirely out of argument; he must fill up his time in some way, hence his efforts to arouse the prejudice of the audience against us, and our doctrine, by repeatedly charging us with believing, what we NEVER HAVE BELIEVED, and what we have positively denied in the hearing of the Gentleman, and the audience. We again repeat that we have not called upon Mr. Franklin, to explain our views for us, we believe with all our ignorance, we can so explain ourself as to be understood, and my worthy friend, will find this out by the time he is done with us. We now must positively affirm that neither Augustine, nor Calvin ever believed the doctrine of the Regular Baptist, and we challenge the Gentleman to show it, if he can. It is true, we believe

some things that those men believed; but is this any reason why we should be called by their name? It is also true, that we believe some things that my opponent believes, but who, in their sober senses, would ever think of calling us Franklinites. I presume the Gentleman would acknowledge us himself, and we are sure that we do not claim him as the founder of our sect or faith; we claim much higher authority for both. But my friend's argument; he tells us that there is no guilt attached to Infants, that they are as holy as the Angels in Heaven, and that they were made so by the death, and sufferings of Christ, and consequently remain so, until they cross the line of accountability, and become actual transgressors. Now, the fallacy of this argument, must be apparent to all candid persons, upon one moment's reflection. We have no account of the sufferings of Holy Angels, and why, because they are clear of sin. Can misery, pain and death, exist where there is no sin? all must answer no. Do Infants suffer misery, pain and death? to our sorrow many of us are compelled to acknowledge they do. Now, if they are not "sinners, how, or upon what principle do they thus suffer. Will a holy, righteous, and just God thus punish the innocent? we are sure he will not. We now appeal to parents here, who have like our self, been so unfortunate as to loose some of their children, have you ever witnessed more severe, and heart-rending sufferings, than you have seen in small children? We know the answer will be no. Let us now enquire what can be the cause of all this wretched suffering. My friend tells you they are without sin, that they are holy, (*O, My God, what a contemptible idea of thy divine character* to thus charge Thee with such gross injustice). There is not a parent in this audience, no, nor one on earth, who loves his offspring, that would thus punish one whom he knows to be perfectly innocent; and will our Heavenly Father, act more unjustly than we, be less merciful than we, surely it cannot be true. This is a grave subject, and should be treated as such, if touched at all. But we should not have been here, had our opponent attended to the proposition before us, but as we are here, we shall make the Gentleman sick enough of it before we leave it. We now call upon him, to show us in his next speech, *what is the cause of all the sufferings and death of Infants, if they*

*we not sinners.* Here will be ample room for our friend to make a display of his learning and talents, and will even then find use for more profound logic, than is given by Mr. Hedge, and after all will forever fail to show the justice of their *sufferings and death, if they are not sinners.* Here we would remark that the opinion prevails almost universally, that if infants are sinners, if they die in infancy they cannot be saved. This notion grows out of an incorrect idea of the wisdom, and perfections of the Holy Lord God, and the almost universally received opinion, that we have something to do, in order to our salvation. Now we hold that all who die in infancy, are finally saved, because the all wise God, could just as easy make an arrangement *to save them all, as to save one of them* that would die in infancy, and consequently such were embraced in the glorious plan of redemption, treasured in our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, and manifested in his sufferings and death, and revealed, to all the redeemed, by the Holy Spirit, by which Spirit they are quickened into divine life, made partaker of the divine nature, and qualified for the enjoyment of a heavenly or spiritual world; without which qualification, none can dwell with God in glory. In this way we believe both infants and adults are saved, consequently they will all sing the same song, praise the same Jesus, and dwell in the same Heaven. We will now examine our friend's theory: And in the first place we remark that Infants are either natural, or spiritual beings. If spiritual, *death can never touch them;* but if they are natural beings, and die without regeneration, they die natural beings, consequently can only enjoy a natural Heaven, and if this be true, they only required a natural Saviour; and as such, their Saviour is not the Jesus of the Bible, and we have no account of any other Saviour, but the Jesus of the Bible, consequently, if my friend's views are correct, Infants have no Saviour, and as such you see my friends who it is that sends Infants to hell. But again, he tells us that there is no salvation without reformation, faith, and immersion; if so, do infants reform, profess faith, and receive immersion, you know my audience they do not; hence we prove by Mr. Franklin himself, that not only all infants, but every one else who do not reform, believe and be immersed, are all damned together. So much for my

friend's repeated attacks upon us, about preaching Infants to hell. Surely he is the last man that should ever dare to accuse any one of teaching such a doctrine, for they who live in glass houses should not throw stones, but my friend tells us that all commentators, and Biblical scholars, agree with him, in his views upon the subject, that he is found in good company, and also that common sense would teach us that his views upon this subject are right; but thank the Lord, commentators Biblical scholars and common sense all to stand aside as proof in this discussion for the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the umpire here, the evidence by which all our views are to be tested. My friend thinks our book would have made a much better appearance, if the first two propositions had been blended together, well perhaps it would, but we have not propositions enough yet, for my worthy and learned opponent's convenience. This is evident from the fact, that he is continually after something altogether foreign from the propositions we have agreed to discuss. His objection to the discussion of the first two propositions was, that there would necessarily be considerable repetition. Had the gentleman's cause been such as to make us believe he was honest on the subject of repetition, we should have been glad; besides it would have been a great saving of time, but what are the facts in the case. It must be evident to all present, that without much repetition, my friend would have been put to silence by our first speech, and his repetition causes much repetition on our part, for we intend to follow him, if he will not follow us, and we intend to show the people that he exhausted his stock of wisdom in his first speech, and that all he can now do, is to repeat what he has already said, in each of his speeches now delivered what has he done, but stigmatize us with Calvinism, infidelity, universalism and fatalism, and the restoration of the race by the death of Christ. I now appeal to the audience if all those parts have not been promptly answered, and yet notwithstanding he comes near the close of his second speech, and repeats what he twice declared in his first speech, that Christ redeemed the race from Adamic transgression. Now in the name of all that is sacred, I ask what has this to do with the proposition before us. Suppose the gentleman could prove all he has said upon this subject, would

it disprove the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, certainly it would not. Well suppose he could prove that we were a *Calvinist, that we were an infidel, universalist, and fatalist all, would it disprove our proposition*; every one knows it would not. Why is the gentleman so afraid of the proposition? It must be evident to the audience that he is perfectly satisfied that the doctrine of our proposition, is true according to the Bible, and that he cannot overthrow it, and that he would only be insulting the good sense of the audience to attempt it.

We will now again answer his remark that the race were restored by the death of Christ, *to all they lost by the transgression of Adam*. Well what did the race lose by the disobedience of Adam? In the first place they lost uninterrupted peace, and happiness in the garden. *Were they restored to it by the death of Christ?* In the second place they lost daily intercourse, and conversation with God their Creator. *Were they restored to it?* In the third place they lost moral goodness, and uprightness. *Were they restored to it?* My friend Mr. Franklin, knows better than to affirm these things in the presence of this intelligent audience, as much as he has said about the swamps of India, and blue stocking Baptist. He cannot persuade them to believe such bombast as this. But once more they forfeited life, "For, said Jehovah, in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." The only question here to be settled, is what kind of life did the race forfeit. If my friend says material life, every person present will know he is wrong; because the race had died from creation down to the present generation; here they were not restored to material life. Well, perhaps my friend will say, they fell from a state of moral rectitude. Have they been restored to that? No! "For they go astray from the womb speaking lies; they have together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one; they have altogether become filthy." Here it is evident they were not restored to a state of moral rectitude. What shall we say next? Perhaps my friend will say, they were restored to spiritual life. We deny this position most positively, because they did not possess spiritual life in creation, and as such they could not forfeit such a life, what saith the scriptures, 1st.

Corinthians, 15th chap. and 46, 47 verses, "Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is NATURAL. The first man is of the *earth, earthy,*" Here is positive proof, that the first man was natural and of the earth, and consequently was not possessed of spiritual life; therefore could not possibly forfeit that which he did not possess; hence all my friend's logic about restoration, is found to be bad logic, and wholly without foundation in truth.

But again, suppose the race did forfeit spiritual or eternal life, and Christ restored it to them by his death, and they possess it until they cross the line of accountability, and again forfeit it by actual transgression. How are they to be restored the second time. We learn in the sacred scriptures that there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin; that Jesus dieth no more; and without spiritual life they cannot be saved. So we see that according to the gentleman's restoration plan, all who cross the line of accountability, and commit actual sin, are forever gone. Now my audience, we wish you to reflect one moment, and think seriously. We have just shown you that the gentleman's theory damns Infants, and all unimmersed persons. Here we show that all who commit actual transgression are lost, irretrievably lost. What think you, my friends, of such a system as this. Does not the blood run cold in your veins, in view of such gross error being palmed upon the people, for gospel truth? May almighty God save me and the people, from such awful delusion as this. So much for the gentleman's repetition of the foul charges, made upon us in his first speech.

Well, what next. The wise man from the Queen city, charges us with being an apologist for the wicked conduct of the ungodly. That we tell the sinner to go on in your mad career; get drunk, swear, lie, cheat, and defraud all you can. Yes, to debauch yourself in every species of crime, and base prostitution that your wicked nature desires, for you cannot avoid it. God has ordained and decreed that you should do so, you are



only doing the will of God, and consequently you are doing right, for God will never punish any man for doing his will. Now my audience if you thought you had not sufficient of the depravity of the human heart before, surely you have evidence enough, and strong to the point before you now. From what heart but one totally depraved, could such base charges, and foul misrepresentations flow? The people here have known me intimately for a number of years; they have been well acquainted with my course, and they know the whole catalogue of charges named above, are slanderously false. Yes those of the gentlemen's own order, will not sustain him in such heavy charges as he "has here made; and should he reiterate those charges until the close of this discussion, he could not make the people here believe it. Nay, verily we offer no apology for the wicked conduct of any man, or set of men, for we hold that all men are under the greatest possible responsibility to God that made them; they are also responsible to the laws of the country, and each one in his own individual capacity, is responsible for his conduct to his fellow men. Well we are asked, can the wicked reform his life? *We answer he can!* The drunkard, the profane, the liar, the tattler, the gambler, the adulterer, and all others guilty of a violation of the laws of the land, can reform or refrain from such conduct; and they *ought most assuredly to do so*. And why? First, because such conduct is contrary to the laws both of God and man. Secondly, it is contrary to our own best interest. Sober, honest, industrious, quiet men, are much more respectable, and consequently more honorable than the base and profligate. Such men make better statesmen, better legislators, better citizens, better husbands, and better fathers; hence you will perceive that all the gentleman's fiery darts have missed us; that we go strongly both by precept and example, for moral reformation, and not for encouraging crime, and debauchery, as my friend has told you.

We will now say, that *God has not decreed that any man should sin, far from it, man sins because he is a sinner;* and the spirit or principle that caused

man to sin, did not come from God, but from Satan the of God and men. I hope 'therefore, that we shall have no more about our believing that our heavenly Father influences men to sin, for we believe no such thing; and those that accuse us, *know better when they do it*. But be it distinctly understood, *and never let it be forgotten*, that notwithstanding men have the power to reform their lives in a moral point of view, nevertheless as we remarked in our last speech, morality is not religion; at least it is not the religion of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, as taught in the Bible; and if this is all the religion my friend has, I pity him in my very soul. We awfully fear there are thousands who are deceived upon this very point, supposing *morality is religion*.

But my time is nearly out, and we now make the enquiry, has the learned gentleman attempted to answer one of my proof texts in any way? He has not, neither will he attempt it. He knows well they are un-answerable; indeed, they never can be satisfactorily answered by any that Elder Franklin together with thousands of others, want a *new translation of the Holy Scriptures*; for sure it is they never can sustain their doctrine from our present translation or common version of the Bible. We think it must be evident to all present, that if the scriptures we have introduced could be explained in any other way, than we have explained them, a gentleman of Mr. Franklin's learning and talents, would have made some effort toward it. His entire silence on this subject, is conclusive evidence to all that those scriptures cannot so be construed as to prove the gentleman's theory.

We now pledge our honor as a gentleman, and our character as a Gospel Minister, that if we fail to attempt to give some explanation of the scriptures introduced by our friend, to disprove our proposition, that we will surrender the point, and acknowledge ourselves completely defeated in this discussion. We again affirm that the doctrine of our proposition is taught in the sacred scriptures; and so clearly taught as not to admit of a single doubt upon the subject. It is taught in almost every page of the Bible. We could refer you to many other verses equally pertinent to the point. But until those we have

already introduced be replied to, we deem it unnecessary. For if the proof now before you fails to convince you of the truth of the doctrine of total depravity we presume you would not be persuaded although one should rise from the dead.

Time expired.

**MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD REPLY**  
**FIRST PROPOSITION**

MR. CHAIRMAN:

My worthy opponent has left his affirmative proposition bodily, and devoted his entire speech to an effort to rid his doctrine of the charge that it involves infant damnation, and that it forms an apology for sinners. So far as the proposition is concerned, I have nothing to do, and might take my seat, for certainly the gentleman has not attempted an argument in his last speech. Having nothing legitimately before me to the point in debate, for the edification and entertainment of the audience, I shall follow the gentleman and show up the barrenness of the soil and the nakedness of the system upon which he has discoursed with such fervor and zeal for the last half hour.

I have not said that he believes in infant damnation, but that his system *involves* it. This I am still certain is the case. How does he escape from the conclusion? He says, and not only says, but tries hard to prove, that infants are *sinners*. How singular his argument to prove it! His argument is, that they suffer, and therefore are sinners; for God would not thus punish them if they were not sinners! He even goes further, and allows that it is a reflection upon the character of Deity, to suppose that He would thus punish them, if they were not sinners! Now this is the most shocking and monstrous sophistry we have lately met with.

What kind of a character does his doctrine give the ineffable and glorious Deity! He assumes that the bodily sufferings of infants in this life are *punishments*, which God visits upon them *for their sins!* He does then believe, and admit before this audience that God *punishes infants for their sins;* but he adopts so much of Universalism as to put their punishment in this world. He does then believe in *infant sinners* and *infant punishment,* or *infant damnation,*

only he is so much of a Universalist as to put it all in this world. He speaks of the sufferings of infants in death, as a punishment because they are sinners. He must then believe they are sinners in death. He does, then, if I understand him, believe that God does punish infants for sin! Yes, and sins that they never could avoid! According to him, they were born sinners, and could not be anything else, and yet God punishes them because they are sinners!

But I deny his position—that infants are sinners. Where is his proof? He thinks they must be sinners, because they suffer. Did not Jesus suffer? Was it because he sinned? or because man sinned? Infants suffer, not because they sin, or are sinners, but because adult sinners before them have involved their innocent off-spring in consequences resulting in suffering. Wicked parents can and do now frequently involve their innocent children in suffering; but that suffering is no evidence that the children are sinners. My friend can never prove that infants are sinners till he can overthrow the words of Jesus; for he says, "Of such is the kingdom of God," and to adults, "Except you be converted and become as a little child, you cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Did the Lord require adults to be converted and become as *little children*, knowing that they were *sinners*? or did he require adult persons to be converted and become as *little sinners*? My friend, however, will have it that infants are sinners, and that they are punished because they are sinners. Will he, then, inform us from what this guilt arises? They cannot be actual sinners without guilt, and there can be no guilt unless it proceeds from something. If they are guilty, will he be so good as to inform us from what that guilt arises? If he shall say, there is no guilt in their case, will he inform us how they can be punished for sin when they are not guilty? But this much I wish the audience now to keep in remembrance, that he has not only argued that infants are sinners, but he has stated that God punishes them. He believes, then, in infant sinners, and that God punishes them; and if they are sinners, and the Lord punishes them, he either punishes them in a state of condemnation or without condemnation. If he says they are without condemnation, he not only

has the singularity of a sinner without condemnation, but has the Lord punishing uncondemned infants! If he says, they are condemned, he believes in infant damnation, or condemnation, which is the same, only it is in this life.

But the gentleman speaks of "an arrangement to save them all," alluding to infants. What kind of an arrangement does he mean? He believes they are sinners. Does he know of any arrangement for their conversion? He speaks of their being "quickened into divine life." What does he mean by this? Does he know of any infant regeneration? If he does, will he give us an account of it. We should like to see the Scripture that speaks of it. There is not one hint at infant regeneration in the Bible, or any necessity for it. But as Mr. Hume has now assumed that infants are sinners, and that their sufferings, even in death, are punishments because they are sinners, he must think them all sinners in death. He must then believe in infant regeneration, and not only so, but regeneration of *all infants after death*; for the sufferings of death are because they are sinners! Will he explain to us his system of infant regeneration after death.

If he believes in infant regeneration, he ought, to be consistent, to believe in infant baptism. They go hand in hand. But we deny the whole premises. Infants have no actual sin—need no regeneration—need no baptism; for "of such is the kingdom of God." They stand in the same relation to heaven as a converted person." The corruption of spirit from which adult persons are delivered in conversion does not belong to infants, and consequently they do not need deliverance from it. They need, and so does every saint, the deliverance from the Adamic sin, set forth 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23; "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's "at his coming." Here is deliverance from the Adamic sin, not by regeneration or conversion, but by a resurrection from the dead through Christ. They who are Christ's will be raised from the dead at his coming, and forever delivered from the Adamic sin.

Mr. Hume has now made an important admission. He admits that the sinner can reform. Reform means the same as *repent*. In this he has abstractly admitted that the sinner can repent. He admits that the drunkard can reform, and other corrupt characters. But although reforming from these corruptions is a part of conversion, a part of the compliance with the holy statute of Heaven— though temperance is a part of Christianity, and spiritual as much as any other commandment, he does not intend to admit that a sinner can turn to God and become a Christian. For he does not receive that "almost universally received opinion, that we have something to do in order to our salvation." He believes no such doctrine as this; for should he grant that we have anything to do in order to our salvation, it might be equivalent to admitting that if we are not saved the fault is our own.

We are at a loss how to suit the gentleman, for he will not admit that we have anything to do in order to our salvation. But if we have nothing to do in order to our salvation, and are not saved, who is to blame? Not the sinner, for he could not do anything in order to salvation. Who then is to blame? Mr. Hume is bound to apologize for the sinner, and say that he was not to blame, for he could not do anything in order to salvation. He should not be punished, for he has neglected nothing in his power to do. The reason of his not being saved is not in himself, but in God, who did not desire his salvation. The worthy gentleman denies we did not accuse him of doing it directly, but his doctrine does it in spite of him. It is true, we have now forced him to admit that the drunkard, the fornicator or other vile characters can reform, but he took care not to admit that they could become Christians, or that they could do anything in order to salvation apologizing for sinners, [and](#)

His admission, however, is a virtual admission that his affirmative proposition is not true. He has admitted that the most corrupt characters can reform from their most corrupt deeds. This I regard as a fair and full acknowledgment that his affirmative proposition, of *total hereditary depravity*, is not true. Could men wholly corrupt reform in any sense? Repentance is an act of obedience to God. Could a man wholly corrupt perform an act, of obedience to God? Surely he could not. But if men can reform from their worst corruptions in this life, why can they not reform from any other transgressions? It must be self-evident that he who can reform from his worst transgressions can reform from all others, and that man could not do this, if he were totally depraved.

There was a time when gospel repentance unto life was not granted; and Paul, alluding to this time, says, "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now he commandeth all men everywhere to repent."—Acts xvii. 30. He proceeds immediately to give the reason why he commanded all men everywhere to repent, in the following words: "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness." Would God command all men everywhere to repent, in view of the fact that he will judge the world in righteousness, if he knew that men could not repent?

I invite the gentleman's attention to the absurdity of God loving a mass of totally corrupt matter! Does he believe it? Does he believe that the Lord gave himself for a mass of total hereditary corruption? I hope he will explain. The Scriptures say that God loved the world, and, as a manifestation of it, he gave his Son for it. Did he give his Son for that which was wholly corrupt? The truth is, man was created in the image of God, and God loved him. He still saw in him, after he had fallen, the attribute of volition, choice, or the power of determining his own actions, and he gave him the privilege of being restored or the privilege of returning to his Father and his God. His will is to save him, if he will receive the Redeemer, and condemn him if he does not. To all this the gentleman objects, for he cannot endure the idea that man can do anything in order to salvation. He has



forgotten the young man who came to be Lord, saying, " Good Master, what good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?" If that young gentleman had come to Mr. Hume, asking the same question, he would have responded in language like the following: "What good thing must you do to inherit eternal life? My dear sir, you cannot do any good thing. You are totally corrupt, and you speak of doing any good thing to inherit eternal life!" But our gracious Redeemer did not thus teach, but reminded him of the commandments of God under the law. The young man said, all these he had observed from his youth. The Savior reminded him of one thing that he still lacked, and it was one thing that he *had to do to obtain eternal life*. "Go," said the Lord, "sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and come, follow thou me, and then shalt thou have treasure in heaven." Here is a promise of treasure in heaven based upon the action of a man. This is not a work of the flesh, but one of the "good works which God has ordained that we should walk in them."

But I pass to Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. The works of the flesh here spoken of the gentleman has referred to as total hereditary depravity. Let us then see what this depravity is. The apostle enumerated as follows: "Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, sedition, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings and such like; of which I tell you before, as I have also told you in times past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Now the most dull of perception cannot fail to see that the doing of these things is here set forth as a reason why such characters shall not enter into the kingdom of God. This is one of the gentleman's proof-texts of total hereditary depravity. Now recollect that he has admitted, in the speech you have just heard, that a man can reform from these very transgressions. In this, he admits that a man can reform from total hereditary depravity!

His doctrine is a singular affair! According to it, man can do nothing in order to salvation. But he can reform from the worst transgressions in this world, even

from total hereditary depravity itself—that is, a man totally depraved can reform from the most corrupt acts of a totally depraved being! If this is not a set of twistifications, I know not where you will find them on this earth I am sorry that the gentleman came out here in a strange place to me, and told the people that I am *dishonest*. If he had not let it out, perhaps the people would not have perceived it. Of course I shall not attempt any defense. But I have one advantage, I am debating with a very honest man and the people here all know it. I shall, therefore, give myself no further trouble on this head. I was amused at the gentleman, trying to make the people here believe, that our doctrinal position involves the damnation of infants. I was sorry to hear him so strain his voice and see him sweat so profusely to bring something out of nothing. He seemed determined to make the audience believe that we do involve the damnation of infants. But it was a failure. He *worked* and worked hard too, but could not show how believing that a penitent believer is required to be immersed, in order to the forgiveness of sins, could involve the damnation of infants. This was the weakest thing I ever knew a man try to fasten upon people who do not believe in, but have always opposed infant baptism; upon the ground too, that they are without actual sin and certain all-to be saved.

I think if Mr. Hume should read our debate, and find his denials in his last speech of my having paid attention to his proof texts, that he will feel somewhat confused. He complains that I do not stick to the proposition! I have nothing to do with the proposition, as I do not believe it, except to show that his proof does not sustain it. All I have to do, is to follow him. This I shall do, however disagreeable it maybe to him. That he has literally failed, and in his last speech deserted the question, all must be sensible. Time expired.

**MR. HUME'S LAST SPEECH**  
**ON THE FIRST PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS——LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

My friend, Mr. Franklin, has acknowledged the truth at last. He now admits that infants suffer and die because of sins entailed upon them by their parents. This is a very fatal admission for my friend, at this time. He told us in his second speech that they were holy as the angels of heaven, and as such they did not need regeneration. He has, throughout his arguments so far, denied hereditary depravity, and now (*being so closely pursued upon this subject*) he comes out and acknowledges the doctrine of hereditary depravity in full, by admitting that children suffer and die because of the sins of their parents. We hope, my audience, that you are fully prepared to analyze the gentleman's argument here. He has told us that they were *holy, free from sin; that they did not need regeneration*. He now tells us that they have to suffer misery and death, because of the sins of others (to wit), *their parents*. *O, consistency thou art a jewel*. Abraham said, *God would not punish the innocent for the guilty*; but my friend is not ashamed to contradict him, and publicly declare in the face of this respectable audience, that the great and eternal Jehovah does punish the innocent for the guilty, and not only the innocent but those that are so holy that they do not need regeneration to prepare them for heaven. Such a contemptible view of the character of a holy God should never be cherished in the bosom of any man, for if we really entertained such views we would be ashamed to acknowledge them. But such

are the consequences that must necessarily follow every attempt at defending a doctrine that is untrue in itself. We have often heard it remarked, that drowning men will catch at straws. The truth of the remark is clearly manifested in the case before us; but we feel disposed to excuse the gentleman, inasmuch as this is the best he can do. The only thing that we can blame him for, is for attempting to defend a system fraught with so much error and inconsistency as to drive him to such measures for its support.

The gentleman in order to make some show of sincerity in his views upon this subject, refers you again to the xv. chapter of 1st Corinthians, where it is said, for as *IN* Adam ALL die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; and the gentleman tells us that *IN* and *BUT* in this text mean the same thing, and that we are to understand the apostle to convey the idea that the race die *BY* Adam's transgression, and the race were all made alive *IN* Christ when he rose from the dead. This is very strange logic indeed to come from a Greek scholar. Now we do not profess to know any thing about Greek, and we are lead to doubt our friend's knowledge of it, from the fact that his definition of the terms *IN* and *BY* are contrary to good sense. Boys and girls ten years old, know better. If I should say I was *in* this house, when I only walked *by* it, all who know the facts would very justly accuse me of falsehood; and not only so, but if the gentleman's definition of those terras be true, he will forever fail to prove that saints will finally get *in to* heaven. They may go *by* heaven, but they have no assurance that they will get *into* heaven. Sinners may go *TO* hell, but not go *into* it. We hope we shall ever be saved from such Greek as this.

But why does the gentleman labor so hard to make the audience believe his definition to be true? Simply because he dreads the consequences of admitting that *IN* means *IN*; because we have shown you in a former speech that none could be made alive *IN* Christ but such as were intrinsically and substantially *IN* Him; and to be made alive *IN* Christ, was all the sinner needs to qualify him for the enjoyment of the paradise of God. And we also challenged the gentleman in a former speech, and we now repeat it, with all

his wisdom and learning, to show that there were any more brought to view in his favorite text, than Christ and those that were Christ's at his coming. Well, you are aware, my audience, that my friend did, not attempt to show that there were any others brought to view in this quotation. Well, why did he not attempt it? Because he well knew that he could not succeed without butchering good language and common sense, both; and if he did this, there would be some *even down here in the swamps of Indiana, where ignorance stalks abroad at noon day*, that would detect him, and consequently he could not palm off such a theory upon the people. Hence it is evident to this audience, and we believe to the gentleman himself, that he has made a signal failure upon the subject of showing to this respectable audience, that *in* and *by* are synonymous terms in the text referred to.

But the gentleman seems determined to make you believe that we deny the power of moral reformation to such as are not born again; but he will find himself as much mistaken upon this subject, as he has with regard to compelling us to avow Calvinism. We in this country are so profoundly ignorant, that we will not let others think and believe for us, we are determined to believe for *ourselves*. And such obstinacy may, by some, be considered criminal, but we glory in the privilege. We have already positively declared in the hearing of the gentleman and audience, that we do verily believe that unconverted men who indulge in licentious and wicked conduct have the power to reform their lives, or refrain from such acts of wickedness and debauchery, and live a moral life. And we have also said that they ought to do so, while at the same time we have been very particular to impress upon the minds of the people the important truth, that this moral reformation is by no means the religion of the Bible. The religion of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ has to do with the heart, producing therein love to God and hatred to sin. Such persons reform their lives from very different motives to what those are influenced by, who reform from the fear of future punishment, or for the purpose of rendering themselves more respectable in life. Hence, as we have

before remarked, all truly pious men are moral men but all moral men are not truly pious. My friend appears determined to make us believe that his religion consists exclusively in a rigid course of morals. He seems to have no idea of any other. Well, we told him in our last speech, that if this was all the religion he knew anything of, we were sorry for him. And we would here remark, that we can but indulge the hope that he will yet be instructed in the knowledge of vital piety more perfectly. We would be glad if our friend could be persuaded to pay some attention to our proposition, for truly it is one of importance; and if true all should acknowledge it, and if false we ought all to know it. We verily believe the truth of the doctrine of our proposition" My friend says he does not believe it. If he does not why does he not give us some reasons why he does not believe it? He has, so far, failed to introduce one text to disprove our affirmative, and we presume he will not at this late hour of the day, attempt it. But he tells us that he did not come here to make Scripture rebut Scripture, or to make one part of the Bible contradict another. Well we have not *asked him to do this*, we only wish him if he can, to show one text that disproves the doctrine of our proposition. We had supposed he came here for that purpose, but perhaps we have been mistaken. We judge, however, the reason why our worthy friend has not yet given some Scripture on the subject; is from the simple fact that he has none to give. Well, if he has not, let him come out like a man and acknowledge the fact. This he surely ought to do, for we feel very certain that this audience have already made the acknowledgment for him; and we have no doubt but they, like our self, feel considerably disappointed in finding the learned gentleman so far delinquent in point of Scripture testimony.

There is another matter that astonishes us somewhat, and that is, my friend has not as yet, and we suppose he will not attempt to reply to one of the many passages we have introduced to prove the truth of the doctrine of our proposition. Hence we are compelled to believe that he accords to us the justice of interpreting those Scriptures correctly. Hence his tacit

acknowledgment of the truth contained in our proposition; for be assured, friends, if he could have brought, any testimony against it, he would have done so before now. And let it be remembered, that the gentleman himself acknowledged this morning that if we succeeded in establishing the doctrine of total depravity, he might as well give up his first affirmative, for if our affirmative was true his first affirmative was not true. Well, if we have not sustained fully the truth of the doctrine taught in our proposition, it is simply because the Bible is not true; for there is no point in theology more clearly taught in the sacred Scriptures than the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, and we know the Bible is true, and teaches nothing but what is true.

Mr. Franklin admitted in his last speech, that children suffered and died because of the sins of their parents. Here he admitted the very doctrine for which we are contending. Hence we have proven by the Bible, by common observation, by Christian experience, and by my honorable friend from the Queen City, that the doctrine of total depravity is true. This is evident to all present, and as such we feel that we are fully sustained in all we promised to do. It is true my friend, Mr. Franklin, has roundly denied the doctrine of our proposition, and has often told us that it could not be true, because it would destroy his favorite theory, to wit, *conditional salvation*. If the bare assertions of our friend were to be taken as evidence in this case, we have had an abundance. But we have not yet agreed to be governed in this discussion by the sayings of Elder Franklin, *for we receive not testimony from men*, but are alone to be governed by what is written in the sacred Scriptures.

But the gentleman has surely forgotten that we are to-day discussing the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, and is deeply engaged in discussing the doctrine of condition salvation, which we have agreed to discuss tomorrow.

Well if he has fully surrendered the point on the subject of depravity, we suppose he had as well be at that as anything else; for sure it is, he will need more than one day to prove what he has agreed to prove on to-morrow. But we don't intend to be enticed away from our proposition, until we are done with it; and then we shall be ready

and fully prepared to give him close chase on to-morrow. We had fondly hoped that having the embodiment of the wisdom of the Christian church, in the person of Mr. Franklin, to contend against in this debate, that we should have heard something more against the doctrine of depravity. We had a right to expect this, under all the circumstances. What then, my audience, must be our astonishment and disappointment, to find nothing more in him, or to hear nothing more from him, than we have often heard before; and from those too, who were not so favorably situated as the learned gentleman from Cincinnati. Is it not enough to convince every one present that truth is mighty, and must prevail; and notwithstanding the wisdom and learning of the age, even the most talented among the opposers of God's eternal truth, prove themselves mere ciphers, when they undertake to establish a theory which is positively contrary to the oracles of eternal truth.

We are now near the close of our last speech, upon this subject; and we wish to rivet it upon the minds of this audience, that the gentleman has entirely failed to introduce scripture to disprove our proposition. He has also failed to reply to those introduced by us; and we venture now to prophecy that in his closing speech, he will pursue his former course; never touch the proposition or the scriptures we have relied upon for proof of the doctrine of our proposition, but will endeavor to draw your minds away from the subject by appealing to your sympathies on the subject of infants; and giving you a touching lecture upon the awful consequences that must necessarily follow, if our doctrine be true. But, dear friends, you ought to be honest before God, and with yourselves; and be determined to know what the scriptures teach upon this subject, for a correct understanding of this important doctrine is alone calculated to lead the mind to rely wholly upon a power greater than our own for salvation. For just as long as we believe we can do anything ourselves toward our own eternal salvation, just that long we will be unwilling to trust our salvation in the hands of another. We will now spend the remainder of our time in recapitulation, in order to more deeply and powerfully impress



your minds with what we have said, and the positive scripture proofs we have introduced. The number of texts you can ascertain by reference to my first speech. You will doubtless remember that my first position, was that Adam the natural father of mankind, became a corrupt and sinful being, in consequence of the violation of God's most holy law. This we proved most conclusively from by what is said in the 5th, 6th, and 8th chapters of the book of Genesis, and also in the 5th chapter of Paul's letter to his brethren, at Rome. We showed you the awful curse that Jehovah, God, pronounced upon man for his disobedience. We showed you that sin entered our world by this one man; that by him condemnation came upon all men; and that by his disobedience, many were made sinners. And now upon this single fact, we take the ground that all who have descended from him, are corrupt and defiled like him; and consequently are totally depraved. We have shown you from the language of the book of God "that every imagination of the thought of the heart is only evil continually; that all flesh has corrupted its way before God; that the heart is hard and deceitful, and above ALL THINGS DESPERATELY WICKED." We have also shown you that "the wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies. Yea, more, that this awful corruption, depravity, and sin is traced back even to conception. Hence, David says, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and IN SIN DID MY MOTHER CONCEIVED ME." Have you, dear friends, ever before heard such an array of pointed scripture proof to sustain one single point, as we have here given; and yet we have only hinted at a few of the many passages that the Bible furnishes to sustain the doctrine of our proposition. We have referred you to the language of Job, where he enquires, "Who can bring an unclean thing, out of an unclean? The answer is, *no one*. Now if Adam was unclean by reason of sin, then it is evident that nothing clean has ever descended from him. We have also referred you to the language of the Apostle James. He tells us that "the same fountain cannot send forth sweet water and bitter," and the Savior declares "a corrupt tree, cannot bring forth good fruit." Hence it is evident

that all men everywhere are alike corrupt and depraved, for they have all sprung from the same corrupt fountain, and consequently partake of the nature of the tree or fountain, from which they have descended. This being true it necessarily follows that hereditary depravity is also true; and if so, we have fully sustained our proposition, which all present must acknowledge. We have promptly met the gentleman upon all his assaults upon us, about Infant damnation ; and we believe have shown you to a certainty that he is the man that teaches that doctrine. We have also met him promptly in his labored effort to make us acknowledge Calvinism, universalism, and infidelity. How far we have met him successfully is for you to determine. But the most important matter for you now to determine is, whether we have sustained the doctrine of our proposition. Yea, or nay, whether the holy scriptures do teach the doctrine of total hereditary depravity or not. If you say they do, then my friend's affirmative to-morrow he acknowledges himself to be untrue; and that it is untrue, we shall be able fully to show at the proper time. We now in conclusion beg of you not to let your minds be diverted from the real point at issue, and in your retirement this evening ask yourselves the solemn and important question, Is the doctrine of total hereditary depravity true? do the scriptures teach it? and remember, if this doctrine is taught in the Bible, all your prejudices against it; cannot| overthrow it. No, it will stand as firm as the pillars of Heaven, and in the midst of the wreck of nature and crash of worlds, this doctrine taught in God's holy word, will shine brilliantly; and God himself will acknowledge his own eternal truth to the utter confusion of all his enemies.

Time expired.

## MR. FRANKLIN'S CLOSING SPEECH.

### FIRST PROPOSITION.

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

"We have now heard the sum total of the gentleman's argument on total hereditary depravity. We shall make a few remarks upon his last speech first, and then revive the argument. He makes me say, that God punished the innocent for the guilty. I never uttered such a sentiment. I deny that God punishes infants at all. Sufferings and disgrace have, and do still, come upon infants by the wickedness of their parents, not as a punishment from God, but contrary to the will of God; and he will punish the parents for causing their innocent children to suffer. But Mr. Hume did say that infants are punished, and assumed that they were punished because they are *sinner*s. We deny both, that they are, sinners and that they are punished. God does not regard them as sinners, and does not punish them. All the sufferings that have ever been brought upon them, have been unjustly brought upon the innocent, by the wickedness of those who have gone before them, contrary to the will of God. I believe the language of God, that the innocent shall not be punished for the guilty, as firmly as the gentleman, and I abhor the sentiment that God punishes infants, because they are sinners, as without a shadow of foundation in the Bible, and most prejudicial to the character of God.

I am sorry to be compelled to expose, in the presence of this large audience, so weak a thing as Mr. Hume's attempt at criticism, on the words *in* and *by*, touching

1st. Cor. xv: 22. It was wholly gratuitous, on his part, and uncalled for. He assumes, what I have never thought or said, that I have taken the position, that the word *in*, always means *by*, and makes a prodigious ado about it. It is known to scholars, that the Greek *en* is translated *in* and *by* both, in a great variety of places in the New Testament. A principal rule governing the translator, is that the Greek word *en* should be translated *in* when it signifies *place*, and *by* when it signifies instrumentality or agency. In view of this rule, when Paul says: "As *in* Adam a ll die, even so *in* Christ shall all be made alive," we should read: "As *by* Adam all die, even so *by* Christ shall all be made a live." Adam was the instrument, or the agent, through whom all die. "By one man sin entered into the world." Christ is the agent, or the instrument, through or by whom all shall be made alive. The passage does not mean that Adam was the *place in* which a ll die, but the *agent*, or *instrument by* whom all die; and Christ is not the *place in* which a ll are made alive, but the *agent* or *instrument, by* whom all shall be made alive. "By him God made the worlds." But where the Greek *en* means *place*, as when it signifies the place where baptism was administered—"en Jordan," it should be translated *in*.

If I understand Mr. Hume, he challenges me to find any only those who are Christ's mentioned in this passage. I think I can easily accommodate him in this. Let us look at the passage. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." Here we have death and the resurrection of the dead. How many does death and the resurrection of the dead extend to? To the race certainly. "For as in Adam *all* die." How many die in or by Adam? The answer is, the human race. "Even so in Christ shall all be made alive," or raised from the dead. How many does this include? If this passage does not establish a universal resurrection from the dead, no passage in the Bible does.— But those that are Christ's shall be made alive at his coming. These very words in themselves imply that there will be others that are not Christ's, at his coming and the resurrection of the dead. The same number

that die by Adam shall be made alive, or saved from the Adamic sin by Christ. But unless men are saved from their own sins, in this life, we have no evidence that they ever will be saved from them. There is no evidence of any deliverance from personal or actual sin in the resurrection, or any time after death. We must obtain personal pardon in order to be delivered from personal sins.

The gentleman tries to slur over his admission that a man can reform or repent. He now explains that they can reform, but a moral reform is not religion, and allows we are in a dangerous predicament, if our religion consists in a rigid morality. But he need give himself no trouble about our religion just now. It is his doctrine and admissions we are now considering. He has quoted Paul's enumeration of the works of the flesh, as a passage teaching total hereditary depravity, and yet he admits that a man can reform from these very works of the flesh, which, according to Paul, will bar certain characters from the kingdom of God. Paul says, "they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Mr. Hume admits that a man can reform from such things, thus admitting, not merely amoral reform, but a spiritual reform from the very things that would hinder him from entering the kingdom of God. Or, in other words, he admits that a man can reform from total hereditary depravity, which consists of Paul's enumeration of the works of the flesh, and thus renounces his favorite doctrine, that the sinner cannot do anything, and admits that he can do the very thing—reform from the very sins that he in his way of inheriting the kingdom of God. Mr. Hume makes a great ado, because I do not quote Scripture against total hereditary depravity! I have already explained to him, that I do not bring the Bible in array against itself. There is not a word about total hereditary depravity in the Bible, and of course we shall not find any place where it is named out and declared false, like the deeds of the Nicolaitians. I do not wish to make infidels, and therefore, feel some responsibility in showing that the Bible harmonizes. There is no need of proof

against his doctrine. If there is none for it, that is sufficient. But I have already shown that there are clear and fully developed principles in his own proof-texts, that refute and forever annihilate his doctrine of depravity, as this audience well know. Mr. Hume again repeats his assertion, that I have not attended to a *single* proof-text introduced by him. Is he confused so that he does not know what he did say, or was he contriving what to say, so that he did not hear, or why did he make and then repeat in his last speech, the reckless statement, that I had not attended to one of his proof- texts, when I had attended to all so far as they could be thought to have any bearing on his proposition. He certainly will feel confused with his statement, when he reads the debate in his sober mind.

But we hasten to make a very brief recapitulation of the argument. We stated as distinctly as we could in our opening speech, that Mr. Hume, in maintaining his affirmative proposition, must find the principal terms of his proposition, or others of the same import, in his proof-texts. That if he failed to do this, he fails in his proof; for there is no possibility for any text to prove any proposition, unless it contains the principal terms, or others of the same import. I leave you to judge how much attention he has given to this matter, and simply state, that he has not quoted a passage containing any one of the principal words of his proposition. He has not quoted a passage containing either of the words, *total, hereditary or depravity*. Nor has he found any text, speaking of man or the race, containing a term equivalent to either of these words. Where then is his proof of the total hereditary depravity of man? He has not found it in any place and no man can find it.

We have objected to the doctrine, that it involves the damnation of Infants, inasmuch as it declares them totally *depraved*, and myriads of them die in infancy, and consequently without regeneration. He says, he believes that Infants are all saved who die in infancy, and there must be some arrangement for their salvation. But does he find this plan? Did he show it to us in the Bible? Not a hint of it. His doctrine declares them sinners, and he has even represented them as suffering death, because they

are sinners. He must then invent "some arrangement" after death for their regeneration, or they are lost. He has yet left us in the absence of any plan.

I object to his doctrine, that it puts a grave apology into the lips of every sinner in the world for being a sinner. According to his doctrine, every sinner on earth was born totally depraved, and never had it in his power to turn to God, and be a Christian. He puts an excuse into the lips of every sinner who hears him in all this country. Ask the sinner. Why, my dear sir, are you not a Christian? He can respond as follows: "Because sir, Mr. Hume has told me that I am totally depraved; that I can do nothing in order to salvation; that I cannot turn to God; that I cannot believe, and cannot be anything but a sinner." What can Mr. Hume say to him? He can say, "I did tell you so, and it is even true." But who is to blame that the man is not a Christian? Not the man himself, for he could not do anything to become a Christian. In this way he is the apologist for all the sinners on earth. It is true, he has admitted that they can make some moral reforms, but are sinners still and have no religion. Who is to blame? Not the sinner, for he never had it in his power to be anything but a sinner.

I object to his doctrine, because it represents the holy and just God as punishing men in hell forever, for being sinful, who never had the power to be holy. I maintain that God would not punish men for sins that they could not avoid. Such a doctrine can have no moral influence on the world, and can make no impression upon the minds of men, but that the author of it is a cruel tyrant. Still it is a legitimate result from his doctrine, and no man living can avoid it. If men are born totally depraved, and never have the power to serve God and become acceptable to him, they cannot in reason be punished for not serving him, or for sins they could not be saved from.

I object to his doctrine, because it nullifies and renders useless the preaching of the gospel—disannuls the last commission the Lord gave the Apostles, to preach the gospel to every creature. What use is there in preaching it? The sinner cannot believe, according to the doctrine of my friend cannot repent, turn to God and become a

Christian—cannot even understand the gospel when it is preached!

His doctrine destroys the agency of man—that highest and noblest attribute of his, in being created in the image of God, and denies that he can do the will of God. The Lord said, "I come, it is written of me in the volume of the book, to do thy will, O! God." He says that his will may be done on earth as it is in heaven. But the doctrine of Mr. Hume denies that man can do the will of God. According to his doctrine, men have no choice whether they serve God or the devil. They cannot serve God until some irresistible power makes them the servants of God, and then they cannot help but serve him. It makes man a mere machine, without any power to be anything except what God irresistibly makes him. It thus destroys the basis of all rewards and punishments. No man should be punished for sins that he could not avoid, and no man should be rewarded for righteousness irresistibly forced upon him.

I have examined the gentleman's "array of proof-texts" and found that his doctrine of total hereditary depravity is not found in them. The passage from Genesis vi. 6,11 that "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" and that "the earth was corrupt before God; and that the earth was filled with violence," does not prove *total* depravity, for there were some good on the earth at this time, and it was not *hereditary*, for the same passage says, "for all flesh had *corrupted his way* upon the earth. The charge here brought is not for *hereditary* corruption, but corruptions of their own doing. His doctrine is not in this passage.

David's allusion to the wickedness of his mother at the time of his conception, is but a highly wrought expression in acknowledgment of his sinfulness; but certainly no evidence that the man after *God's own heart* was totally depraved, or that his depravity was hereditary. We know he was not totally depraved at the very time he used this language. In the connection of this language, we are informed that "God looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if any did understand, that they did seek after God. Every one of them is gone back; they are altogether



become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no not God would not look down to see if any understand and seek God, if he knew that all were totally depraved, and could not seek God, or understand. He could not say that every one of them is "*gone back*" and "*become filthy*," if he had known them to be totally depraved. This passage is a complete refutation of my friend's position. A man *totally corrupt*, cannot *become* filthy, nor *go back*.

We have so completely routed him from Rom. v. chapter, that he has abandoned it in his last speech. His reference to First Corinthians, xv. 21, 22, 23, has proved unfortunate, as it has involved him in several charges of a most ridiculous character to occur in a discussion of this description.

Last of all, we routed him from the works of the flesh, enumerated by Paul, Gal. v. chapter, and pressed him until he well nigh renounced his own doctrine; when he admitted that men can reform from some of the worst transgressions on earth. Even drunkenness, which would forbid that a man should inherit the kingdom of God, he admits a man can reform from. I am in hopes that we s h all yet have him in a king temperance speeches, since he admits that man can reform from drunkenness; for, in t his case, he would certainly do more good than he can in preaching to sinners, if they cannot turn to God, and become Christians. He strained his lungs "hard in his closing speech, and perspired freely, thus trying by *works*, to save his cause; and in the midst of his efforts, he inquired what I have done. He should have inquired what he has done; but that was not necessary, for all saw that he failed, and that I had not only shown his failure, but the absurdities of his doctrine." We leave the point, then, for to-day, but shall be closely connected with the same subject tomorrow, when I hope to bring some testimonies that no man ever did or can overthrow.

Time expired.

**MR. FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS.**  
**ON THE SECOND PROPOSITION**

---

TUESDAY, November 18th, 9 ½ o'clock A.M.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS—LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

The proposition to be discussed in your hearing to day, has just been read by the President Moderator. It involves the same argument discussed on yesterday. This fact I stated to Mr. Hume before the discussion commenced, and he admitted it, but still thought we had better discuss the subject in the manner agreed upon by our respective friends. I should have preferred discussing the subject under one proposition, as it would have avoided some repetition and made a more systematic book. But I must yield, and take things as I find them.

In this proposition I affirm, that "where the gospel is preached as first delivered by the apostles, any unregenerate person, of adult years and sane mind, can believe, repent, confess the Lord Jesus Christ, turn to God and be finally saved." This proposition is one of the highest importance. It covers the whole question of the *human will*, of the *volition*, of the power of choice, or the power of determining our own actions. Upon it is suspended all praise and all blame, all virtue and all vice, all rewards and all punishments. If any part of the human race *can not* turn to God, they cannot in justice be held responsible and punished for not turning.

The proposition is plain, and its terms need but few words to define them. The whole argument turns upon one word; that is the word *can*. We have no dispute now about any of the other terms in the proposition; but

when I use the word *can*, the worthy gentleman uses the word *can not*. Here is a fair and a direct issue. I affirm that all persons of adult years and sane mind, where the gospel is preached, *can* turn to God and be saved. He denies that all persons, here described, *can* turn to God. Here is the issue—he says they *can not*, I say they *can*. He pleads inability to turn to God; I insist that God has given all included in the proposition, ability to turn to Him. He will have to meet men at every point not with a *will not*, but with a *can not*.

He has denied being a Calvinist. We intend now to try him for Calvinism before this audience, and I think we shall find him guilty. The whole matter turns upon the question of ability. Has God granted the privilege or the ability to all where the gospel is preached, to be saved? Upon this point, in my estimation, turns the whole question of man's responsibility to God. If God has given the privilege to all who hear the gospel to turn to Him and be saved, man is responsible and may justly be punished for *not turning*; but if he cannot turn to God, he cannot be justly punished for not turning. Such is our issue. I. Our first argument is founded upon the purpose of God. I mean by the purpose of God, his original intention. There is no doubt but God had an original intention or purpose in creating man, and that intention is called in the Scriptures "the eternal purpose of God." If we, then, can determine what His eternal purpose was, or his intention in creating man, it will have an important bearing upon this whole controversy. Can we, then, get a clue to the eternal purpose of God? I think we can. The first passage I shall call attention to is Eph. iii.: 7, 11. It reads as follows: "Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should, preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ; to the intent

that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

In this passage it is asserted, that Paul was made a minister, and the grace of God was given to him for a certain purpose, viz: that he might preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and make *all men see* what is the fellowship of the mystery; and at the close of the quotation, he affirms that this was according to the eternal purpose of God. From this, then, it is evident, that it was the original intention, or "the eternal purpose," as Paul calls it, to preach the gospel that *all might see*, and not that a portion, where it is preached, should never have the privilege to see, or that it should never be put in their power to see. If, then, it was in the eternal purpose of God to put it in the power of all men who hear the gospel to see—to make known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, my friend will hardly prove that he never intended some of this class to have the privilege to see. In connection with this passage, I invite the attention of the gentleman to Acts xvii.: 26,27. It reads as follows:

"And hath made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us."

This passage most explicitly states the intention of God in creating man, and that intention was that he should, or might, *seek the Lord and find Him*. It also includes the race. The language is explicit. He speaks of all men who dwell on all the face of the earth, and most unequivocally declares it to be the intention, purpose, design, or will of God, that they should seek the Lord and find Him. If this passage does not show that 'it was put in the power of all, where the gospel is preached, to seek, God and find Him, we do not understand the import of words. Paul was here standing in the Athenian court, before the most distinguished judges, counselors, politicians and philosophers of Athens, and having thus set be-

fore them the intention of God in creating man, he proceeds to inform them that the ignorance before the gospel God winked at, or did not hold them strictly accountable, but that now that the gospel is preached, he commands all men everywhere to repent, because he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness. This places man's responsibility where it ought to be—at every man's own door. It is where the Lord placed it in the following word –:

"If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." These words leave man without an excuse, and take away his cloak for his sin; but my worthy friend determines that he shall have a cloak, he files for him an excuse for his sin; such an excuse, too, as would acquit him from all blame, if it could be justly made. He is the apologist for sin and impiety. He contends that the sinner cannot come to God, and he cannot be justly condemned for not doing what he never had in his power to do. Nor is it of any avail for him to say that he cannot come without the grace of God, for that is precisely what Christ came for; to give grace or power to all who hear him to come. Hence he said, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin," and in verse 24, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now they have both seen and hated me and my Father." Had not the Lord come and spoken to them, removed their disability, they had not had sin, and could not justly have been condemned for their unbelief. But as the Savior had come among them, spoken to them, and done such works among them as no other person had ever done, thus putting it in their power to believe on Him and receive Him, they sinned in not believing on Him and in not receiving Him. The Lord takes from them all excuse for their unbelief, in declaring that he had come and spoken unto them— that he had 'done such works as no other person had ever done, in proof of his divine mission, thus giving them the power to believe. But my worthy friend comes forward and apologizes for them, by saying that they could not *believe*, that God never gave them the power to repent and turn

to Him, and consequently that they were doing all that they by any possibility could do—that is, simply to sin on and keep sinning. He cannot with his system, as Paul did, preach to "all men everywhere to repent;" or if he does, he does it with the belief in his mind that they cannot do it. He justifies the impenitent continually, by declaring that they cannot do otherwise. He cannot, as Paul did, call upon *all men everywhere* to repent, because God will judge the world because he does not believe that they can repent.

But before we dismiss this first argument, we invite attention to Psalms viii.: 3, 4, 5. It reads as follows:

"When I consider thy heavens, the works of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; what is man that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that Thou visitest him? Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; and Thou, hast put all things under his feet."

I quote this passage to set forth the intention of God in creating man. He created him for a high and a noble end. He designed him for the highest and most lofty sphere, and if he fails of that high end, I intend to find the cause of it in his own perversity, which he could have avoided, and not in the intention of God. He created all for the highest and most glorious object, and after man had fallen from that object, through the Lord Jesus Christ, God, in His infinite mercy, has put it in his power to return to his Father and his God and be saved forever. I want the gentleman's attention to these Scriptures, especially John xv.: 22, 24.

II. My second argument is founded upon the promise to Abraham, Genesis xii.: 3. It reads as follows:

"And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

Here we have a promise of a blessing for *all families* of the earth. My friend can find no such promise as to all families of the earth, in his system. His system has no promise in it for all families of the earth. But

we shall apply to Paul for an application of this promise, and see if we can determine what it means. Let us hear him:

"And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." This shows that the promise to Abraham contained' the gospel, or in other words, that the promise was the gospel, in promise. It contained a blessing for all nations. What is this blessing promised to all nations? It must be according to the purpose of God, for the promise can be nothing more than the first step towards developing the purpose, or the original intention of God. If God purposed in himself that man should seek him and have the privilege to find him, the promise of a blessing to all nations should have reference to the medium through which man should seek and find God. This is precisely where Paul applies the promise. He says, that "the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed."

The Scripture foreseeing, is God foreseeing, or foreshadowing, what he would do in accordance with his eternal purpose, and making the promise is preaching the gospel in promise, containing a blessing for all nations. This blessing for all nations is a system of justification, because the apostle makes God foresee that he would justify the matter through faith, and the fact that it is through faith shows that it is conditional. It is a conditional salvation, to be given to them that believe. It is thus clear that God purposed to give all nations the privilege to seek Him and find Him, and His promise to Abraham that He would bless all nations, corresponds with this purpose. Therefore, the purpose of God and His first promise are as free to all as to any one of Adam's race.

III. My third argument is founded upon the testimony of the prophets. Does the testimony of the prophets accord with what we have said? We will hear the apostle Peter, Acts x.: 43, first. He says:

"To Him give all the prophets witness, that through

His name whosoever believeth on Him, shall receive remission of sins." Here appears to be the same extended scheme or plan, not confined to a nation or a family, but, to all who believe, that they may receive the forgiveness of sins. There is nothing partial in it; it is as free to all as to any one. Peter is here working according to the purpose of God, and the promise to Abraham, and alleges that all the prophets bear witness that through the name of Christ, whosoever believeth shall receive remission of sin. This perfectly accords with Joel, ii.: 28. He says:

"And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions; upon my servants and upon my handmaidens in those days will I pour out of my spirit."

Here the prophet refers to the miraculous endowment of the apostles and confirmation of the word of God, and he confines not its benefits to one nation or one people, but promises them to all flesh. Is it not as evident as noon-day that God, when he authorized this prediction, intended a blessing for the race? In view of this promise, Peter said on the day of Pentecost, "The promise is unto you and to your children, and to all them that are afar off." Could this promise have been true, and it never the less true, that a portion of those who hear the gospel could not believe it, could not be blessed by it or saved? But all this perfectly accords with the apostle's remark Col. i:23. It reads as follows:

"If ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister."

In these words, it is not simply stated that the gospel was preached to every creature under heaven, but the *hope* of the gospel. Now I defy my friend to show any *hope* of the gospel he has to preach to every creature under heaven. He may preach the hope of the gospel to the elect, but he cannot sincerely, preach it to the non-elect, for there is no hope of the gospel for them. The



Bible contains no promise for them, if my opponent is right. It contains a condemnation for them, but no medium of justification. It contains for them curses, but no blessings. It contains for them a hell, but no heaven, if he is right, upon any possible grounds. If he is right, the Bible speaks of a hell for the wicked, in which they shall be punished forever, for sins which they never had it in their power to avoid.

We are aiming, in this discussion, to extend his horizon, and enlarge the field before him, that he may have room for his noble powers and his great heart to do some good in the world. He has become so habituated to the narrow limits of his contracted and circumscribed theory, that it seems impossible to induce him to look at the expansive benevolence of the gospel. It is impossible to induce him to believe that God has loved all men as much as himself, and that the grace of God is as free for all who hear it as for any one. Yet such is the truth in the case. Let me refer him to Isaiah xlv. 22. The prophet says:

"Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God and none else." How it would ennoble my friend's whole nature, were he to admit the expansive benevolence of this passage into his heart! But in his present circumscribed system, he cannot cry, "Look unto me, all the ends of the earth and be saved," for he does not believe they can look unto the Lord and be saved. But we insist that the above language cannot be sincere, if the doctrine of my friend is true. God cannot, if he passed by a portion of the human race, without making it possible for them to look to him and be saved, in sincerity call upon them to look unto him and be saved, for He knows they cannot. It is mocking his helpless creatures, to call upon them to do that which is impossible. It is tantalizing them, to invite them to come unto him, when He knows they cannot by any possibility do it.

There is an extensive class of scriptures of this kind, not one of which can be in the spirit of candor, if the doctrine of my friend be true. It cannot be candid to give invitations to all to come, when it is known that many

never can come. The provision must be as wide as the invitation, or else the invitation is given to all for whom the provision is not made, in insincerity, and the cause of their not coming is not in themselves, but in something over which they had no control, and if they are lost for not coming, they are lost for not doing what they never had the ability to do. This represents God as punishing them forever for not doing an impossibility. This is a cruelty and injustice that cannot be ascribed to the ever-blessed God, and any system that ascribes it to him impeaches his holy character, and should be repudiated.

IV. My fourth argument is drawn from John the Baptist. I intend to show to this audience that my worthy friend is not in fellowship with John the Baptist. No two men could differ more widely. John says of himself, "He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light. That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." John I. 9, 10. Let us hear John again. "The next day John seeth Jesus, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Such is an expression of the teaching of John the Baptist. How different from Mr. Hume. John calls our Savior "The true light, *which lighteth every man that cometh into the world,*" but Mr. Hume calls him the light for those whom he intended to enlighten, thus throwing the cause back upon the Lord, if any one is not enlightened. This we repel; if there be those who are not enlightened, we must find the cause in the wickedness of men, and not in the *intention of God*. Because, if it was God's will that they should not be enlightened, his will is done when they are kept in ignorance. This is expressly opposed to his arrangement. He has sent a light more, *the* light for every man that cometh into the world; and if any are not enlightened, it is not because the light was not intended for all, and given freely to all; but because, through the wickedness of man, the light has been veiled from some for whom God gave it.

But John the Baptist, called Christ "the Lamb of God who taketh away *the sin of the world.*" He is the Lamb of God—the sin-offering for the world. Where sin abounded, his grace did much more abound. By whatever

reasoning and argument, the worthy gentleman will show that Christ was the true light to him, or that he was the Lamb of God to take away his sins, I will show that he was the Lamb of God to take away the sins of any other man who repents. I claim here, then, that Christ is the true light to *every man* that cometh into the world, as much as he is the light to any *one man*; and that he is a sin-offering, or the Lamb of God to take away the sin of *every man* as much as any *one man*; and let him gainsay it who can. Did Almighty God prepare the light for every man who cometh into the world, and did he prepare an offering for "the world," and at the same time, pass by a portion of the world without making any provision for them?

V. My fifth argument is founded upon the love of God. "Whom did God love? Did he love the whole race, or only a part? We shall hear the Lord himself state whom he loved. Here are his words:

"And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so might the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." John in. 14, 17.

Here we have two important points most clearly and explicitly stated. 1. That God loveth the world. 2. The object of Christ's mission. The doctrine of my opponent stands in direct opposition to both these points. Let us look at them for a few moments. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." What for? He answers, "That whoever believeth in Him, should not perish but have eternal life." To whom does the Son here say, "might have eternal life?" "*Whosoever believeth in Him.*" Where is the proof of this? He says: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life." Here it is stated, that God loved "the world." What does he mean by *the world*? Immediately after these words, he says, God sent his son into "the world." What world did God send his Son into? The world of mankind. The world of mankind is then the world that God loved,

the world that he sent his Son into, the world that his son did not come to condemn, and the world that "through him might be saved."

What did God send his Son into the world for? The answer in the Lord's own words is: "that the *world through him might be saved.*" That what could be saved. The same world that God loved, that God sent his son into; and that he commanded the Apostles to preach the Gospel to. This is as clear as the sun in the heavens, and this is what Calvinists do not believe. They want to shut out their neighbors, or at least a part of them, from the love of God; from his grace, from his most free and precious gift—the Lord from heaven. We insist that the love of God, his grace, his mercy and his salvation, are just as free to all Mr. Hume's acquaintances, as to himself and brethren.

But we must hear Paul on this point. He says, "For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Much more, then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." Romans v.: 7, 9.

This we quote as corroborative of what the Lord had before said. "God loved the world so that he gave his Son for the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved; and he commended his love toward us, in that we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Our work in this controversy is to plead for the extension of God's love to the world, as originally intended; and thus to show all, that they owe eternal gratitude to God, for his unspeakable love, and that they will justly be punishable if they do not love him, who first loved them. But the mission of our opponent not only now, but in all his efforts, is to circumscribe the grace of God, and induce the people to believe that God never loved a portion of them; that Christ never died for them; that the grace of God was not intended for them; that they never can believe, repent and turn to God, and consequently to justify them in their sins.

VI. My sixth argument is founded upon the death of Christ. Here we

have come to a grave point. This is a capital point in our argument. If Christ died for all, then beyond, all dispute, all who hear the gospel can come to him and be saved. I shall then show beyond doubt, that he died for the race. Without further ceremony I shall appeal to Paul. First Corinthians xv.: 21, 22." For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Here we have a parallel between the first and the second Adams. By the first Adam came death; by the second Adam came the resurrection of the dead. By the first Adam all die; by the second Adam all shall be made alive. The extent of the fall by the first Adam, independent of our volitions, is precisely the same as the extent of the benefits by the second Adam, independent of our choice. The number affected by the Adamic transgression is precisely the same as the number affected by our Savior. The "all" who die by Adam, are precisely the same as the "all" who are made alive by Christ. The whole injury that fell upon us, without our volition or action, by the Adamic sin, is removed by Christ without our volition or action. Hence the same number that are fallen in Adam, will be raised in or by Christ. Whatever that fall was that came by Adam, or whatever that loss was, we shall be restored from it by Christ. However wide or great the number who die by Adam, the same number shall be made alive by Christ. My opponent admits that the race died by Adam, and he admits that the race will be raised from the dead by Christ. In Christ's resurrection from the dead, we have an assurance of a resurrection of all mankind. But if Christ had passed by any and not died for them, could they have been raised from the dead by him?

The great scripture truth that Christ died for all, and was raised from the dead, is the basis of our hope of the resurrection from the dead; and not only *our* hope, but the hope of a world's resurrection from the dead. If there are any for whom he did not die, they will not be raised from the dead. But that he died for all is asserted in so many words. Heb. ii.: 9. "But we see Jesus, who was

made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Here, it is asserted in the roundest terms that he did "*taste death for every man.*" If he died for all, then may we hope for a resurrection of all through him, and then may all come to him and be saved. But we must hear Paul again. He says:"

For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose again." Second Corinthians, v.: 14, 15.

Now we ask how many are dead? My opponent will admit that all are dead—the whole family of man. Paul then argues that all were dead, and proves it by the fact that *Christ died for all*. The "all" then, that Christ died for, are precisely the same as the "all" who were dead. If Christ only died for a *part*, only a *part* were dead. But if he died for all, then were all dead. The worthy gentleman must prepare himself for an atonement as wide in extent as the death. One cannot be made partial and the other universal. He cannot consistently preach universal death, and partial atonement. The same number who were dead, Christ died for; and those whom he died for; can come to him. Death reigned by the first Adam. Life came by the second Adam. Life came to precisely the same number that death reigned over; yet life came to none for whom Christ did not die

My argument from these passages is plain. The fact that Christ has secured for all who die in Adam a resurrection, shows that he died for all; for the race die by Adam, and have the promise that they shall be made alive by Christ unless he died for them. It is asserted that all shall be made alive by him. This shows that he must have died for all. In the other passage the Apostle argues from the fact that he died for all, that all were dead, thus making the number that Christ died for, the same as the number dead. Precisely as wide, then, as death by Adam extends, a resurrection by Christ shall extend. This beyond all dispute extends to all the race. The Lord Jesus Christ then died for the race.

If he died for all, most unquestionably those who hear Christ preached may come to him, believe in him, repent, confess him and be saved. Why may they not? God loved them. Christ died for them. He commanded the gospel to be preached to them; and consequently invited them to come to him and be saved. Could God have loved them; Christ have died for them; commanded the gospel to be preached to all, thus extending the vindication to all, and the doctrine of Mr Hume been true? It is out of the question. His doctrine meets the Bible with a palpable denial at all these points. It denies that God loved all, that Christ died for all, that all have the invitation to come, that it is in the power of all to whom the gospel is preached, to come; and thus remains on the one hand, the argument in favor of reformation, and on the other the ground of condemnation. The Lord claims that he has left the sinner without excuse, but my friend volunteers and puts an excuse into his lips.

If the sinner in the day of judgment can say, God never loved me; Christ never died for me; I have never been invited to come to God; God never extended his grace to me; I never had the power to come; it would acquit him of all blame. The reason of his failure is not in himself, and therefore he is not responsible, and cannot justly be punished. But the state of the case will be entirely different. It will in that day be thundered in the ears of sinners, that God loved them; that the Lord died for them; that the invitation was extended to them; that their obedience was urged upon them; that ability to come to the Lord was given; but the response from them, was, they could not. They will mind the cause of their condemnation in their own perversity, and not in a lack in the provision the Lord has' made. They will be condemned for not receiving a Savior that died for them for not believing a gospel which they could have believed, and for not repenting of sins, of which they might have repented; and not damned former for not performing an impossibility.

Time expired.

**MR. HUME'S FIRST SPEECH  
ON THE SECOND PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN——

I wish you to bear in mind the important fact that my friend, Elder Franklin, entirely failed on yesterday to show under what influence man was led into sin, notwithstanding he was twice called upon to do so. Some information from him upon this subject may be of great service to us all before the close of this discussion. We are now, my audience, about to enter into the investigation of a certain point in theology in which the whole religious world is deeply interested. We are fully aware of the powerful weight of popular prejudice, against which we have to contend in taking the negative of the proposition now before us. We are also aware that the doctrine of our proposition to-day has been the subject of controversy among religionists in all ages. Much time and talent has been devoted to discussing its merits; while the religious world at this time appears to be as much divided upon the subject as at any period of the world's history. Consequently we approach this subject with but little ground to hope that we shall be able to settle a controversy that has so long agitated the Christian world; but notwithstanding all this, we feel willing *God being our helper*, to bear our testimony to God's eternal truth, as we understand it to be revealed in the sacred Scriptures. My friend, Mr. Franklin, has been engaged for the last hour in endeavoring to establish what *perhaps three-fourths of the audience already believe*, that the eternal salvation of sinners is suspended upon conditions to be performed by themselves, while we feel bound in all good



conscience to take an entirely different view of the subject, and consequently you will find me in the negative of the present proposition, contending with the ability that God giveth, that the eternal salvation of sinners is alone suspended upon the eternal and unchangeable love of God in Christ toward them. We hope that the audience will endeavor to listen and determine as for eternity, and remember that all your prejudices in favor of error will never make it the truth. If conditional salvation really is taught in the Holy Bible, no doubt but our learned opponent will be able to show it. This is what he has been engaged at for the last hour, but we have not as yet heard anything from him that tends to convince us that the doctrine of his proposition is true. The first thing the gentleman said in his speech that was worthy of note was in these words, *Man's salvation is in his own hands*. Now, if this be true, surely he is much more independent than we had supposed, and cannot be under obligation to any other. Hence if the gentleman's views are correct, salvation is by works, and not by grace, which position is positively denied by an apostle, as we will show before we are done with this subject. But again, if man's salvation is in his own hands, what use has he for the adorable Savior? We suppose none at all: consequently he can stand aside; for the sinner is perfectly independent upon the subject. If he chooses to save himself, he will do so; but if not, he will take a different course and go down to misery and ruin. But once more, it is not only true that Christ has died for them, but it is also true that the Holy Spirit has done his duty in giving light to every man that cometh into the world, according to my friend's theory, Now my audience will pause one moment and consider. See the blessed Jesus suffering and dying, rising from the dead, ascending on high, and then interceding for sinners: behold him so engaged for the salvation of poor sinners that he sends the Holy Spirit to enlighten them, gives his word to instruct them, sends his gospel to invite them, and after all they are not saved. O, what a poor, disappointed Jesus! Yes, he loves poor sinners, and greatly desires to save them, but the sinner will not be saved; consequently

our dear Redeemer has done all in vain, and has the mortification to behold the *travail of his soul, the purchase of his blood*, sink down to pain and woe. Now, my dear audience, can you persuade yourselves to believe such a system as this? Ask yourselves the question, why is it so? Is not Jesus able to save them? Surely he is. Well, is he not willing to save them? You all acknowledge he is. Then if he is both able and willing, why will it not be done? I suppose my friend will tell you it is simply because the sinner will not be saved. But stop one moment and inquire, will the sinners "*will not*" destroy the love, the mercy and goodness of God, together with the sufferings and death of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the influence of the Holy Spirit, the power of the gospel and written word—*all*? Most assuredly such a theory cannot be true. But more of this in another place.

My friend acknowledges that God had an eternal purpose, and that this purpose will be accomplished. He was pleased in his wisdom to tell us what that purpose was, and referred to Ephesians, third chapter and ninth verse, to prove it, which was, as he says, to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God. But the gentleman is very much mistaken with regard to what the eternal purpose of God was. If you will read the tenth verse and examine it closely, you will find what the purpose of God was in this particular. The Apostle says, "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the *Church* the manifold wisdom of God." Well, what is this according to? Bead the eleventh verse—"According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

My friend's error upon this subject is so plain that we feel assured that the audience will see it. He tells you it was the eternal purpose of God to make *all men see*. Paul tells us it was that the *Church* might know the manifold wisdom of God. Truly, there is a vast difference between the views of Elder Franklin and the Apostle Paul. The audience can believe which they

choose: for our part, we are disposed to believe the inspired Apostle.

We now inquire, if it was the eternal purpose of God in Christ Jesus to manifest his wisdom to the Church, *will He fail to do it? Will He purpose and be disappointed?* We feel confident He will not. We therefore maintain that whatever the all-wise God purposes to do. He will do; because He is infinite in wisdom and almighty in power—that is to say. He knows *all things* and has *all power*; therefore, knowing all things. He is never deceived or mistaken with regard to what He wants done, neither does He lack the power to carry all his will into effect. Then we inquire, if He neither lacks wisdom to see what He wishes done, or power to have it done, will He not do it? It does seem to me that every lady and gentleman present will have to answer, surely He will, and more especially when you hear the mighty God himself declare, by his servant the prophet, I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, *my counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.*—Isaiah xlvii. 9, 10. Here we have the testimony of God himself that his counsel *shall stand*, and He *will do all his pleasure*.

Now if all means all, and our friend says it does, what part of the pleasure of God will not be done? or, in other words, will He not do all He desires to do? We think there is no getting round this position without giving Jehovah himself the lie. Well, He also says his counsel *shall stand*. Now we suppose that purpose and counsel are synonymous terms, as used in the Scriptures. Here the eternal counsel or purpose of God is admitted by my friend, Mr. Franklin. Well, the Lord Jehovah says it *shall stand*. We have shown you from the third chapter of Ephesians, what that eternal purpose was—that the *church* should know the manifold wisdom of God, and not that all men should see, &c. Now if our views are correct, and we think they cannot be gainsaid, the whole fabric built by the gentleman on the text in Ephesians comes down with a mighty crash, while he must look out for other testimony

to sustain his proposition, for sure it is he has none in this text; and now, while upon this point, we would inquire, did Jehovah purpose to save sinners before He did save them, or did He save them first and then purpose to do it?

We hope our friend will be very particular in answering these interrogatories, for they will be of special benefit in this discussion. If it be admitted, and surely it must be, that the Lord God purposed at any time to save sinners, we think it must also be admitted that He purposed to save some sinners; and if so, did He not also purpose how many sinners? To deny this would be equivalent to a denial of the God of the Bible. We would here remark that, according to our views of the character of the God of the Bible, He does nothing without first determining to do, and that He is certain to accomplish all He determines; hence He never meets with any disappointment whatever, but accomplishes his sovereign will in the armies of Heaven as well as among the sons of men. This is the character of the God of the Bible, who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.

The gentleman referred us to Acts xvii. 26, 27, and quoted only a part of the twenty-seventh verse. Had he quoted his whole verse, the text would have explained itself; but he was very careful to leave out the following *by haply they might feel after him and find him.* Now we ask the candid mind in this audience if there is anything here that sustains the gentleman's proposition. He has undertaken to prove that any person of adult years and sane mind can repent, confess the Lord Jesus, turn to God, and be finally saved, and to prove this he quotes a text that says, *"if they should feel after him and find."* If this is the best the gentleman can do, he may as well surrender the point now, for he will never make this audience believe the doctrine of his proposition with such proof as he has yet introduced, and we do not believe he will be able to do any better, but we will patiently wait and see the result.

The gentleman also referred us to the gospel by John xv. 28—"If I had not come and spoken to them they had not

had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." Here the Savior was speaking of the wicked, unbelieving, persecuting Jews, of whom the prophet said, "He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, lest they should see with their eyes, hear with their ears, understand with their hearts, be converted, and I should heal them."—John xii. 40. But suppose we admit the gentleman's argument founded upon this text, that the condemnation of sinners grows out of their rejecting the teachings of Christ—and what will be the result. It must be evident to all that the coming, sufferings and death of Christ, together with his subsequent teaching, is the greatest *curse* that has ever befallen the race, for if rejecting Christ and his teaching is the condemnation of sinners, *then nothing else is*; consequently, if he had not come and taught them, *they would not have been condemned*, and as such they would all have been saved; for without condemnation none could be punished forever. But all now admit that far the greater portion of the human race will be finally lost, and my worthy friend has thought proper to impart to us a knowledge of the reason why sinners are condemned, and that is *because Christ has come and taught them*. Now, my audience, do you not see that if my friend's theory be true, it would have been decidedly better for the race if He had not come at all. Can any one in their sober senses believe such nonsense as this. Surely they cannot. But notwithstanding the astonishing and unheard of doctrine taught by the gentleman upon this subject, he in the next place introduces an argument more positively at war with common sense and the Bible than anything he has said during this discussion, or than I have ever heard drop from the lips of any man, much less from one who possesses the talents and learning of my friend, Mr. Franklin, Indeed it does seem to me that it must have made the good sense of this audience blush. Well, what is it? It is this—*God has given every man power to be regenerated*. Now let us inquire one moment, what is the *reproduced—renewed—born again*. Then the gentleman's idea would be this—God has given every man power to

be *reproduced, renewed* or *born again*. Now We acknowledge that our friend is really smart, but we do not believe he is sufficiently smart to make this audience believe what he has said upon this subject. No, he will have to go beyond the swamps of Indiana, and get entirely out of hearing of the blue stocking Baptist, before he will find people who are so profoundly ignorant as to believe such a palpable and gross insult to common sense as this. What, *that which is not, have power to be?* that which does not exist have power to bring itself into being? My audience, just look at the gentleman's theory one moment, and I feel confident that you will reject it with utter contempt and disdain. A man have power to reproduce himself, renew himself, and, worse than all, to *born himself again!* Surely this must be Hedge's logic, or the logic of some one who has never studied common sense. Now, it is a self-evident fact, that can never be successfully denied, that man has not the power to *produce* himself in the first place, and surely he has not the power to *reproduce* that which he could not *produce*. Again, there never can be a birth without a *begetting* and *quickenning*, after which comes the birth. Now, we ask all candid minds, has a man that does not exist the power to beget and quicken himself, and then bring himself into being? Every intelligent mind here knows better. Yes, children ten years old know better. Mr. Franklin himself knows better, and we hope in his next speech that he will apologize to the audience for such a willful departure from the principles of sound philosophy and common sense.

Our attention was next called to Hebrews ii. 9—"But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for *every man*." Here you see, my audience, the gentleman wants still another proposition, one that embraces the atonement; for this passage strictly belongs to that subject, and has nothing at all to do with the proposition now before us. But we can attend to the gentleman's wanderings, in order to accommodate him, not because it belongs to our subject today. We would then remark

that, had the gentleman read the connection following the ninth verse, the whole matter would have been explained. We will now read it. "For it became him by whom are all thing's, and for whom are all things, in bringing *many sons* unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering; for both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my *brethren*; in the midst of the *church* will I sing praise unto thee: and again, I will put my trust in him: and again. Behold I and the *children* which God has given me. Forasmuch, then, as the *children* are partakers of flesh and blood," &c., &c. Here the "every man" in the ninth verse is clearly defined to be the many *sons*, the *sanctified*, the *brethren*, and the *children* that God had given him, and no more. So much, then, for my friend's dodging off of the atonement.

But we are again referred to Galatians iii. 8, 9. "We have already replied to this connection, and we shall not reply to it again.

But our attention is invited to Acts X. 23—43. The forty-third verse, which is the important text, as the gentleman supposes, reads as follows: "To him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." This is precisely what we believe—that "whosoever believeth, &c. But what does this text say about *any man of sane mind and adult years having power to turn to God?* You know, my audience, that this text, as well as every other one introduced by the gentleman, has nothing to do with the proposition.

But my friend has made another wonderful discovery indeed, and that is, that the apostle Peter was a Calvinist up to the time that he went to the house of Cornelius, after which he changed his opinion and became more liberal in his views. Now if this should be true, we are truly under great obligation to the gentleman for his instruction; but if it is not true, then Mr. Franklin is under great obligation to offer an apology to us for thus attempting to deceive us. Well, that he is wrong is

evident from the simple fact that Peter lived and died long before Calvin was born; consequently Peter knew nothing about Calvin. Well, my friend is wrong from another consideration, and that is, Peter did not at anytime, that we have any account of in the Bible, teach the whole of Calvin's system. *No* doubt he taught some things that Calvin believed and taught, but not because he learned them from John Calvin; for we have just shown that Peter never knew Calvin; hence all the gentleman's boasting about Peter being a Calvinist, and about his changing his doctrine, is found to have originated in the confused brain of my worthy friend, which imagines many things equally without foundation in truth.

But we are referred to Colossians i. 23. By reference to that passage, you will find the Apostle is talking about the gospel having been preached to every creature under heaven, and not about all men having power to repeat, turn to God, and be finally saved.

But again, we are directed to Isaiah xlv. 22—"Look unto me, all the ends of the earth, and be ye saved; for I am God, and there is none else." Here the prophet is reprobating the idolatrous practice of his brethren the Jews; for God had said unto them, "Thou shalt have no God beside me," and they were now engaged in making for themselves idols, gods of their own make, and Jehovah is simply calling their attention to the fact that there is salvation in no God beside him; consequently they should look to him, and not to those dumb idols.

But the gentleman wishes to enlarge our Christian philanthropy, and induce us to embrace a more liberal system, and not confine the benefits of salvation to the little few that are identified with ourself. We now propose to show the audience that, as narrow contracted as the gentleman would fain make you believe we are, we are much more liberal than himself; and if he is honest, we will make him acknowledge it. We do verily believe that there are saints of the Most High God scattered among the different orders of professed Christians, and thousands of them in the world who live and die without being immersed or belonging to any church. This my friend dare not acknowledge; for if he does, then fare-



well to his proposition to-morrow; for he then intends to try to make you believe that without immersion there is no salvation. But be it remembered that the people of God are a little few, so brought to view in the Bible; for Moses says, "The Lord thy God did not choose thee, nor set his love upon thee, because thou art greater than all people; for thou art *the fewest* of all people."—Deut. vii, 7. And again, the Savior says, "Fear not, *little flock.*" Hence you see that both Moses and Christ testify to what we have above remarked, that the Lord's people are comparatively few. So much, then, for my friend's burlesque upon us for want of Christian benevolence.

But the worthy gentleman tells you that we differ very widely from John the Baptist, that we are no relation of his, and refers to John i. 9, to prove it, which reads: "That was the true light, that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Now, my audience, just read the tenth verse, and then ask yourselves the question—Can Mr. Franklin's views be true? That verse reads thus: "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world *knew him not.*" Now, we ask 'you, what good did his lighting do them? For, says the text, they *knew him not.* Hence we remark, it was not the light of divine grace, or surely they would have known him; for, saith the prophet, "all thy children *shall be taught of the Lord.*" We now intend to show this audience that there is no relation between my friend and John the Baptist; no, not so much as second cousin. Read, if you please, the thirteenth verse of the same chapter, and you will be convinced at once that they do not belong to the same family. Hear it, if you please: "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Now has not the gentleman been engaged for one hour laboring hard to prove that man had to do this work himself? Yes, he even went so far as to tell this audience that every man had the power to be born again. Now compare what John says with what Mr. Franklin has said, and we cannot suppose they are of the same family; for surely if they were, there would be more of an agreement in what they said. So much for my friend's denying the relationship between ourself and

John the Baptist. We told the gentleman yesterday that we would pursue him closely to-day, and we intend to do it; and when the artillery of heaven is let loose against the mud walls of the city of delusion in which he dwells, they will be shaken to their very center, and finally demolished.

But the gentleman told us, when last up, that Christ, by his death and suffering, had taken away the sins of the world. We should have been glad if he had more fully defined his position here; for the word "world" in the Scriptures is a very indefinite term, and indeed it is indefinite as used among us, for we speak of the religious world, the political world, the profane world, the moral world, &c. We should be glad to know which of the many worlds brought to view in the Scriptures the gentleman refers to. If he means the world spoken of in 1 John iv. 14, we believe it substantially. That passage reads thus: "For we have seen and do testify that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Savior of the *world*," and we believe the Son did what He came to do, and consequently did save that world. We dare the gentleman to take this ground. If he does, we will show you that it is he that is the Universalist; for if the word "world" means the whole race of mankind, and Christ did what He came to do, then the race of mankind are saved, and we and our friend are both wrong.

Again, if Christ did remove condemnation from the race, I defy the gentleman, with all his talents and learning, to show how any man is to be finally lost, and God remain just. We hope he will attend to this point in his next speech. The gentleman is very anxious, it appears, that we should be more benevolent in our feelings and more liberal in our views. We have already proven to this audience that we are much more liberal in our views than our worthy friend; for we save multiplied thousands of unbaptized persons, and he saves none. But he wants us to do some good, *to make proselytes, we suppose*. We read in the Bible of certain men in ancient times that compassed sea and land to make proselytes, and you perhaps remember the result. We have no desire to make proselytes, and especially such as have recently been

made not far from here. We have now replied to all the gentleman's arguments and proof-texts, and we most positively declare to you that we are unable to see any proof in all the quotations he has made to sustain his proposition.

We now intend to do what, by the rules of debating, we are not required to do; that is, *to prove a negative*. "We intend to show from the Bible, that the gentleman's theory is not true; that sinners are alone saved by grace, and not by works; and we will do this by a discharge of the artillery above referred to, beginning with the 21st verse of the chapter of Matthew, which reads as follows: "And she shall bring forth a son and thou shalt, call his name Jesus, for he *shall save his people from their sins*." Here we have the testimony of an angel, that Jesus *shall save his people*. Not one word here about accepting terms and using means, or of repenting, believing, and turning to God, but the language is plain, definite, and to the point—*he shall save his people*. Matthew, xviii. chapter, 11th verse, the adorable Jesus himself positively declares, the son of man is come to save that which was lost, not to make a way possible whereby the *lost might be* saved, no, but to *save the lost*. Now he either did what he came to do, or he did not. If he did not, where was the use of his coming; if he did do what he came to do (and we maintain that he did), then the lost are saved, and we are right in our views.

But read, if you please, Luke xix. chapter, 10th verse, where the Savior uses the same language verbatim, with the addition of the word seek, and surely he knew for what he came. And he never, upon any occasion, said he came to make salvation possible to any, but to do the work, and that was to save the lost. We now refer you to the gospel by John, vi. chapter, 37th, 38th, 39th, 44th and 47th verses, which read as follows, to wit: "All that the Father giveth me *shall* come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out; for I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. No

man can come to me, except the Father which sent me draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, and they shall all be taught of God; every man, therefore, that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me." Here are at least four important points brought to view in this connection. First, that the Father gave some to the Son; and secondly, that those given *should all come*; thirdly, that none could come but such as were drawn by the Father; and fourthly, that they should all be taught of God. *Every man*, therefore, that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh to Jesus Christ—*not some of them*, but every man. Not that they can or might come, no, but they do come. And why? Simply because they are drawn by the Father. Now, if my friend says that all are drawn by the Father, I prove by the dear Savior that all who are drawn come. And my friend is again dressed up in Universalism, and he does not like this dress very well, but he has to wear it or *turn his coat*. We wonder which he will do.

But again. John viii. chapter, 43d, 44th, 47th verses: "Why do you not understand my speech, even because ye *can not hear my word*." Now—the gentleman told *us* in his speech this morning, that the truth of his proposition turned upon the word CAN; they *can* repent, believe, turn to God, etc. We told you, since we were up, that we would show the gentleman about his *can*. Here it is. Jesus tells certain people they *can not hear his words*. Now, Jesus and the gentleman is at variance here. My friend says they can, and Jesus says they *can not*. I leave you, my audience, to determine between them, while I proceed to show you why they could not hear the words of the Savior. Jesus says in the 44th verse, "Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." This is the reason that the Savior gives, and we suppose he knew. But read the 47th verse, and you will find the same idea confirmed. He there says, "he that is of God heareth God's words: ye, therefore, hear them not, because ye *are not of God*." What do you think, my friends, the gentleman will do with his *can* along here? We rather guess he will have to put *not* to it, or be found contradicting the Savior, and this would not go down

well with the people. Once more. John x. chapter, 28th verse, Jesus says to certain characters, "but ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." Now, the gentleman says, the reason why sinners do not believe, is, because they *will not*. Jesus says, *it is because they are not of his sheep*, and we are so simple that we believe Jesus tells the truth about it. But again. John xii. chapter, 39th and 40th verses, Jesus says: "Therefore they *could not believe*, because that Esaias said again But read the 47th verse, and you will find the same idea confirmed. He there says, "he that is of God heareth God's words; ye, therefore, hear them not, because ye *are not of God*." What do you think, my friends, the gentleman will do with his can along here? We rather guess he will have to put *not* to it, or be found contradicting the Savior, and this would not go down he hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes nor understand with their heart," etc. Here you find the Savior contradicting my friend in most positive terms. In the text above, we showed you that they could not hear the WORDS of the Savior; in this connection we show you that they *can not* believe, they can not see neither can they understand. Now I ask every candid mind here, if we were now to stop and proceed no farther, if we have not redeemed our pledge, which was to prove a negative. The proposition says, any man of adult years and sane mind can hear the word of the Lord and believe; we have showed you that the Master says there are those that *can not* hear the words of the Lord, and *can not believe*.

I have no doubt the gentleman would like, by this time, to have a not attached to his can, but he is too late. The battle has advanced too far, and is waxing hotter and hotter, and will continue to do so, until the gentleman's Armenian nest is entirely burned up. And for the purpose of increasing the fire already so rapidly burning, we invite your attention to the ii. chapter of Acts, 39th verse: "For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, (and who are they?) even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Mark the language—"even as many"—clearly showing there are some which he does not call. Hence, my friends, theory receives another fatal stab here. But once more. Acts xiii. chapter, 48th verse—"And when the Gentiles heard this they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord; and *as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed*." Mark the language here again—"as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed," but no more. This language

bears strong testimony to the fact, that there are some who were not ordained to eternal life. I hope my friend will tell us in his next speech who these are, and whether his will embrace such as God has not ordained to eternal life. But our time is just out, we refer you to Romans ix. chapter 15th 18th vss. Which is strong to the point. For he saith to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I have mercy. So then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, nut of God that showeth mercy. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." Here my friend had as well surrender, for he never can make those Scriptures fit his system.

Time Expired.

**MR FRANKLIN'S SECOND SPEECH**  
**SECOND PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I shall proceed in the first place briefly to review the gentleman's speech. I see no necessity for his continuous insinuations about *learning*. I have not here, and never do in any place, set up any ostentatious claims for superior learning. All the innuendos in that direction are perfectly gratuitous, unless he still feels burnt with one or two failures he has made, in undertaking to emphasize upon words where he proved wholly incapable, such as the words "of" "with," "in" and "by." I am in hopes that in time to come, he wilt profit by the old adage, that small boats should keep near shore, but larger vessels may venture more."

The gentleman has boldly taken the position, that the will has nothing to do with conversion! This is walking up to the point, and meeting the responsibility fairly. It is facing the issue square up. If the *'will* has nothing to do with man's conversion, the unwilling are as liable to be converted as anybody, and the willing as liable to be unconverted. If the unwilling are converted, who shall be rewarded for it? If the willing are left unconverted, who is to blame for it? If a man desires to be a Christian and cannot, who is to be punished for it? Mr. Hume believes that if a man is not converted, he will be lost. But if he is not converted, whose fault was it? Not his, if his *will* has nothing to do with his conversion..

We are now into the real merits of the question. Mr. Hume has ridiculed the very idea of a man's will having anything to do with his conversion; his volition having anything to do with his being born again, or the question

of his salvation being put into his own hands, so that he can decide it himself. In all this, he is a true and genuine Calvinist, but in as direct opposition to the oracles of God, as a man be. I maintain that if a man cannot, determine whether he shall be a child of God or not, he cannot injustice be punished for not being a child of God. If a man cannot choose whether he will be converted or not, he cannot be punished for not being converted. , If a man cannot decide the issue of his salvation, he is not a free moral agent, and consequently not an accountable being, and if not accountable, he cannot be punished for his sins.

The difference between the worthy gentleman and myself, is that I find the cause of the sinners condemnation in *himself*, while he thinks he finds the cause in *God*. I allege, that the reason the sinner is not converted, is in *himself*—in his unwillingness to receive Christ, believe the gospel, submit to it and be saved. Mr. Hume repudiates all this, and alleges that the reason the sinner is not converted is, that God is not willing, or, in other words, that the cause of his not being converted is *in God*, who left him out of his plan, and made no provision for him. He believes that God damns sinners in hell forever, for sins they could not obtain deliverance from, and for not being saints, when he never put it into their power to be saints. HE believes sinners are damned forever, *because God did not will* to save them. I believe the finally impenitent will be damned, because they had it in their power to accept salvation but *would not do it*. I believe God, when he says, "He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance, that "he who cometh to him, he will in no wise cast out" and that "whoever *will*," is invited to come, and that the reason of man's condemnation is, that he rejects these gracious expostulations.

Mr. H. continues to be the apologist for sinners, and acquits them of all blame in not being converted and continuing in their sins, by denying that their own will, volition or consent has anything to do in their conversion. His only reason why they are not converted, is that God does not desire, their conversion, does not desire them to be saints, and yet that he damns them because they are



sinners! While the Lord declares that "He is not willing that any should perish," my opponent would have us believe that the only reason why any perish, is that God is not willing to save them, thus throwing all the blame upon God. But he thinks the will of God is always done. According to his theory, he is doing the will of God in defending the truth, and I am doing the will of God in opposing him! I however, can very easily show that the will of God is not always done. Paul says, "I will therefore, that all men pray everywhere." This is God speaking through Paul, declaring that it is his will that all men pray everywhere. Yet we know that all men do not pray. God says, "He is not willing that any should perish," yet we both admit that some do perish. It is required that the Lord's will should be done on earth as it is in heaven, yet it is not done. Jesus said to the Jews, "How oft *would* I have gathered your children, but ye *would not*." It was his will to have gathered them, but they were not gathered into his fold because of their opposing will. This places the blame where it should be, upon the head of the disobedient, and not upon the Lord.

When God wills something that he will do himself, or something that is not contingent upon the human will, it is certain to be done. It in that case amounts to a decree, but when he simply expresses his *will* or *desire*, in regard to the actions of men, it does not amount to a decree and may fail to be done, in which case the blame falls upon the creature. If it involves man's obedience, it is God's will that it should be done, and his authority requires it, and man is punishable for the violation of his will and authority. But according to the doctrine of the worthy gentleman, that the will of God is always done, every robbery, murder, theft, drunkenness and debauchery with every other species of corruption that occurs on earth, is according to the will of God! His sovereign will is as easy as that of which the Universalist talks so loudly. The man who murders is doing the will of God as much as the man who saves life. It makes God the author of sin, and asserts that "whatever is, is right."

Mr. Hume is anxious that I should tell what it is that leads man into sin. The scriptures says, "Let no man

say where he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempted he any man; but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." James i:13, 14. Here it is stated that man is drawn away of *his own* lust. It places the fault in himself. The devil tempted Eve, Job, and others, but the Apostle commands us to resist the devil and he will flee from us." All this goes to show that the Heavenly Father has put it into the power of the sinner to avoid his sins.

The same principle will be recognized in the last judgment. I cannot now read the whole passage. See Matt. xxv.: 31, 46. The Lord in that day shall say to the righteous, "Come, ye blessed of my Father." What is the ground of this invitation? The Lord states it as follows: "For I was a hungered and ye gave me meat; I was a stranger, and ye took me in, &c. It is as manifest as noon-day, that the Lord here makes their doing these acts of humanity the reason of their reception. But to the wicked he will say, "Depart ye cursed." Why does he order them to depart? "For" says he, "I was a hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink." Here is The Lord's own reason for rejecting the wicked—the lack of those acts of humanity which they had it in their power to have done. This perfectly corresponds with Heb. ii: 3, where the Apostle asks the important question, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" How manifest it is from this, that a man may neglect the great salvation which God in so much mercy has provided, and lose it, thus throwing the blame upon the sinner, and not upon the Lord, as Mr. Hume's position does.

I am not surprised at the unpopularity of Mr. Hume's position, of which he complained, if he is in the habit of handling scripture as he did the purpose of God to which I referred, Eph. iii.: 7, 11. He makes this whole passage teach that the fellowship of the mystery was made known *to the church*. Now I deny in the roundest terms that such is the sense of the passage, or that there is any such thing in it. Verse 7, the Apostle asserts that he was made a min-

ister and verse 8, he tells us what he was made a minister for. Here it is, in his own words: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make *all men see* what is the fellowship of the mystery." He does not say, "to make the church see," but to make "*all men see*." My friend was not made a minister for the same purpose that Paul was. Paul was made to make "all men see," but Mr. Hume makes it his mission to make me believe one part of mankind *never can see*. But we will hear Paul further. He says: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." He does not say, made known *to the church*, as my friend has it, but "that now *unto the principalities* and powers in heavenly places, might be known *by the church* the manifold wisdom of God." The church is God's medium, through which he makes known his manifold wisdom, *to the principalities* and powers.

The Apostle here sets out a most beautiful and stupendous plan. God had made him a minister, bestowed upon him the grace of apostleship, that he might make *all men see* and that by or through the church the manifold wisdom of God might be made known to the principalities and powers in heavenly places; all according to the eternal purpose of God. Such a purpose as this is worthy of God, and high as the heavens above that partial and one-eyed purpose of which Mr. Hume talks. It contemplates good to the *race*, and not a little favoritism to *a few*. The effort of Mr. Hume to make this audience believe that the position I occupy sets aside the Savior, was one of the weakest, and most pointless things I have seen. How can he himself think there is a shadow of reality in it? Jesus is the author and finisher of the faith; the beginning and the ending; the first and the last. We; are the whole scheme to him. He is the center and circumference of it. His free and unmerited grace has brought this whole system of benevolence and mercy down to man, and now, because I claim that he requires man to receive it upon certain stipulations, and that he has the power to receive it or reject it, he comes forward with a flourish, and announces that I set aside the Savior.

The gentleman kindly proposes to prove to you that our salvation is not of *works*. I am aware that it is not of the works of the law, but by the working of faith. Paul has alleged that we are not saved by works, and James has declared that a man is justified by works. How is this? There is not the least difficulty. They are not speaking of the same works. Paul is speaking of the works of the law of Moses, and James is speaking of the works of the law of Christ—"good works, which God has ordained that we should walk in them." But the steps of obedience we are required to take in regeneration, or conversion are not, in the New Testament sense, called *works* at all, either of the law or gospel. What the gospel means by good works, consists of acts of benevolence or humanity performed after we are justified.

Another delusion that haunted the gentleman's imagination, was that according to my position, Jesus would be disappointed. But it was entirely beyond my comprehension how he could be disappointed. It was his purpose to die for all, that the gospel should be preached to all, that all should have the privilege of believing, repenting and being saved—to save those who received it, and condemn those who do not receive it; and he carries out that purpose and fulfills it to the letter. I cannot for the life of me see that he will be disappointed. He has done, is doing, and will do all his pleasure, and his purpose will stand forever. Mr. Hume's purpose will not stand and *he* will be disappointed—not the Lord.

My worthy friend tried to raise a dust, touching my omitting the words, "if haply they might feel after him and find him." If in the haste of a quotation from memory, I omitted these words, it was unintentional, for certainly there is nothing in these words against me. Indeed, these words should be in to give full force to my argument. The Lord here is informing us what he made all men who dwell on all the face of the earth for. He says, it was "That they should seek the Lord, if haply they *might feel after him and find him.*" Acts, xvii.: 27. Would the Lord say, if haply they *might feel after the Lord and find him*" if he knew that any portion of them could not find him? Mr. Hume had better have let this passage alone; it is a strong proof against him.

Mr. Hume makes a great ado about my quotation from John xv.: 22. "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sins." His remarks appear to me but little more than derision of these words of Jesus, and no off set of anything I have said. The passage does not say, nor did I intimate, that they would have been saved if Christ had not come, but the passage does imply in the most 'unequivocal manner, that if he had not come, they would have had a cloak for their sins, and been free from the sin of rejecting him. But in coming, speaking to them and doing among them such works as none other had ever done, he had left them *without excuse*. If there are any for whom Christ did not die, according to this passage, they have a cloak for their sins, and in the place of being left without excuse, they have an unanswerable excuse for their sins. *They never had it in their power to escape from them.*

The gentleman asks if Christ did that which he came to do, and answers that he did. He then quotes that "He comes to save that which was lost." His meaning is, that he comes that that which was lost *might be saved*, but not unequivocally *to save that which was lost*. He claim? that the Lord did save that which was lost. Well, what was lost? We answer the human race. He has thus, almost in the same breath in which he was trying to make the audience think we were favoring Universalism, plunged into that fatal delusion himself. The truth is, the Lord did not come to save that which was lost, which was the human race, in the absolute and unconditional sense of which he speaks, or there is no escape from Universalism. But he came, as a passage, already cited, beautifully expresses it, "into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world through him *might be saved*." Here it is asserted that the world *might be saved*. John says to the reader, "these things are written that ye *might believe*." The gospel was commanded to be preached to every creature under heaven, and Paul says, "it was preached to every creature under heaven." Remember, now that the object of writing, publishing or preaching, was that the hearers *might believe*. The passage which the gentleman

accused me of intentionally omitting, Acts xvii.:27, declares that God commands all men who dwell on all the face of the earth, that they should seek the Lord, if haply they *might feel after him and find him*. The passages quoted by the gentleman, with so much confidence containing the word "cannot," in every instance mean the same as we mean one half of the time now, viz: *will not*. "He *could not* do many miracles," means he *would not*.

Time expired.

**MR. HUME'S SECOND SPEECH,  
ON THE SECOND PROPOSITION.**

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS—LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

When my time expired in my last speech, we were discoursing on the subject of the divine sovereignty of Him who holds in his hands the keys of hell and of death; who opens and none can shut, and shuts and none can open. Which sovereignty is presented in the language of the apostle recorded in the vii. of Romans, where the apostle says, "Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He *hardeneth*." Now we maintain, that if Jehovah *hardened* none, then the language here employed would be unmeaning; a which the inspired writers have never done, for they never, used language that was un meaning in itself. Moreover, the apostle says in the 22d, 23d verses, "What if God willing to show His wrath and to make His name known, endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath *fitted to destruction*, and that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy which He had afore prepared unto glory. Now here are two classes of vessels, the one *fitted to destruction*, the other *afore prepared unto glory*. We now ask, *are these both the same?* If so, then we have language again that impresses the mind falsely, which cannot be the case. What then are the facts in the case? Simply these—there are some characters *fitted to destruction*. Who fitted them, it matters not. We ask the gentleman, are these the people that *can* repent, believe

and turn to God? It must be evident they are *not*. We have "now proceeded by this connection that God *hardeneth some*, that some are *fitted to destruction*. Now if any of these are of adult years and sane mind, then the gentleman's proposition is not true, and this he dare not deny.

We will now notice the gentleman's speech. He is determined to try to make the audience believe that we believe God has foreordained and decreed the damnation of a part of the human race, let them do what they will. If the gentleman's false accusations against us were to be taken as evidence in this discussion, we would have long since surrendered the point, for surely he abounds in them. But every one here knows that we have made no such statements. We have not so much as hinted, that God had reprobated any one of the race. We have in most positive terms denied believing any such thing; and we now state for the special information of the gentleman, that sin is the cause why men are lost. Jehovah manifests his displeasure against sin, in the punishment of all such as sin is found upon. This is the reason why men are lost, and not because God has decreed it. Let it therefore be distinctly understood, that sin is the cause why any of the race are finally lost.

But the gentleman has referred us to 1st Timothy, ii. chapter, and the first six verses. Truly a fatal reference it will be to him indeed. Let us now read it: "I exhort therefore that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, for kings and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty, for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, 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. Now we most positively believe all that is said in this connection to be true; we dare our friend to acknowledge the same. It is said here that Jesus gave himself a ransom for *all* to be testified in due time; and why? because God *will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth*. Now we substantially believe



that the will of God, as expressed in this text, will be accomplished. Well, what is that will. The text says he will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. Does my friend, Mr. Franklin, believe the all men in this text will be saved. He does not acknowledge it, for if he does then his whole system falls to the ground. Will we believe it, and why? because the text says God will have it so, and if he will have all men to be saved who shall prevent it? None.

We will here remark that the word ALL, like the word world, is very indefinite, as we will show from the sacred Scriptures. It is said in the Bible, "Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. Now you know, my audience, the word all in this text does not embrace all the race, because Herod and his men of war were so enraged at the announcement of the birth of the Savior, that they killed all the children from two years old and under. Now had the news of the birth of Messiah been good to them, surely they would not have acted thus wickedly.

But again, it is said in the Scriptures, the law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. Now we ask, has all the race pressed into the kingdom of God. Every one here knows they have not; hence, my audience, it is evident that the terms all and even every man, do not mean the whole human race. How then are we to understand such terms? We understand them simply to embrace all and every one that the speaker has in view when he employs the language, and no more. If the gentleman is disposed to deny our position here, we will give him more of the same kind, for we assure you that the Bible abounds with similar passages, all of which go to prove at the terms all, all men, and every man, does not mean all the race of men.

The gentleman, in the next place, introduces, we suppose, a favorite theory of his, which we intend to show this audience is, like the rest of his arguments, without foundation in truth. It is this: he declared when last up, that sinners are damned for rejecting the gospel. We wonder how many systems of condemnation the gentle-

man will introduce, before he is done? He told us also in his last speech, that thousands were sent to hell because they withhold from the poor. , and do not bestow upon them such things as they need. Now, my friends, with regard to his first cause of condemnation, what have you to say if sinners are to be damned for rejecting the gospel? Would it not be decidedly better for them never to hear the gospel; for we see a vast number who do not receive and profit by the gospel, consequently, if my friend's theory be true, it would have been far better for them never to have heard the gospel. Now what a contemptible view of the character of a holy God! Sinners are not yet condemned. God knows they must be condemned, or he will have to save them. He also knows who will reject the gospel. He wants an excuse to damn them, and as such he sends his gospel to them (knowing they will reject it), on purpose to have an excuse to damn them. What think you, my friends, of such a God as this? If Elder Franklin chooses to bow to such a one he is welcome to do so; for my part, I would as soon worship a God made of a frozen pumpkin. Surely the gentleman has forgotten the language of the dear Savior upon the subject. He says, sinners are condemned already; and we say, this condemnation grows out of the violation of the law, without which there could be no condemnation for the law condemns all who violate its holy precepts, and poor sinners only need justification from the claims of the law, which justification is revealed or brought to view by or through the gospel. Hence the gospel is a proclamation of peace and pardon through the merits of Christ, and not a system of condemnation and death. We fear the gentleman's whole theory is built upon law, and has no gospel in it.

But the gentleman's other system of condemnation w entirely new and unheard of, until this wise man from the Queen City has this day revealed it. And we can not, for one moment, believe that this revelation is from the spirit of inspiration. We hope, friends, that you have not forgotten it. He declared to us, that thousands would go down to hell because they would not give to the poor. We wonder whose logic this is. Is it found in Hedge's,

or in some other work of the same kind, or is it taught in some one of the many translations of the holy Scriptures the gentleman has read. We venture to assert that it is not to be found in either, or any where else in the wide world, but in the vain imagination of my friend, Mr. Franklin, whose mind appears remarkably fruitful in ideas, never before thought of. Now, my audience, will you examine this new theory one moment. The gentleman has told us that the great God loves the race; that Jesus Christ has died for the race; that both the Father and the Son desired to save the race; and for that purpose, God has enlightened the race; Christ has restored the race; that the Bible and the gospel is given to instruct the race; and after all, there are thousands of the race go down to eternal pain simply because they have failed to give a few dimes to the poor. Now we believe it to be perfectly right to administer to the necessities of the poor, but we do not believe that a few dimes given to the poor will accomplish that which the love of God, the power of God, the sufferings and death of Christ, the Bible and gospel "will all fail to accomplish. And we are sure this audience does not believe any such God-dishonoring doctrine as this. Mr. Franklin himself does not believe it; but he must fill up his time, he must say something, and we are disposed to believe this is the best he can do; and if so, bad is the best, most assuredly.

You can now see, my friends, what means a man will resort to, who undertakes to advocate a system wholly at war with the sacred doctrine of the Bible. O, friends, just think of the idea of a little money doing for you what the Lord Jesus Christ cannot do without it, and we feel confident you will spurn it from your minds with horror and utter contempt. So much for the gentleman's two systems of condemnation. We now pass on to notice the next item in the gentleman's speech, worthy of note. He referred us to Matthew, xxv. chapter, 36th and 36th verses: "For I was an hungered 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." Here the gentleman thinks he will surely triumph; that

this quotation clearly proves that saints are to be admitted into Heaven itself, upon the ground of their good works. But if the gentleman will read the next three verses, he will there learn that those saints did not acknowledge the doctrine for which he is here contending; for they say, "Lord, when saw we thee an hungered and fed thee,-or thirsty and gave thee drink? or a stranger and took thee in? or naked and clothed thee, sick or in prison and came unto thee." Here you see, my friends, these people could not believe their good works had recommended them to the favor of God. We suppose our friend could tell when he had performed a great many good works; but those who were saved alone by grace did not arrive there in that way. But if you, my audience, will read the 34th verse, you will there learn that the kingdom was prepared for these very people from the foundation of the world. Now, can any person of sane mind believe that they were admitted into heaven for what they had done, when the kingdom was prepared for them front the foundation of the world? Here we have a kingdom prepared, and a people prepared to enjoy that kingdom. Hence the language of the Savior to the woman who was so very solicitous about the welfare of her two sons. She desired that they should set upon either hand of the Savior, when he came in his kingdom. Jesus said unto her, "to set on my right hand and on my left hand, is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared." We ask could language be plainer. Here the Savior positively declares that there was a people for whom his kingdom was prepared, and that it should be given to them and none others. Here is also a death blow to the doctrine of free moral agency, for Christ himself could not give the kingdom to any but those for whom it was prepared, for said he, it is not mine to give.

So much, then, for the gentleman's plan of getting to heaven by works. Indeed, if he gets there upon his plan, he will have to occupy a different apartment from those who are saved by grace alone. We here remark, dear friends, that none ever has been or will be saved upon the gentleman's work plan; no, unless saved alone by the merits of Christ, they are forever gone.

The next item in my friend's speech that we shall notice, is this. He tells us that the wicked actions of men constitute them sinners. Now this is a palpable contradiction to every principle of sound philosophy and common sense; for if men were not sinners, they would not act wickedly. Every act of men flows from some preceding cause; remove the cause, and the effect will cease. What then is the cause of men acting wickedly? We answer, because they are sinners. Hence, the man who defrauds his neighbor is dishonest in heart; the man who profanes the name of the Lord, does it because he is wicked in heart; the man who steals his neighbor's horse, does it because he is a thief in heart—had he not been a thief he would not have stolen the horse. This is so plain, that it admits of no argument. This is cause producing effect, but my friend has an effect without any cause; but this is like many other things introduced by the gentleman. It is, however, one thing to make broad assertions, but a very different thing to make the people believe them. So much for my friend's logic upon this subject. Well, what next? Listen: the gentleman comes up again in broad terms, and denies the agency of the Holy Spirit in the work of regeneration. This perfectly harmonizes with what he said in his speech this morning, that men had the power to be regenerated, at pleasure. We have shown you, in a former speech, that regenerate means reproduce, renew, born again. Then, according to the gentleman's theory, there is no influence of the Holy Spirit in reproducing, renewing, being born again. How then is it done? We must reproduce ourselves, or some other person must do it for us, or it will not be done at all. We have shown you, in a former speech, the utter impossibility of a man's reproducing himself, and if my friend thinks he possesses the power of reproducing, we must have some further evidence of his power upon this subject, before we can believe it. Such stuff is too foolish for men to talk about; but men sometimes involve themselves in just such absurdities, rather than acknowledge themselves defeated. Now, my friend, Mr. Franklin, may exhaust his whole stock of wisdom, and display all the talents he possesses, call to his aid all the logic he

has read, and after all he will forever fail to make this audience believe a theory so completely at war with the principles of truth and common sense.

We frankly confess that Elder Franklin comes out the most Bold Off and independent on the system of works, of any man we have ever heard. He seems to be perfectly ignorant with regard to the great system of salvation by grace, treasured in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and to have no hope of future happiness only what is founded upon the principle of his own works, by which none ever were, or can, be saved. We now call upon Mr. Franklin to tell this people in his next speech, if the Holy Spirit is not concerned in the important work of regeneration. How is it performed? Does the sinner perform it himself, or does some other person do it for him? Now we will venture to prophesy, that the gentleman will not attempt to answer those interrogatories, but will pass them by in silence, for surely this is the best he can do. But he has presented another strange idea to our minds, and that is, that none are under the influence of the Holy Spirit but the apostles. Now is it not passingly strange, that the gentleman will attempt to make us believe that the apostles were saved in a different way from what sinners are now saved. He admits that the apostles were under the influence of the Holy Spirit, but denies that sinners are now regenerated in that way. This is more of the gentleman's strange logic and inconsistencies. He has the apostles saved in one way, and modern sinners in a different way. We suppose the idea would be about this: that the apostles were so much worse than sinners are in this age, and consequently, nothing short of Almighty power could reach their case; but we are so much better by nature, and possess so many superior advantages, that we can get along by the use of our own powers, without the aid of the Holy Spirit. Now, my audience, the inconsistency of such an idea as this must be apparent to all candid minds, for surely sinners, of every age, are saved precisely in the same way. But the gentleman says we can resist the Holy Ghost, and sinners do resist it, and this is the reason why they are not saved. Here we have a third system of condemnation introduced. We have been

told that sinners were condemned for rejecting the gospel; that they were condemned for not giving to the poor; and now we are informed that they are condemned for resisting the Holy Ghost. How many more systems of condemnation the gentleman will discover, before this debate closes, we cannot tell; one thing we do know, and that is, he has introduced more now than he can prove from the Bible. Indeed he seems to have but little use for the Bible, supposing that we will take his assertions as proof; but we have not yet agreed to do so.

We have now answered all the gentleman's arguments, and will proceed to let loose upon him another heavy discharge of the artillery of Heaven, as recorded in 1st Corinthians, chapter i, 26th and 27th verses, which read as follows: "For you see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men, after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world, to confound the things which are mighty," &c. Now, my audience, what becomes of the gentleman's universal calling? You know he has done his best to make you believe that all the race had a chance for Heaven; that they were all redeemed, all restored, and all called. Now the apostle says in plain terms, in the passage above quoted, that not many wise men, after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called. Here the apostle positively contradicts Mr. Franklin. He says, all are called the apostle says, not many of a certain class are called. We know there are a vast number of wise men, after the flesh, in the world; there are also a great many mighty men—and the inspired writer says, positively, that not many of this class are called. Well, if you will read the 29th verse, you will there learn the reason why they are not, which reads, "that no flesh should glory in his presence." Now you see, my friends, that the great God acts entirely different from what men do. Men choose the great, the learned, the wise, to transact their business; God chooses the poor, the unlearned, the foolish, and even the base and despised, to bring to nought the things that are. Hence you see that all the gentleman has said about his uni-

versal calling is untrue, according to the sacred Scriptures. But again, chapter ii., 14th verse: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Now here is positive testimony, that the natural man can not understand the things of the spirit. We hope the gentleman will be kind enough, in his next speech, to tell us if his can embrace the natural man; if so, he and Paul are at war again, for Paul says they can not—and we feel assured this audience will believe the apostle.

Time expired.



## **MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD SPEECH.**

### **SECOND PROPOSITION.**

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The question before us is a very plain one, relating simply to adult persons where the gospel is preached. I am pleased to show that, where the gospel is preached, any person of adult years and sane mind can come to the Lord and be saved.

This the gentleman denies. But has he made any reference to any class, of adult years and sane mind, where the gospel is preached, who cannot, come to the Lord and be saved? He certainly has not and can not. If there are any here of adult years and sane mind, who cannot be saved, we should be glad to see him point them out. But there are none such here. There is not a person here, nor in any other place where the gospel is preached, to whom the gospel is not just as free as it is to Mr. Hume himself. Let him make a distinction, if he can. By the same argument that he will show that Christ died for him, that the grace of God is extended to him or that God him, I will show that he died for any other man he can point out, that his grace is extended to any other, and that God loved any other. I defy him to bar the kingdom of God against any man he ever saw, with any bar that will not bar himself out, of the kingdom of God, unless he appeals to his life and shows that it is more in conformity with the gospel than any other.

A beautiful system this to be propagated in this community, circumscribing the grace of God, narrowing down the promises of God, and denying them to a large portion of mankind! My object is to enlarge the gentle

man's heart and ennoble his soul, so that he may feel the same interest in the salvation of all mankind he does now in a part. All I ask of him is to have the same love the Lord did, preach the gospel to the same number, invite the same number to come to the Lord that he did, and extend to them the same promises. This he can never do, with his view.

But, not to detain you with general observations, I come to take a brief notice of the gentleman's reply. I am seriously fearful that my worthy friend will run into Universalism. In commenting upon 1 Timothy, ii. 4, he insists that the words "who will 'have all men to be saved'" shall be expounded, as equivalent to "who shall have all men to be saved." The difference between him and myself is upon the word "will." He uses it in the sense of shall, while I think it only expresses will or desire. It is of precisely the same import as the expression—"He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." It is the Lord's will, or desire, that all men should be saved. Both of these passages are of the same spirit of the expression—"He takes no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but rather all men should come to repentance." Now if it is true that there are any for whom Christ did not die, that the grace of God is not extended to them, and whom God did not love, the Lord cannot say that "He is not willing that any should perish;" for, according to his doctrine, I defy him to show any reason for any man's perishing, except that the Lord did not desire to save him, and made no provision for him. This is precisely the view Mr. Hume takes of the subject; hence he argues that they were not included in the atonement, not in the promise to Abraham, not in the provision, and therefore cannot be saved. He tries to escape from the words of the Apostle, "who will or desires, all men to be saved," by laboring to show that the passage does not include all men. But this does not meet the point. Our argument relates to adult persons, where the gospel is preached. Does his quibble escape the deduction from these words? By no means; but it shows, what I have seen from the beginning, that he is determined to find the cause of the

sinner's condemnation in God, and not in the sinner. Hence he denies that it is the desire of the Lord that all men should, be saved, and, as a matter of course, does not believe that "He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

I desire the audience to have this point fixed in their minds. An issue is now directly formed between us, touching the desire of God. I contend that He desires the salvation of all men, and is not willing that any should perish. Mr. Hume argues that God does not desire the salvation of all men, and does not argue this lack of a desire on the part of the Lord merely as a reason why all men will not be saved, but as the reason why all men, where the gospel is preached, cannot come to God. But the gentleman has another reason to the same effect. He quotes the words, "Not many great, not many mighty, not many noble are called." The reason, then, why they do not come to the Lord, is because He never called them, according to this doctrine, and not because of any wrong in themselves. I told you that he was the apologist of the sinner. He is determined to excuse the sinner of all blame, and hence he assigns, as the reason why God will damn him, that He never called him.

Again, to add to this horrible doctrine, he assigns, as a reason why any man, where the gospel is preached, can not come to the Lord, that "whom He will He hardeneth." He appears determined to cast all the infamy upon the Lord in his power, and, therefore, says the reason why some, where the gospel is preached, cannot come to the Lord is, that He hardens them! If the Lord hardens them so they cannot come, who is to blame—the creature, who cannot come, or his Lord, who hardens him so that he cannot come? I say that Mr. Hume throws all the blame upon the Lord, who hardens the sinner. Let me quote one passage that shows who the Lord hardens, or visits with strong delusion. "Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; *because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be*

*saved.* And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure, in unrighteousness."—2 These. ii. 9—12.

Mr. Hume denies that men will be damned for rejecting the gospel. If I do not refute him here, I will give up the whole controversy. What is the reason given in the passage just quoted for men perishing? "Because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." And for the same cause the Lord will send strong delusion upon them, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Here is the ground of their delusion and damnation, not in the fact that the Lord hardened them, or passed by them without calling them, but in the fact that "they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved"—that they "believed not the truth"—that they had pleasure in unrighteousness." Here is the cause of their delusion and damnation, in their own perversity of heart and life.

But we wish you to keep Mr. Hume's denial before the mind, viz.: that men shall be damned for rejecting the gospel. The Lord 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." Believeth not what? "Why, believeth not the gospel, which he commanded to be preached. I ask any man in his right mind if the ground of damnation here is not, refusing to believe, or rejecting the gospel? The case is as plain as sunbeams. He commanded the gospel to be preached to every creature. He then divides the adults into two classes—the believers and unbelievers. The believers, He says, shall "be saved, and those who believe not shall be damned. Is not their unbelief the ground of their damnation? Would the Lord damn them for their unbelief, if they could not believe?"

But as the gentleman is dull of hearing on this point, and slow to learn, we must give him line upon line and precept upon precept. Upon whom, then, will the Lord take vengeance at his coming? Paul says, "On them who 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 the glory of his power."—2 These. i. 9, 10. Does not this passage base their destruction on their not knowing God, and disobeying the gospel? It certainly does, and declares that God shall take vengeance on them for their ignorance and disobedience. Speaking of the great salvation, Paul asks, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" Here, it is manifest that a man may fail to escape through his neglect, so that negligence may prevent a man's salvation. But if this does not satisfy him that the conduct of men may be the cause of their damnation, I will call his attention to the charge the Lord will bring against them in the day of judgment. It is in the following words: "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." They, so unmindful of their duty, and unconscious of any remissness, will inquire— When saw we thee a hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?" He proceeds to inform them in the following words: "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." In this clause. He shows that their hardness of heart and want of benevolence to his disciples He receives, and will so regard it in the day of judgment, as done to himself; and the consequence of such inhumanity He sets forth in the following awful words: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."—Matt. xxv. 46.

Mr. Hume has tried to make me appear to teach differently on different points, in mentioning different causes of condemnation. There is a sense in which all condemnation has one cause. For instance, the cause of all condemnation is disobedience. No man will be damned for anything but disobedience or sin; but there are many acts of disobedience or many sins. If I point to any one act of disobedience as a cause of condemnation, I do not contradict myself when I point to any other act of disobedience as a cause of condemnation. There are many sins, any one of which might be a cause of

condemnation. One man may be condemned for his inhumanity, another for drunkenness, another for profanity, another for fornication, &c., &c. When I refer to any one of these, as a cause of damnation, I by no means refer to it as the only cause, or, of course, I would contradict myself when I refer to anything else as a cause. Therefore all that has been said about contradicting myself is sheer nonsense.

I am surprised at the repeated assertions of Mr. Hume that I do not believe in the influence of the Spirit, except what accompanied the Apostles. I do not believe that any man now is inspired and possessed with supernatural gifts, as the Apostles were. But I do not believe that any man not born of the Spirit, born from above, can see the kingdom of God. But I believe that a man can resist the Holy Spirit, repel the invitations of the Lord, refuse to repent or believe, and consequently incur guilt, in failing to be converted. No man becomes a servant of God, without his own consent. The Lord says, "All the day long I have stretched forth my hand to a disobedient and gainsaying people." Could the Lord thus talk to the children of men, if he knew they could not come to him? It would be mocking his dependent creatures. It would be as if Mr. Hume would see his little son fallen into a pit, whence he could not escape without assistance. He stands alone, looking down upon his helpless condition, knowing that it is impossible for him to get out without aid, but refusing to aid one particle, extending his hands towards the helpless child, crying, "Come unto me," I am not willing that you should perish," but rather that you should live. At length, as if impatient he cries out, "All the day long I have stretched forth my hand to a disobedient and gainsaying child." Would not the child regard it as most cruel mocking? Could the child, or spectators, help but think he was a most cruel hypocrite? What shall we say, then, of the Calvinistic God, who has promised to bless all the families of the earth, who has said He is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all; who has said that the world through his Son might be saved; who has commanded all men everywhere to repent; who has included all in unbelief that He might have

mercy upon all; who has said his Son is a ransom for all; who has said that He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; who has said He loved the world; who has claimed to be of tender compassion—that He takes no pleasure in the death of the sinner—wills that all men should be saved—is not willing that any should perish—that all the day long he has stretched forth the hand, crying "Come unto me, all you that labor and are heavy laden, and you shall find rest to your souls"—that "he who comes to me I will in no wise cast out"—that "the Spirit says Come, and the bride says Come, and whosoever will, let him come and take of the water of life freely;" who cries, "How oft would I have gathered your children, \* \* \* but ye would not," and says, "To whomsoever you yield yourselves servants, his servants you are;" we say, what shall we think of a God who would thus address his dependent creatures, knowing at the same time that a large portion of them could no more come to him, believe in him, repent, or become Christians than they could make a world? I say, it represents the Almighty as insincere, mocking and tantalizing his creatures by holding up before them and inviting them to a blessed Savior, who He knew had not died for them, and a glorious heaven to which He knew they never could attain, and to gain which He never intended to give one particle of assistance Still Mr. Hume would have us believe that the blessed Deity stands in precisely this attitude to all the non-elect!

I regard all these promises of the Almighty as solemn, candid, and firm as his own glorious throne. He had compassion upon the human race. His Almighty bosom moved with mercy for fallen humanity, and He expressed the emotions of his stupendous compassion in the most precious of all gifts—his only Son and our Savior, He sent him into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. My opponent denies the object of his mission, as here stated—that the world through him might be saved—and denies that a portion of the world, even here, where the gospel is preached, can come to him and be saved! But He died for the World. He arose from the dead, thus opening the grave

for the world. He went to heaven, and sent the Spirit to convince the world of sin, righteousness and judgment. He commanded the gospel to be preached in all the World—to every creature—commanded it to be sounded to the ends of the earth, proposing to save those who should believe and submit to it, and damn those who would not believe. So certain it is that men will be damned if they believe not the gospel, that the Lord said, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on Him." "He that believeth on me," said the Lord, "shall never die." So important it is that men believe, and so certain it is that our conversion depends upon our believing.

If it is faith that purifies the heart, as the apostle teaches; and if, without faith it is impossible to please God, and they who come to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of those who diligently seek him; and if repentance is of such vast moment that except we repent we shall perish; and if, as is the case beyond all controversy, faith and repentance are included in the new birth, or regeneration, and they stand in the form of a command, men can obey or disobey these commands, and thus be converted or refuse to be converted. It is good sense and sound theology, where the gospel is preached, to say that a man can hear, or refuse to hear—that he can believe, or refuse to believe—that he can repent or refuse to repent—that he can confess Christ, or refuse to confess him—that he can "yield himself to be a servant of Christ," or refuse to yield. Yielding to all this is being converted, regenerated, born of God. The sinner, like the prodigal son, has power to say, I will arise, and go to my father's house," and he has not only power to say he will go, but, as he did, he has power to go.

So much for the ridiculous nonsense of the last speech, in regard to a man's volition in being born of God. The Lord has left man without excuse. He has loved him, pitied him, had compassion upon him, and kindly invited him to come to his Father and his God. If he does not come, he may take the blame upon his own soul, and say, when he shall find himself overwhelmed in condemnation—What more could the Lord have done that He



has not done? "What greater love or kindness could He have shown"? He invited me to come and live forever. He commanded me to believe, to repent and put my trust in him. I refused; I resisted his will, despised his invitations, turned away mine ear from his land exhortations, and would not have the Savior for my Master and Redeemer. I have done the deed; I have brought this ruin upon myself. I am the betrayer of my own interest, and the destroyer of my own soul. It only stings my poor soul the worse that God loved me, but I would not love myself.

Time expired.

**MR. HUME'S THIRD SPEECH**  
**ON SECOND PROPOSITION.**  
**SECOND DAY.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—

When my time last expired we had just introduced some of our proof texts, recorded in the 2d chapter of 1st. Corinthians which we wish you to bear in mind, particularly the 7th and 14th verses. The 7th verse reads as follows, to wit:"But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory." Here it is evident that the great God had the salvation of sinners in contemplation, before the world began; that he had ordained their salvation, and in the great scheme or plan thus ordained, is revealed the hidden wisdom of God. Now ask yourselves the question could the Lord God, have thus in his wisdom ordained the salvation of sinners, without having regard to personal identity, or in other words without having in view definitely, the number and persons whom he in his wisdom thus ordained unto glory? We think this fact must be evident to every candid mind, for we cannot suppose for one moment that the all-wise God would ordain a plan, or system of salvation before the world began, without regard to those who were to be saved by it. This is in perfect harmony with the eternal purpose introduced by the gentleman in his first speech, which we wish you to bear in mind while we introduce the 14th verse which reads, "but the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." Now my friend says that *any man*

of sane mind, and adult years can understand, believe turn to God, &c. Are not all regenerate men, natural men? surely they are. Well, the Apostle says they can not know the things of the spirit of God. My friend says they can. Here he contradicts the Apostle again.

But once more, my friend says there is no influence of the spirit until we get into the kingdom. Here according to the gentleman's theory, we have to repent, believe, turn to God, and confess the Lord Jesus; all, without the holy spirit, and indeed be immersed without it; for we must be immersed into the kingdom when we first find the influence of the spirit. Now let us try the gentleman's theory, when he receives a member, he makes him profess faith in Jesus Christ. This, according to his theory they must do without the influence of the holy spirit. Paul says no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost. Hence my friend requires before baptism, what the Apostle says no man can say without the Holy Ghost. Here we think our friend will forever fail to show any consistency in his theory. Paul says they cannot receive the things of the spirit, Mr. Franklin says they can. Now my audience, do you not see that my friend's can, would be more scriptural if it had a not attached to it. We think our friend will have to labor hard to reconcile such palpable contradictions. We now pass on to notice the gentleman's last speech. He thinks we would be much more in our duty if we would preach the gospel to all men, to every creature, and not be so selfish as to confine it to a little few. Now we suppose our learned opponent is not acquainted with the practice of regular Baptist Ministers. We were convinced in his first speech that he was not at all acquainted with either the doctrine or the people against which he was contending. We think it very doubtful whether the gentleman, or any of his brethren travel as far, or preach to as many people every year as do many of the ministers of our order. We would be willing ourself, to compare notes with the gentleman on this subject; and we have never yet refused to preach to a congregation because they were sinners. No, verily it is sinners we preach to every time we do preach, for we preach to no others, while we feel assured that God must

give the hearing ear, and the understanding heart, or there will be no good done, or God alone giveth the increase. So much then for the gentlemen's burlesque upon us about our preaching to a little few. I might here add that there is no people in this country, who are favored with larger or more respectable and attentive congregations than the regular Baptist, and they are willing at all times to try to preach to all who wish to hear them. But we are referred to the gospel by John, chap. in. 5th verse. We again declare most positively that this text does not touch the proposition, which reads that any man of adult years, and sane mind, can repent, believe, confess the Lord Jesus, turn to God and be saved. We ask, is there one word of this? In the text referred to, there is not. We will however try to accommodate the gentleman, by giving some attention to one of his favorite texts. We expected to meet this argument to-morrow, for it properly belongs to the subject of debate on the third proposition. We will now read the text, and have the audience to determine what it has to do with our proposition to-day. It reads thus "Jesus answered verily, verily I say unto thee except a man be born of water, and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Now the gentleman has told us that this birth of the water is baptism or immersion, consequently there is no way into the kingdom but to be born into it, and this is to be immersed into it. Now my audience, we deny the gentleman's whole theory upon the subject, first because Christ and Nicodemus were not talking upon the subject of baptism. Secondly, because baptism is no where in the scriptures represented under the idea or figure of a birth, and thirdly, because it is contrary to the principles of sound philosophy and common sense. This we will try to show by reference to the first 21 verses of the chapter of John, which contains the whole of the conversation between Christ and Nicodemus. You will see that the subject of baptism was not named or referred to in the first instance. What then was the subject matter of their conversation? We answer it was simply the subject of the natural or fleshly birth and the spiritual birth. Hence the Savior in the early part of the conversation said to the Ruler except a man be born again

he cannot *see* the kingdom of God. Now if the Savior did mean here that the new birth was water baptism, and a man must be baptized before he can see the kingdom, the idea is clearly presented that the man goes in the kingdom blind, and if so surely he cannot know when he is going, w what he is doing. Now the gross error presented in this view of the subject, is so plain that every one present must see it; but the truth is, the Savior had no reference to water baptism in this conversation, but alone referred to the natural or fleshly birth, under the figure of water. Hence in the 6th verse he says that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. "We "will now read this text to suit the gentleman's theory, when we would have this strange and nondescript idea presented. That which is born of water is water. Now every lady and gentleman here knows the text cannot mean any such thing. But again, if the Savior did mean water baptism, why was the matter so profoundly mysterious to Nicodemus? Hear him ask in the 9th verse, what can these things be? Now you all know my audience, that there is no mystery in baptism, hence it is evident that the wise ruler did not understand things as my friend Mr. Franklin does. It is self-evident therefore that the Savior simply conveyed the idea that there was an absolute necessity for the natural and spiritual birth in order to the enjoyment of the kingdom of God. We now challenge the gentleman to show one text in all the Bible, where baptism is compared to a birth. We are sure he will not do it because he cannot for the reverse is true baptism, is represented under the figure of a death and burial, but nowhere under the figure of a birth.

But once more, every one here knows perfectly well that the thing born necessarily partakes of the nature and substance of the parent of which it is born. Here if we are born of water, the water is our parent, and consequently we must partake of the nature and substance of water, which every one knows is not true. Indeed, an attempt to impose such an idea on the people here, is nothing short of telling them that they are a set of dupes and wholly without understanding. We feel confident this audience cannot possibly believe such nonsense as this.

The gentleman tells us that he can show from the library of any gentleman, who has furnished himself with the standard works of the age, that his views of the above passage are correct. But he supposed that we and our people, had no standard works. The gentleman is very much mistaken indeed. We acknowledge one standard work, and but one; the Holy Ghost is the author of it, and we call it the Bible. We would not exchange it for all other works upon earth. No, we rely more certainly upon one plain "thus saith the Lord" revealed in his word, than all the works of men ever presented to the public, for what the Lord God has said we know to be true, but what wise men have said may be wrong. We are willing *for God to be true, but every man a liar. If we, were now engaged in discussing worldly matters, then we might* receive testimony from men, but as we are engaged in discussing matters which involve eternal interests, we are only willing to take as evidence what Jehovah has been pleased to reveal in his word; and we feel inclined to interpret for our self, and not suffer Mr. Hedge, or any one else to interpret for us. This point is guarded well in our rules of debate. You will there learn that nothing is to be admitted as evidence here, but King James' version of the holy scriptures. My friend however, is not to be blamed for trying to get evidence outside of the Bible, for sure it is, he has not as yet found any in it.

But the gentleman complains that we do not reply to his proof texts. And why do we not? Simply because he has introduced none. We now appeal to the audience if we have not replied to many more of the gentleman's texts to-day, than he did to ours on yesterday. Out of the host of texts that we introduced as proofs of our affirmative on yesterday, he in his wisdom condescended to notice three of them and no more, while we have to-day noticed every one that he has introduced that touched the subject of his proposition, and several which did not, and this we feel sure the audience has observed. But our friend sticks closely to his favorite theory of salvation by works, hence the remark that any man can love God, and keep his commandments, which will secure their eternal salvation. Now in reply to this argument, we would re-

mark that no man in an unconverted state can, or does love God, for all unconverted men love sin, while none love God, but such as are born of God, and get a discovery of the beauty, the glory and the grandeur of his holy character. When this is seen and understood, the individual loves God for what he is, because he is lovely, hence the language of Apostle John, "Every one that loveth, is born of God, for God is love," and now under the influence of this holy principle of love, the soul is led to obey God and keep his commandments, and at the same to hate and abhor sin, because it is sin and contrary to the holy character of God. Therefore the greatest grief of the true Christian, is because they cannot live more free from sin than they do; hence their frequent cry, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me, &c," we heartily concur with the gentleman in his views with regard to the effect of the gospel upon our actions, producing reformation in the external or outward man; but this reformation flows from an inward work upon the heart, which we have just shown you. The man or woman is born of God, and in this birth they are possessed of a holy principle or nature that is like God their Father. This principle exerts a powerful influence over their actions; hence the outward action is under the influence of an inward principle, which leads such as are under its influence, to endeavor to walk humbly and circumspectly before the Lord. We explained to you, in our last speech, why men sin—it is simply because they are sinners. The reason why Christian people sin, is because they are only converted in part; they have a wicked corrupt nature to contend with, and will have until the death of the body. Hence the apostle says, "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, so that ye can not do the things that ye would;" and again, "to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not." This every Christian understands, but hypocrites know nothing at all about it.

The gentleman's remarks upon the passage in the ninth of Romans, we have no objection to. He admits the people are the clay, and God is the potter. This is just what we believe, and that the potter makes such vessels

as seemeth good in his sight—some to honor and some to dishonor; vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, and vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory. This is his sovereign right, and we have no business to enquire why it is so. But the gentleman continues to boast of the great extent of God's love. He says, he loved the race as well as he loved either of us. This we have not disputed, but we have said, and we say again, that what God loves once he loves eternally. If there ever was a time when he loved the race he loves them still, whether in heaven, upon earth, or in hell, for the God of the Bible undergoes no change. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. He is of the same or of one mind, and none can turn him. Hence it is said, "I am God; I change not, therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." Now be it remembered, and let it never be forgotten, that my unshaken faith is, that every one of the objects of God's unchanging love will as surely rest with Him in glory, as they are loved by Him, for they are a part of Him. And no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church. But the gentleman makes another effort to prove that any man of adult years and sane mind can repent, believe, turn to God, &c., and what do you think, my friends, it is? Surely it is like all the other attempts he has made. Well, what is it? Listen: "Let no man say when he is tempted he is tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man."—James, chapter i., 13th verse. Now it will surely require Hedge's logic and my friend's both, to squeeze any proof out of this text to sustain his proposition. But we suppose it is the best he can do, and we therefore excuse him, knowing that the audience cannot be thus easily imposed upon.

We have now followed the gentleman through all his meanderings, and we must say we have never witnessed a more signal failure at any time. We had supposed a gentleman of Mr. Franklin's talents and experience, would have known better than to have undertaken to prove from the Bible the doctrine of his proposition. We hope the people will bear in mind the language of the proposition,



which is—"Any man of adult years and sane mind, can repent, believe, confess the Lord Jesus, turn to God, and "be finally saved." We now say, fearless of successful contradiction, that there has not been one text to the point introduced, and we are sure there will not. We told you in our first speech this morning, that we would prove by pointed Scripture testimony, that the doctrine taught in the proposition was not true. We feel that we have redeemed our pledge already; but we intend now to give you a little evidence, as strong to the point as any we have yet introduced. We will commence with Ephesians, chapter ii., 8th and 9th verses: "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of ivories, least any man should toast." Now my friend has been doing his best to make us believe it was entirely by works of our own that we were to be saved. Here the apostle says, positively, it is not of works, but by grace, that we are saved. Now grace means free favor bestowed upon an unworthy object, and if I, by my act, bring God under obligation to me, then, it is a matter of debt and no more grace. This is plain to every honest mind; but read the 10th verse: "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Now the terms, His workmanship, and created, in this text, throw it entirely beyond the power of the creature, and places our salvation entirely in the hands of the God of Israel, where it ought to be, and where we are truly glad it is; for says the text, we are his workmanship. Whose workmanship? Why God's workmanship, and not our own, created in Christ also. Well, who possesses power to create in Christ? None out God alone, and my friend dare not deny it. Hence his whole work-system is nothing but a thin linsey woolsey garment, that cannot possibly hang together, but must be, entirely torn away by such a heavy discharge of heaven's artillery, and its utter worthlessness made manifest to all. We now refer you to Titus, chapter iii., 5th and 6th verses: "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, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior."

Here the apostle says, emphatically, that it is not by works of righteousness which we have done; Mr. Franklin says it is. But again—1st Peter, chap. ii., 8th verse: "Being disobedient whereunto they were appointed;" 2d Peter, chapter ii., 12th verse—"These as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed, shall utterly perish in their own corruption." Now we should be very much pleased, indeed, if Mr. Franklin would tell us whether his can embrace those who were appointed unto disobedience made to be taken and destroyed, and the apostle says shall utterly perish in their own corruption. We rather guess the gentleman will have some trouble here.

We now intend to show that the gentleman has to make it appear that the apostle bore false testimony, before he can sustain his proposition. Read, if you please, Galatians, chapter iv., from the 23d verse to the end of the chapter, in this connection. We have an account of some who were born after the FLESH, and what they would do, to wit, they would persecute them that were born after the spirit; these were the children of the bondwoman. Now read the 30th verse, particularly, which says— "Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman." Now we ask, does not the gentleman's theory give the apostle the lie? He says, any man of adult years and sane mind can repent, &c.; the apostle says, positively, the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir. Here is not only a can not, but a positive shall not. Now we are not disposed to be any more benevolent than the apostle, for we know he was right, and understood well what he said.

Time expired.

## **MR. FRANKLIN'S CLOSING SPEECH.**

### **SECOND PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

My friend has labored like an Apostle to prove that some portion of our race, who hear the gospel, cannot come to God and be saved. If he is right in this, and should convince any persons of it, he might save such persons all efforts to become Christians. His theory is very short and simple, and its application easy. The non-elect never can turn to God. The elect cannot resist turning to him. Therefore, it is useless for any, elect or non-elect, to give themselves any uneasiness about it. In his own good time, God will irresistibly turn the elect to himself and save them, so that it is useless for them to feel any anxiety on the subject. The non-elect never can come to the Lord or be saved; therefore, it is useless for them to feel any anxiety in regard to the matter. Both the elect and non-elect may feel some desire to know whether they are elect or non-elect, but as this cannot be determined in this life, and, as the elect must infallibly be saved, and the non-elect must be inevitably lost, they had as well turn their attention to other matters, and wait for the Lord to send them to their final destiny. Such is the soothing nature of his doctrine. He desires, I presume, to convince the non-elect in this community that they never can turn to God, become pious and do good among their fellow-creatures, and that, therefore, it is useless to try. As there, is no possible happiness for them in the world to come, they had best try and get the good of the present state.

"What good it can do to one soul of Adam's race to believe his doctrine, if true, or what harm it could do to

disbelieve it, is what the gentleman has not deigned to tell us. If his doctrine is true, men may act as they please, for the elect will all be saved, and the non-elect lost, believe it or not. If I believed his doctrine, I assure you I should not spend much time in trying to convince men, for the elect cannot be lost, and the non-elect cannot be saved, believe it or not. Why he should labor so hard to prevent me from convincing this audience that any person can turn to God and become a Christian, I cannot see, if he believes his doctrine, unless he wishes to save them the trouble of trying. He cannot say there is any danger in their trying. Nothing that I can teach, according to his doctrine, can be the means of any one being lost.

But, in his zeal, he refers to the "hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world," and in a few words afterwards he so changed it as to read "ordained their salvation." With men who know the meaning of language, there is some difference between "wisdom which God has ordained," and "ordained their salvation;" but with Mr Hume it all means the same. But I defy him or any other man to show that this "wisdom ordained before the world" is any freer for him than for myself or any man who this day hears us. Let him produce a person of adult years and sane mind here, where the gospel is preached, who cannot come to the Lord and be converted.

Mr. Hume continues to repeat his old misrepresentation—that I have said there is no influence of the Holy Spirit—than which nothing is more incorrect. There is not an expression in the New Testament that I can more heartily quote than the declaration of Paul, that "no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit," but the Holy Spirit has enabled every man, where the gospel is preached, to say that "Jesus is Lord," as much as any one man. Who is there here that cannot say that "Jesus is Lord?" Who is there, in any place where the gospel is preached, of sane mind and adult years, that cannot say, that "Jesus is Lord?" All can say this, and yet no man can say it but by the Holy Spirit. If the Holy Spirit had not revealed it, no man could say it; but

since He has revealed it, any man, where the gospel is preached or the revelation is made, can say it.

How the words, "The natural man received not the things of the Spirit, neither indeed can he know them," &c., proves that one part of the people cannot be converted more than another, I cannot see. But my friend believes that the elect can be converted, while his proof text would prove as much that they cannot be saved as any body else. He takes the natural man as meaning the unregenerated man. Before conversion the elect are natural men, as much as anybody else, and he makes the Apostle affirm that they cannot receive the things of the Spirit or even know them. If this passage, therefore, proves that anybody can be converted and saved, it proves it of the elect as much as anybody else. But the Apostle is not saying one word about regeneration, or who can come to God in this passage. He has a very different theme before his mind. He is looking at the philosopher, who denied the use of the gospel or the inspired Apostles, alleging that he could know God without either. He was Paul's "natural man," or an uninspired man, who received not the things of the Spirit and could not know them; that is, could not know them without inspiration. The Apostle did not mean that he could not know them by hearing the gospel, but that he could not know them without hearing the gospel, or inspiration. No man, he alleges, knows the mind of a man, much less the mind of God, without a revelation from him. But, says the Apostle, "We," the Apostles, "have the Spirit of God," the spirit of inspiration, "and the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God."

My friend reminds us that God gives the increase. That is very true, but not till Paul, Apollos, or some one else, has planted. But the worthy gentleman can do nothing for the sinner, not even to plant the good seed in his heart. He does not preach to sinners, but "feeds the sheep!" It is true, the gentleman did say he preached to all who attend. But what does he preach to them? that they can come to God? that they can repent? that they can be converted? that they can be saved? that he can do them any good, preaching to them? By

no means; but that they cannot come, he converted or saved, and that his preaching can do them no good. This latter I think very true, if he preaches the doctrine he has contended for in this debate.

The gentleman aimed to afford us a little light on John iii. 5—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." He informs us that "water," in this passage, means flesh, and that our Lord meant, "Except a man be born of the flesh and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God!" This is the first comment we have met with, making water, in this or any other passage, either literally or figuratively, mean flesh! But Mr. Hume says such is the meaning of it. Let us look at it. In the third verse the Lord says, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Recollect he is speaking of an adult person, "a man," and not about his being born the first time, but "born again." Nicodemus asks how this can be—"How can a man be born when he is old?" Recollect the question. It is not how a child is born, but how a man is torn when he is old. This is what the Lord proceeds to answer. How does He say it is done? "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Mr. Hume actually makes our Lord sanction the ridiculous idea, mentioned by Nicodemus, of a man, when he is old, being born of the flesh. It is all nonsense about water, in this passage, meaning flesh. It destroys the whole force of the passage. It means water, and was so understood by the ancient fathers, the great reformer, and all the most commanding authorities in the world. It shows, too, that if a man is not born of God, it is his own fault. If he is left out of the kingdom of God, where the gospel is preached, the fault is his own, and his condemnation will be just.

The gentleman says he has no objections to our remarks upon Romans ix, touching the potter and the clay. Then he gives up his doctrine, for I have shown that the Lord's reason for making a vessel to dishonor is that the clay, or the people, do evil in his sight, and his reason for making a vessel unto honor is that they repent

of their evil and do good. They are not good, because He makes them vessels to honor, but He makes them vessels to honor because they are good. The others are not evil because He makes them vessels to wrath, but He makes them vessels to wrath because they are evil. "If a man, therefore, will purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor," says Paul.

The gentleman resorts to Eph. ii. 8, 9—"For by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." No passage in the Bible more perfectly harmonizes with all we have been saying than this. Our salvation is the free and unmerited gift of God; it is all a matter of grace, free and unmerited grace, and not of the works of the law of Moses; but still the very next verse speaks of "good works, which God has ordained that we should walk in them." Our good works do not purchase salvation. God bestows upon us freely the forgiveness of our sins, and then demands of us to walk in the good works which He has ordained in the gospel, but not in the works of the law of Moses; for by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified in the sight of God. But Paul instructed Timothy, and with him all other preachers, to "charge them that are rich in this world that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate, laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." Such is a mere specimen of what can be produced of the same kind, showing that while salvation is the free and unmerited gift of God, all of grace, and not by the works of the law of Moses, it is still true that in the New Testament God has ordained good works that we should walk in them;" "that He may lay hold on eternal life," and, as James has it, "we are justified by works and not by faith only.

Having now replied to the gentleman's objections so far as I think they require any reply, I must give you a brief summary of the argument. I have shown you

that the Lord made all men to dwell on all the face of the earth, that they might seek the Lord and find him. If this passage is true, all men who dwell on all the face of the earth have a right to seek the Lord and find him. This was in the original intention of God when He made man, and the object for which He made him. The promise to Abraham contained a blessing for all the families of the earth. I defy Mr. Hume, or any other man, to show, according to his doctrine, any blessing for all the families of the earth, in this world or the world to come. Paul, in referring to this promise, calls it "the gospel preached to Abraham." The gospel is, then, a blessing to all the families of the earth, but not if a large portion of them can never receive it. The prophets have said that Christ should "be for salvation to the ends of the earth," David says that God is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works. John the Baptist calls Christ the "true light that lighteth every man who cometh into the world," and says that He is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." All these passages show the same expansive design in reference to the race. But the Apostle John, in one short sentence, states what was not the design, and what was the design of God in sending Christ into the world, in the following words: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." Mr. Hume's doctrine subverts the intention of the mission of Jesus, which was that the "world through him might be saved." He does not believe that through him the world might be saved.

How beautifully all this corresponds with the words of the angel at the birth of Jesus—"Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." In connection with this, we should inquire how wide the grace of God abounds. He says, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Mr. Hume has it that where sin abounded, grace did much less abound. We have also ascertained that to the same extent that the offence abounded, the gift also extended, and that the same "all" that were dead, Christ died for. The gentleman has given us a fine specimen of quibbling on this



point, in trying to show that the word "all" does not mean the race, and the word "world" means less than the human family. But this game must be blocked. Let him look at 2 Cor. v. 14, 15, and tell me how many were dead. He is bound to admit that the *human race were dead*. Those who were dead Christ died for, that *they might live*. What world did God send his Son into? Whatever world it was that He sent his Son into, *that world through him might be saved*. Was it the *race* that were dead? It was the *race*, then, that Christ died for, because He died for those who were dead, that they might live. Who did the Apostle mean by "all men who dwell upon all the face of the earth," who were "made of one blood?" Did he mean the race? Then the same race can seek the Lord and find him. Who did the Lord mean, when He commanded the gospel to be preached to every creature—to *all nations*. Who does he think were addressed, when He says, "their sound went out into all the world, and their voice unto the ends of the earth?" Who did our Lord mean when He said, "Come unto me, all you that labor and are heavy laden, and you shall find rest to your souls?" Who did He mean in that blessed gospel, addressed to all nations, to every creature, when He says, "These things are written that you *might believe*, that believing you might have life?"

It is as manifest as the noon-day sun that these merciful and expansive invitations are to "the human race—as free to all mankind as the atmosphere we breathe.

Therefore they are, as Paul says, "without excuse." But Mr. Hume labors to put, an excuse into their lips, one of the best excuses in the world, if it were true, one that would obliterate all blame from every sinner under heaven: that is, that they *could not be converted and serve God*—that God never loved them, Christ never died for them; they could not be anything but sinners, that God had hardened them to make them sinners, and that He will damn them for the sins He hardened them and caused them to commit! Such is the monstrous and horrible doctrine he brings in opposition to the free and blessed gospel of the grace of God!

But now for the true reason why men are condemned. Paul gives it, as follows: "All the day long have I stretched out my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people." The same sentiment is more clearly expressed would I have gathered your children, \* \* \* but *ye would not*." Says the Lord, "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he who believes and is baptized, shall be saved, and *he who believes not shall be damned*."

Here is the cause of damnation—that men *believe not the gospel*. Would God damn men for not believing the gospel, if they could not believe it? Surely He would not. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," says the Lord. Refusing to repent, or impenitence, will be a cause of damnation. But the lack of good works will damn a man in the final judgment. What does the Lord himself give as the ground of rejecting some men in judgment? He will say to them, "When I was hungry, you fed me not, naked and you clothed me not, sick and in prison and you visited me not." What does the Lord give as the cause of condemnation in the resurrection? He says, "They who have done good shall come forth to a resurrection of life, and they who have *done evil* to a resurrection of damnation." "Not every one who saith unto me. Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom, but he who doeth the will of my Father." "Harden not your hearts," says the Lord. "He who cometh to me I will in nowise cast out," says our gracious Redeemer. "The Spirit says Come, and the bride says Come, and let him who hears say Come, and *whosoever will*, let him take of the water of life freely." If, then, the gospel containing an invitation to all, is preached to every creature, and God made all nations who dwell on all the face of the earth that they might seek the Lord *and find him*; and if Jesus was sent into the world that the world through him might be saved, I have proved that any adult person of sane mind, where the gospel is preached, can come to the Lord and be saved.

Time expired.

**MR. HUME'S LAST SPEECH,  
OH THE SECOND PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS—LADIES AND GBNTLBMEN.:

I have now arisen for the purpose of closing the discussion upon the second proposition. All the arguments and Scripture proofs are now introduced; at least, we are not allowed to introduce any new argument in our present speech. We shall briefly notice the arguments of our friend in his last speech, and devote the remainder of our time in recapitulation.

Elder Franklin seems to think that we are out of ammunition, but he will find himself very much mistaken before he is done with us. For our artillery is increasing, the mouth of our cannon is enlarging, our magazine is full to overflowing, and already has the deafening roar of the same been heard by the gentleman, which appears to have very much alarmed him. But the worst has not yet come, for soon, very soon, will he hear heaven's artillery burst upon him in peals of loudest thunder, and the very stronghold in which he seems to rest securely, sliake to its very center—wlien it will be made to appear to this audience that his strength is perfect weakness. And for the gentleman's special benefit we will inform him, that we have plenty in store to render him very uncomfortable until the close of this discussion. This, however, he will ascertain in due time. We freely confess that we do not know what our friend was trying to do in his last speech; whether he was endeavoring to prove Universalism, Ar-

menianism, or some other ism—perhaps he knew, but surely no one else did. There is one thing, however, we know, and that is, he did not attempt to introduce any Scripture to prove that *any man of adult years and sane mind could repent, believe, confess the Lord Jesus, turn to God, and be finally saved*. Well, this is what he has undertaken to prove, and you see, my audience, how he has undertaken to do it, which was by continually burlesquing the doctrine of sovereign-reigning and all-conquering grace, and those who believed it charging them with believing and practising almost every thing that is wicked, immoral, and irreligious, while he has been as cautious in approaching the Bible, as if it contained some deadly thing. And why? Because he well knew that the doctrine of his proposition could not be sustained by the Scriptures of eternal truth, and as such the least he had to do with them the better for him. We wish it now distinctly understood, and we hope it will be remembered, that there has not been one text introduced this day to sustain the affirmative of his proposition. There is one thing more we know, and that is, there has been no effort made on the part of Mr. Franklin to explain the passages of Scripture introduced by us, differently from what we have explained them, thereby evidently admitting our interpretation to be true, which is equivalent to an acknowledgment that he is wrong in his views upon this subject. Indeed, the gentleman has been sufficiently honest to acknowledge himself wrong in one instance, at least. You will doubtless recollect that in replying to the text in John, where it said, "therefore they *could not believe*," the gentleman said, these were reprobate Jews whose minds had been blinded so that they could not believe. This is acknowledging the truth like a man. But in this concession he evidently contradicts the language of his proposition, and not only so, but he contradicts everything he has said to-day in support of the proposition. We now appeal to the audience to know, in what way the gentleman replied to the text in the i. chapter of Matthew, 21st verse: "And she shall bring forth a son and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he *shall save his people*." You know, my audience, that he has not so

much as named it. We told you the text did not say, he should devise means or make a way possible, but said positively he *shall save his people*. To this he made no reply. We also referred you to chapter xviii., 9th verse, which reads: "For the Son of Man is come to *save that which is lost*." Not to provide a remedy for the lost—no, but to *save them*. We proceeded to show you who the lost in the text were, and that the mission of Jesus Christ into the world was to *save them*, and we maintained that the adorable Redeemer did accomplish that for which he came, and that was to *save the lost*. To this, also, he made no reply. Well, why did he not? Simply because he nor any other man who believes as he does, can make a Scriptural reply without destroying their own system, and rather than do this, he was disposed to pass those pointed Scripture proofs by in silence. We next referred you to the gospel by John, chapter vi., 37th, 38th, 39th, 44th, and 46th verses. Here we will show the gentleman whether we have been out of ammunition. The roar of our cannon he shall hear. Let us now read, beginning at the 37th verse: "All that the Father giveth me *shall come to me*, and him that cometh to me I will in nowise cast out; for I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of *all which he hath given me* I shall lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." Here we have the doctrine of election or specialty clearly taught, to which we called your attention in a former speech. Jesus himself here declares, that all that the Father giveth him *shall come to him*—not *can or may come*, no, but they *shall come*. The idea is also clearly taught, that there are some that are not given to the Savior. We have already inquired if the gentleman's *can* will embrace those who are not given to Christ, and to all this we have had no reply.

We think our friend has pursued a very wise course, in not attempting to reply to such passages as these, for well does he know that he can never make them fit his system. But the dear Redeemer still goes further, and remarks: "For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." Now we have already

shown you what Jesus said that will was, and it was not *to make all men see*, neither was it *to make salvation possible to all men*, but for a very different purpose. Hence Jesus says, " *and this is the will of Him that sent me, that of all He hath given me I should lose nothing.*" Now we have shown you, that if the Father has given the race of men to Christ the Savior, that all the race *shall come*, and they that come shall in nowise be cast out. Hence, upon my friend's hypothesis, Universalism is true, and he can not possibly get out of it. But hear the Savior in the 44th verse—" *No man can come to me except the father which sent me draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day.*" Now we told you the gentleman's theory received a fatal stab, for he says any man of adult years and sane mind *can* come; Jesus says, " *no man can come to me except the father draw him.*" Now we have already shown you, that if the gentleman contends that the Father draws all the race of men, then all the race come and consequently are all saved. Hence the language of the 45th verse— "It is written in the prophets, and they shall *all be taught of God*; every man, therefore, that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me." Not *some of them*, no, but *every man*. Here, my audience, is a salvation sure and certain, and the people who are to be saved clearly defined to be those whom the Father gave to the Son. Those drawn by the Father, *every one that hath, heard and learned of the Father*, and no more. Now, my audience, what reply did the gentleman make to this whole connexion? You know that he did not so much as allude to it, consequently, we are drawn to the irresistible conclusion that he knew he could not, and as such passed it by, as he did others, in dead silence.

We next referred you to John viii. 43, 44, where the Savior propounded a question to the Jews. Hear it: "Why do ye not understand my speech; even because ye *cannot hear*. Hear my words: Ye are of your father, the devil," &c. Again, in the forty-seventh verse, Jesus says, "He that is of God heareth God's words; ye, therefore, hear them not, because ye are not of God." How any sane man can contend for the doctrine of universal conditional salvation, in the face of such plain,

pointed Scripture testimony to the contrary, is a profound mystery to us. Here the Savior says, in plain words, that there are some who *cannot hear his words*. Well, who are they? Let Jesus answer the question. He says they are the children of the devil, and the reason why they do not hear God's words is because they are not of God, And yet, in the face of all this, and much more that has been introduced equally pertinent to the point, we find a learned and talented gentleman contending that any man can hear the word of the Lord, repent, believe, turn to God, etc., and not one word of reply made to the above quotation. We sincerely hope the audience will bear this in mind, and remember that if a successful reply could have been made, doubtless my learned opponent would have made it.

We next referred you to John x. 26, where Jesus said to certain people, "Ye believe not, *because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you.*" You will perhaps remember that we remarked, when we quoted this passage, that if we should ask Mr. Franklin why sinners did not believe, he would answer, Because they will not, for they can repent, &c. Now the Redeemer and my friend would answer very differently, for the Lord Jesus said it was *because they were not of his sheep*. We have had no reply to this passage.

Once more. We in the next place directed your attention to Acts ii. 39, where the Apostle says, "For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, *even as many* as the Lord our God shall call." Here we wished you to bear in mind the peculiar language of the Apostle, "even as many as the Lord our God shall call," evidently presenting the idea that there were some that the Lord our God did not call. We have told you in a former speech, and we reiterate it now again, that this fact is too self-evident to be denied. We also told you that Elder Franklin himself would not deny it, and truly he has not, for he has said nothing about it.

We then introduced Acts xiii. 18, which reads "And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord." Well, what was the result? Hear it: "As many as were ordained to eternal life,

believed." We inquired, when we read this passage, what the gentleman would do with his "*can*" along here. We wished to know whether his "*can*" would embrace those that were not ordained to eternal life. But we have not heard a word from him on the subject. We hope the audience will remember that none believed but such as were ordained to eternal life. This text most clearly conveys the idea that there are some who were not ordained to eternal life, and as such my friend's "*can*" will not embrace them.

We next called your attention to the divine sovereignty of God in the great work of man's salvation, as revealed in Romans ix. 15—24. To that part of this connection that speaks of the potter and the clay, the gentleman made some reply. You perhaps remember the manner in which this subject was disposed of, but we ask you what reply was made to the text that reads, "Therefore it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy?" My friend appeared to have no time to attend to this passage, or he had no disposition to do so. Perhaps the latter was true, and why? Because he had been laboring for at least two hours to make this audience believe what the Apostle here says is not true, and what is that? Why, has he not done his best to make you believe that man must will, that he must run, or, in other words, to make you believe that the salvation of sinners was in their own hands. Surely he lias, and he will not now deny it. But Paul says "it is *not* of him that willeth, or of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." Hence, as we showed you, Paul ascribes the salvation of sinners to one cause, and my friend Franklin to another. But the Apostle, in this connection, adds, "Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth." Now, my friends, can you recollect the gentleman's reply to this text. We do not really believe you can, for the very best of reasons—he made none. Well, we do not blame him for his frequent failures to reply, for what reply could any man make that occupies the ground my friend does. We presume all his friends would do just as he has done—pass them by in silence,



without even an attempt to reply to them. Now the true sense of the text, as we told you, is this: the great and omnipotent Jehovah has *mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth*. We have no doubt but this is a bitter pill for our learned friend to swallow, but he has to take it. We hope it will do him good, as truth does the upright in heart.

But the Apostle goes still further in this connection, and speaks of *vessels of wrath fitted to destruction*. Now we told you, in a former speech, that we were not careful at this time about who or what *fitted them for destruction*. We only wished our friend to tell us whether his "*can*" embraced them. This, however, he did not think proper to do.

But the Apostle goes still another step farther, and says something about *vessels of mercy which He (God) had afore prepared unto glory*. Ah, my friends, as I told you before, here lies the great scarecrow—the idea of God having chosen his people in Christ before the world began, or having afore prepared certain vessels unto glory, is more than my worthy friend is willing to bear; indeed he is not willing to say anything at all about it, notwithstanding it is so clearly taught throughout the Bible.

Well, you know, my friends, he has not touched one of these passages, notwithstanding they have been before him since our first speech. We now ask this intelligent audience if his perfect silence upon all those passages has not convinced them thoroughly that even Mr. Franklin, with all his talents and learning, is wholly unable to show you the error of our interpretation of those passages, if indeed we have committed errors. We think every candid mind is now satisfied that Elder Franklin is wrong in his views with regard to the great system of' salvation. But we are not done recapitulating yet.

You were next invited to notice 1 Cor. ii. 10—14. You will there learn of hidden wisdom which God *ordained before the world* unto our glory. Now, we asked the audience if they could believe that Jehovah had, in his wisdom, before the world *ordained* certain people unto glory, and would fail to bring them into the enjoyment of

that glory. We hope this will not be forgotten. The Apostle also says, in this connection, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Upon this subject we remarked that one of two things was true—there was *no such thing as natural men now in the world*, or the gentleman's proposition was false, for most assuredly the gospel is one of the things of the Spirit of God, and so also is the written word, and the Apostle says, in positive terms, the natural man receiveth *not the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them*, and as such, the doctrine of the proposition is untrue. We also referred you to Ephesians ii. 8, 9, 10—"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.*" We told you that this text alone was sufficient to convince every unprejudiced mind that the gentleman was wrong.

He has often remarked, during this discussion, that if men got to heaven they had to *work*; hence, it is evident that this working class are of a different family from the apostle, the saints at Ephesus, or the faithful in Christ Jesus. We told you these were nothing more or less than the ancient Pharisees, who taught that except the people were circumcised and kept the whole law, they could not be saved. The principle is the same, but clothed in a different dress. But the apostle further adds—"For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works. We remarked upon this text, that the Christian was both the workmanship and the creation of God. We called upon the gentleman to know whether he professed to have power to create; to this we received no answer. Well, there *cannot he a Christian without a creation*, and none have power to create but God alone—hence, God alone has the power to create in Christ Jesus. But we also told you that the gentleman would have to prove the apostle to be a liar, before he could sustain his affirmative. This we more fully proved from the text in chapter iv. of Galatians, which reads—"Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman *shall not be heir* with the son of the free woman." Hence we said to you,

that if the doctrine of the gentleman's proposition was true, then the apostle was wrong, because the son of the bondwoman could be an heir if he would, according to my friend's theory. But my time is nearly out, and we must hasten. We now inquire of you, my audience, what more do you want to convince you that Elder Franklin is wrong in his views on this subject, and that salvation flows to poor sinners alone upon the principles of sovereign, free, and reigning grace? We have most clearly proved from the Bible that *he is wrong*. We tell you, in plain language, *he is wrong*, and Mr. Franklin himself acknowledged that he was wrong, for there were some in the days of the Savior that *could not believe*. Now if you believe the Bible, if you believe me, nay more, if you believe my worthy friend himself, he has most signally failed to sustain the affirmative of the present proposition. We therefore still maintain that poor ungodly sinners are saved by grace alone, without works; yes, unconditionally saved, through the righteous merits of our ever blessed Eedeemer, who gave himself for us. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all the powers within me praise His holy name, for rich, free, and unmerited grace, which has been so freely bestowed upon the chief of sinners.

My dear, dying audience, suffer me in conclusion to say to you, that this glorious grace must *save you, or you are gone forever*. Yes, none but Jesus can do helpless sinners good. O, what a glorious theme, to contemplate the fullness, the freeness, and the richness of this grace treasured in our Lord and Savior Jesua Christ before all worlds, which began to be manifested in the promise made to the woman that her seed should bruise the serpent's head, but which was more gloriously manifested in the birth, sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension and glorious intercession of Him who died that sinners might live. This exalted grace was still more fully manifested on the day of Pentecost, when thousands were pierced in their hearts and made to cry out. It is this grace, my dear friends, that has been poured out abundantly upon poor sinners in every age, from then till now, by the power of which they are quickened into divine life, mada partakers of the divine nature, translated from the king-

dom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear son. Yea more, by its heavenly influence poor sinners are made to fall out with themselves, to hate sin, to love God and holiness, and to desire to walk in humble obedience to all the commandments of the Lord, blameless. And finally, dear friends, it is this grace that will bring the whole redeemed family into the enjoyment of that blessed inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, where the wicked cease from troubling and where the weary will forever be at rest. Beloved friends, may you and I be among that happy throng, to praise Jesus for the riches of his grace so freely bestowed upon objects so very unworthy.

Time expired.

**MR. FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS,  
ON THE THIRD PROPOSITION.**

WEDNESDAY, 9 ½ O'CLOCK.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS—LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

The question we are to discuss to-day, is one of very grave importance. It relates to our indication into Christ and the forgiveness of sins. If there is an important period in a man's life, it is the period where God has promised the remission of sins. In the economy of God, there must be a distinct period marked out, where the Lord has promised and man attains the pardon of his past sins. This period we intend to paint out from the living oracles, so clearly, that we think no man here can fail to understand us.

The proposition just read by the president moderator, is very clear and unambiguous. It requires no time spent in defining it. The most important expression in our proposition is "the remission of past sins." But this is easily apprehended. "Past sins," mean the sins of a person's life before conversion; including all actual sins committed from the period of accountably, to the time of regeneration. "Remission," means cutting off, blotting out, or destroying a person's connection with former sins, so as to separate him from them. It is not pardoning or separating from *one sin*—the Adamic sin, but "past sins," our own actual sins. Upon this, I presume we shall have no difference. We are also agreed as to what baptism is, what faith is, and what repentance is. The simple question with us at present, is the *design* of baptism. What is it for? In this controversy I affirm that "The immer-

sion of a penitent believer, by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is for the remission of past sins."

This the worthy gentleman denies. We both believe in baptism, but while I believe it is for the remission of sins, he believes it is not for remission of sins. Such is the nature of the issue between us. We have nothing to do but to make straight-forward work—to follow the plain and indisputable teachings of the infallible scriptures; wherever they lead, we are bound to follow. We are not to prove some position of our own by Scriptures, but to sustain a point in the proposition expressed in the precise words of Scripture—the words *for the remission of sins*.

This is a great matter, relating to our entering into covenant with God. No absurdity should exist here. As ministers of the gospel, we should be able to show how a man enters into this holy covenant with the utmost clearness. If a man enters this covenant according to the Scripture, he can date the time of his admission and pardon as distinctly as the time when a child is born into the world, or the period of entrance into the marriage covenant. To do this, we have nothing to do but to be true to God and to the Scriptures. We have no twisting and quibbling to do. All that is necessary on our part, is to make straight-forward work—to follow Jesus as directed in the oracles of God.

We are not here to tell about *our* church, our faith, our doctrine, our religion, our way, and our views. Nor are we to consult *our* brethren or any body else. The gentleman speaks of the Regular Baptist Church, and "Mr. Hume's teaching," but there are not standard authorities with us. We are not inquiring about admission into the Regular Baptist Church, nor about what is compatible with Mr. Hume's teaching. The simple matter with us is, what do the oracles of God teach? How is an honest seeker introduced into the kingdom or church of Christ? How do humble penitents obtain the forgiveness of sins? The answer to these most vital questions must not be human; must not be from man, but from God. Any man who cannot find and give a direct answer to these questions from God, evidently was not sent by him to preach

the gospel. No divinely authorized teacher of the New Testament ever hesitated to point the honest penitent the way into the kingdom of God, with unerring certainty. The first preachers never sent such an one away *seeking*, or kept him *seeking* for months or years without finding the way to the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world. But I hasten to the argument.

I. The first point I shall make, is based upon the fact that remission of sins is *in the name* of Jesus Christ. Some men become so horrified at the word *baptizo*, that they cannot be induced to see any other important word standing in connection with it. In connection with the word baptize, you will find the important expressions, "the *name* of the Lord," the "name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," in "the name of Jesus Christ," and in "his name." His glorious name is exalted above every name, both of things in heaven and on earth. To his name every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess. Peter says, that "all the prophets bear witness of him, that *through his name* whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts. x.: 43. On another occasion, Peter makes a reference the words of Isaiah: "Behold I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect and precious, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be confounded." Peter then remarks to the Jewish wise men: "This is the stone rejected of your builders, but the same is become the head of the corner; neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other *name* given under heaven nor among men whereby ye can be saved." Acts. iv.: 12. There is no promise of salvation out of the name of Jesus Christ. All who obtain the forgiveness of sins must do it in the name of Christ, for there is no forgiveness out of his name.

II. The second point to which I call attention, is, that remission of sins is in or through the blood of Christ. No man can obtain remission of sins without coming to the blood of Christ. The praise of the heavenly hosts in the world to come, will be ascribed to him "who washed us from our sins in his own blood." The language of the book of God to the children of God, now is, that "if we have fellowship one with another, the blood of Jesus

Christ *his Son cleanseth us from all sin*. All the blood of all the victims offered by patriarchs, as well as those upon Jewish altars, pointed to the blood of the one great sin offering in the end of the ages. Without this blood, there is no remission, and without an application of it there is no cleansing from sins. The sinner must be brought to the blood of Christ, or his sins cannot be washed away. All this the gentleman is bound to admit.

III. Forgiveness of sins is *in Christ*. Out of him, there is no forgiveness. To be in him, is to be in *his body*, in his *church*. This the worthy gentleman will admit. He is bound to admit all three of the points now stated,. He cannot deny them.

*Mr. Hume*. I admit them all; I believe in these three points as much as he does himself.

*Mr. Franklin*.—Certainly the gentleman admits them; we state them as an admitted basis to reach some points not admitted.

I cannot in a single paragraph elucidate the subject, but will bring it before the gentleman in as few words as possible. The first matter, then, is to show how a man is brought *into Christ*, for when he is *in Christ*, he is a new creature; he comes to the blood which is in him—in his body; he comes to his spirit which is also in his body; he comes to spiritual life which is in his body; he comes to the divine nature; in one word, he comes to the enjoyment of all spiritual blessings in heavenly places, in Christ Jesus. We must be in Christ before we have his name upon us; before we come to his blood; before we come to his spirit and before we enjoy pardon. It then becomes a matter of vast moment that a person knows how to enter into him. This is, then, the great matter to look after. How do we enter into him?

It has long been said, and well said, that there must be an *in* before there can be an *into*. We must have come *into* this house before we could be said to be *in* it. We came *into* the world, before we were *in* it. We were never *in* any place, without first entering *into* it. If any man is then *in Christ*, he must have entered *into Christ* first. If we are then, the children of God by faith, *in Christ*, how did we in the first place enter *into* him?



Some preachers have amused themselves and their audiences, by saying that our religion is "head religion;" but I intend to show the gentleman that he has nothing, and that no preacher in this town has anything for head, heart or spirit, that we have not, of a divine character; that he has nothing divine for body, soul or spirit that we have not, and we invite his closest attention, and his strongest objections, that he may make the most of it in his power. We have no fears but it will stand the test.

IV. The fourth point we call the attention of the gentleman to is, that the Lord requires three divine changes in order to an entrance into Christ, and no man can enter, according to the Scriptures, without them.

1. The first is a *divine change of the heart*. We wish most explicitly and distinctly to make this statement, and we wish we could make it in such a manner that it could not be forgotten. No person, we repeat, can enter into the kingdom of Christ without a divine change of heart. We wish also not to be misunderstood about what is meant by this expression. It is not New Testament language, but that which is intended we believe is correct, and we have no disposition to dispute with men about the mere verbiage, when their meaning is correct. What they mean, then, by the words "change of heart" is correct, is Scriptural. What, then, do they mean? We have heard them frequently describe it in language like this:

"The man who is changed in heart loves that he once hated, and hates that he once loved. He loves God; he loves the Bible; he loves the people of God and his worship. He delights in and loves obedience to the Lord. He hates sin, transgression, and all sinful ways. He designs good, and studies to do good and avoid evil. He does not get beyond the reach of sin and temptation, but he does get beyond the *design* and *intention* to sin. This man, changed from the love of sin to the love of God, is changed in heart."

The question will naturally arise, how was this change effected? Some one will respond that it was effected by the Holy Spirit. This is unquestionably true; but how did the Holy Spirit reach the heart and accomplish this

work? We read in Scripture, that He has a sword, with which He pierces the heart. Paul says that the sword of the Spirit is the word of God. How did He use this instrument? On the day of Pentecost, He came from heaven, and inspired the Apostles—made instruments of them, through which He spoke to the people. What was the effect of the word spoken? Luke says, "When they heard this, they were *pierced in the heart*, and cried out, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" What was it that pierced their hearts? Evidently the sword of the Spirit—the word of God.

But Paul, in so many words, declares that the heart is *purified* by faith. This is the same as the heart *changed* by faith. The motives, intentions and designs are purified by faith. Faith comes by hearing, and healing by the word of God. If, then, hearing is by the word of God, and faith comes by hearing, and the heart is changed by faith, it amounts to the same as the heart being pierced on hearing the word on Pentecost. It reaches the heart in both cases and changes it; and this change, effected through these divine instrumentalities, is what we mean by a *change of heart*. Without this, we say, no person can enter into Christ.

2. The second change is a divine change in the character. No man can enter into Christ without a change of character, and all the baptism in the world would be of no importance to one soul of Adam's race, without the previous change of heart and character. And, as the Lord designed three divine changes, He has arranged three appointments for the accomplishment of that object. He has appointed faith to change the heart; and repentance to change the character; and no man can enter into his kingdom without repentance, which changes the character. God takes an account of the actions of men, and will call them to account for their actions, in the day of final accounts. This is the reason why He commands all men everywhere to repent, and the reason why the Lord said, "Except you repent, you shall perish."

When the heart is changed, the man feels right, and his intentions are good, and when a man's character is changed, his actions are good. His intentions and actions

are purified, and consequently good. But the worthy gentleman must not stop here and pronounce the work done. He has been wont to think the process too short. He must not now stop and proclaim it complete before it is accomplished. Every item must have its own place, and accomplish its own object, There is, then, still an important part of the work incomplete.

3. The third divine change is the change in the *relation*, or in the *state*. No man can be in Christ till the relation is changed. Without the change in the relation or state, he stands in the same relation to his sins, to the world, to the church, and to God, that he did before. It is not enough that he hale his sins, nor that he cease the practice of sin, but he should be separated from his *past sins*. But he cannot separate himself from his old sins, or, in other words, he cannot pardon his sins. The pardoning power is in the lawgiver. None but He can separate from sins. He has a special appointment for those previously changed in heart by faith, and changed in character by repentance, that changes the relation or the state.

We trust now that we are fully understood. The change of state is to pass from one state to the other, from one kingdom to the other, from an unpardoned to a pardoned state, from out of Christ into him. But as I intend to make sure work here, and run no risk, I shall keep an Apostle between the gentleman and myself. I shall then appeal to Paul to ascertain how a man changed in heart and in character enters into Christ. Let us hear the Apostle: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." If they were the children of God by faith *in* Christ, they must have entered *into* him somehow. Let us hear, then, how they entered into him. He says, "For as many of you as have been baptized *into* a. Christ have put on Christ."—Gal. iii. 26, 27.

Here we have the divine appointment, set forth by the Apostle's own pen, that introduces us *into* Christ. It is the divine ceremony that changes the state or the relation. It is like entering into the marriage covenant. None can properly enter or enjoy that covenant without three, similar changes. They must first be changed in

heart or the affections. They must then be changed in character or actions, and make the necessary preparations to enter that holy state. But they are still, though changed in heart and in actions, not in the new state. The gentleman claims no father-in-law, the lady claims no mother-in-law. Neither of them claim brothers in-law or sisters in-law, nor can either, in case of death, legally claim the inheritance of the other. The reason is, that they have not yet come to the completing act. They have not passed through the ceremony that changes the state or relation. The marriage ceremony may, too, appear to some not at all essential, but still people of sense do not expect the privileges of the marriage state without submitting to it. It does not change the heart, the affections, or the character, but the state or the relation. It takes the man whose heart and character have previously been changed, and brings him into a new state.

The same is true of the baptismal ceremony; it does not change the heart, the affections, nor the character, but takes the man, previously changed in heart and character, into a new relation. In the language of the oracles of God, he is said to be "in Christ," and the Bible says, "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." The economy of God is complete. If He designed a man to be changed in heart, He appointed faith to produce that change. When He designed him to be changed in character. He appointed repentance for that purpose. When he was prepared for a change of state and the enjoyment of pardon. He required him to submit to the baptismal economy, which changes the state and brings him to pardon. The Lord designed that *men* should believe; He therefore gave facts upon credible testimony, to be believed. He intended that believers should be obedient; He therefore gave them commandments to be obeyed. He intended all obedient believers to have a hope; He therefore gave them "the exceeding great and precious promises," that they might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruptions of the world through lust.

We have been thus particular in setting this subject before our friend, that he may know what he has to con-

tend with. "We do not wish him to fight in the dark, nor to employ his whole powers in battling down a man of straw. We do not teach that baptism *alone* can bring any person into Christ, but baptism, administered to a person such as we have described, changes the state— brings the person into Christ. Baptism is not to bring a person into the Regular Baptist Church. My friend is horribly mistaken in baptizing into the Baptist Church, unless baptizing into the Baptist Church and into the Church of Christ are the same thing. But we do not believe that what, he calls the "Regular Baptist Church" is "the body of Christ." The body of Christ is the kingdom or Church of Christ, consisting of all the children of God, or as Paul expresses it, "the whole family in heaven and upon earth."

It is upon this body that the name of Christ is placed. In it the blood of Christ flows to cleanse from all sin. In it the Spirit of God dwells, and in it are all spiritual blessings. In this body are the life, the truth, and the love of God. Out of it, no man has a promise that he can come into the name, come to the blood, to the Spirit, the life, or any spiritual blessing. How important, then, that we make no mistake about the admission into this body! We have found one passage where we read of being "baptized into Christ." We must hear the Apostle once more. He says, "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized *into* Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."—Rom. vi. 1-4.

Here we find another clear case of baptizing *into* Christ. Baptism is, then, the divine ceremony that changes the relation and introduces the penitent into Christ. But this is not all. This passage shows that baptism brings the proper subject *into the death* of Christ. Here it is, then, that the subject comes to the blood of Christ, for it was in his death that his blood was shed for many for the remission of sins. Baptism, then, brings

the proper candidate *into Christ*—into his body, into his death, into his name, and, of course, to his blood, that cleanseth from all sin. Hence the Apostle, in the seventeenth verse of this same chapter, says, "God be thanked that, though ye were the servants of sin, ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being *then* made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." From this language, it is manifest that the Apostle regarded them as being made free from sin, in the act of obeying from the heart the form of doctrine delivered them.

But the prophets bear witness of Christ, that *through His name*, whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins. Where, then, do they get into his name? This we must find expressed in Scripture. We have no way of our own, and shall attempt to establish no theory, but bring unequivocal statements from the Bible. Let the Bible, then, state how we get *into* or *take upon* vs the name of Christ. In order to approach this point, I shall divorce the gentleman from John the Baptist first. John the Baptist preached baptism for the remission of sins. Let us hear Mark. He says, "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance *for the remission of sins.*"—Mark i. 4. Let us hear Luke. He says, "And came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance *for the remission of sins.*"— Luke iii. 5. In both these passages, we have baptism for remission of sins, in the plainest and most unequivocal language. This is what John preached, but what the worthy gentleman does not preach and does not believe. He and John are therefore not in fellowship. But we leave him and John to settle this, and proceed to find how persons get into the name of Christ.

Let us now hear the last commission: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them into the *name of* the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Here the *name* is mentioned, but in the common version of the Scriptures it is not "*into* the name," but "*in* the name;" yet every man of intelligence knows that in the original and in many translations, it is "*into the name*"— "baptized *into* the name," at that. But we hasten-to

hear the last commission as recorded by Mark. He has it: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."— Mark xvi. 15, 16. All the comment we shall make here is to state, that the *salvation* mentioned here does not mean the eternal salvation, but pardon or salvation from sin. He that believeth and is baptized shall be pardoned, is the force of the language. To complete the matter, let us hear Luke's version of the commission: "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved 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."—Luke xxiv. 46, 47.

. From these passages, it is evident that remission of sins is in the name of Christ, and that there is no promise of pardon without getting into his name. Now we must harmonize these passages. My worthy opponent does not try to harmonize Scripture. His method appears to be to bring Scripture against Scripture, or Scripture to refute Scripture. But this cannot be done; the Bible is in perfect harmony with itself. It teaches but one doctrine. The last commission contains the same doctrine found in the preaching of the apostles, under that commission. The Bible is our creed; I believe the whole of it, and am bound to harmonize it. When the Lord gave the last commission to the apostles, he commanded them to wait for the promise—to wait for the Comforter, to guide them into all truths. This order they obeyed, and when that distinguished period arrived, they were all together in one place. The Holy Spirit came from heaven in a visible and miraculous form, and clothed them with supernatural power. An audience is assembled. The first discourse is delivered. When the people hear it, they are pierced in the heart and demand what they shall do. We have, in Acts ii. 38, an inspired answer to the important inquiry, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" I am in favor of giving the same answer to the same question. Will the worthy gentleman do the same? What was the answer given? "Then Peter said unto

them, repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all them That are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Here they are commanded to be baptized *in the name* of Jesus Christ? What is it for? The apostle says, *for the remission of sins*. Here is the precise issue between myself and the worthy gentleman. I contend for the very language of this passage. He does not believe it, or if he does, he believes that I am right, and that baptism is *for remission of sins*. Our issue is not upon an abstract question, but upon the very language of Scripture. My friend will say, Peter was wrong—that baptism was not for remission of sins. But here, in so many words, I find in Peter's answer the doctrine of my proposition—baptism for remission of sins. The simple question between us is, was Peter right? I say, he was; my friend will say he was not right.

Let us hear the result, when the apostle gave this command: "Then they that gladly received His word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Here is the result: then as at the present day, those who gladly received the word were baptized, and the balance were not. Here is work for my friend. He will find use for all the argument and logic he can command. The case is an exceedingly plain one. The apostle delivers his first discourse to unconverted men—it pierces them to the heart. They cry out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The apostle answers, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in *the name* of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*." I claim that he answered right, and that my friend and myself have no right to give a different answer. He claims the privilege to give a different answer. He says, baptism is not for remission. I stand with the apostle; he stands against him.

The gentleman will desire me to inform him how many the Lord has called. I, of course, will do the best I can for him on this score. Paul says to one of the churches, "He called you by our gospel." If we wish, then, to



know how many were called, we must notice to whom the gospel was to be preached. The Lord commanded it to be preached to "every creature." and Paul, in the first chapter of Colossians, says, "the hope of the gospel was preached to every creature under heaven." Again, he says, "their sound went into all the world, and their voice to the ends of the earth." This shows, then, that the call was extensive enough, and more than enough for Calvinism. The promise that God made to Abraham, was to all the families of the earth. Peter said, "The promise is to you and to your children, and to all them that are afar off."

But we have one very plain matter for the worthy gentleman. Baptism is *for* the remission of sins, or it is *not* for remission. He has kindly intimated that some doctrine he felt it incumbent upon himself to expose, was preached in the garden of Eden. If baptism is *not* for remission of sins, we need a supplement, and what is worse, the very supplement used in Eden. It was the word "*not*." The Lord said, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." An expositor and an interpreter made his appearance, and prepared an amendment, not upon a substitution but upon the original. He simply asked the liberty to supply one word. That one word was the word "not"—the very same supplement that my friend made to-day. He said, "God does know that ye shall *not* surely die." Now we do not like supplements wh<sup>^</sup>re the original does not justify any, and especially from such an unworthy source.

Let us, however, see how this borrowed supplement will look in a few passages: "He that believeth and is baptized shall *not* be saved." How would the gentleman like to insert this little word? I think he would not insert it for a round sum. Let us try another passage:

"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth *not* also now save us." How does he like this reading? Again:

"Arise and be baptized, and *not* wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." How does he like the looks of this supplement here? Does it not look about as bad as it did ill the sentence, "Ye shall *not* surely die"? Once more: "Repent, and be baptized

every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *not* for the remission of sins." How would he like to insert this word in these places in his Bible? He surely would not do it for a large consideration. Why, then, name it in his heart? He surely would not read, "his blood shed for many *not* for the remission of sins!" This would be shocking.

Here, then, in the Scriptures, we find baptism for the *remission of sins*, in the words of our proposition, and in the words that declare that the blood of Christ was shed for many for the remission of sins. Any argument that will show that baptism is not for the remission of sins, will show that the blood of Christ was not shed for the remission of sins, and that our proposition itself does not mean baptism for remission of sins. I do not like this little negative word *not*. It has too much of the anti-means in it; too much opposition to every good work in it. It would stand and object to Sunday schools, temperance and missionary movements. It leans decidedly the other way.

Remission of sins is in the name of Christ. Baptism is in the name of the Lord. ' Baptism brings us into the death of Christ, and consequently to the blood of Christ. Baptism brings us into the body of Christ. There we meet the name, the blood, the spirit, the life, and all spiritual blessings. Baptism brings the penitent believer there, and, therefore, is for the remission of sins.

Time expired.

**MR. HUME'S FIRST SPEECH**  
**ON THE THIRD PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN——

During the last two days we have been frequently told by the gentleman, that he believed every word in the sacred Scriptures, and that he did not wish to introduce a Scripture to rebut Scripture; that he did not believe all that is said in the Bible, but only such parts thereof as seemed to suit our theory. Now, we would have the gentleman to know, that neither he, or ourself, can produce one portion of Scripture that will contradict nor rebut another, for the Scriptures all harmonize, and all prove the same great truths; and we do verily believe everything therein revealed. But the great difficulty with my friend is, there is no portion of them that proves the doctrine he has here undertaken to defend; hence the very few proof-texts introduced by the gentleman during this discussion, and we fear you will find the same deficiency throughout this debate. The first thing the gentleman said this morning that we thought worthy of note, was another burlesque hurled at us for our opposition, as he said, to the doctrine of good works. We have been informed since we closed last evening, that it was said in this house yesterday, that the good works that we believed in, was in banging around groceries and drinking whiskey. *O what a pity that any person should suffer their zeal to lead them so far away from the truth.* Now, it is known to the greater portion of this audience, that we have lived near here since 1840, except two years' absence in Kentucky, and we now challenge the world to produce a man that will say that he has ever at any time saw us in, or lurking about a grocery or retail li-

quor shop; and we also challenge any man to point to the time and place, when he ever saw us in the least disguised with intoxicating drinks of any kind. Every lady and gentleman in and around Mt. Vernon, knows well that the charge is slanderously false.

We now remark, and we challenge contradiction from any man, that if all men would pursue the same course that we do, there would not be a retail liquor shop or a drunken man in the state of Indiana, or in the world. We are truly sorry that circumstances have made it necessary for us to deviate from the subject matter of debate, but we are fully prepared to meet the enemy at every point, and we intend to do it. Now it is known to you my audience, that we have already given our views at some length upon the subject of good works. You know also that we advocate strenuously the doctrine of good works, but we wish to put them in their proper place and enjoin their observance upon the proper class of people; hence the language of one item of our articles of faith, which reads thus: "We believe that good works are the *fruits* of the faith of God's elect, and follow after they are born of the spirit of God." This is what we believe upon this subject.

But no doubt the gentleman would be much pleased if he could prevail upon us to occupy all our time upon this subject. This, however, he cannot do. We intend to follow him closely on the present proposition, for we are aware that here is, as he supposes, his strong fort. We intend, however, to drive him from his stronghold, show you his lurking places, fire his cob bouse, burn up his nest, and leave him without even a shadow of foundation to set his foot upon before we get through with this proposition, the doctrine of which involves considerations of the most important character. We are now engaged in discussing the great principle, upon which the *sins* of the rebellious are pardoned or forgiven. Well, surely there could not be a more important subject introduced for your consideration, or one upon which you should more sincerely desire to know the truth. My friend has undertaken to prove that baptism or immersion is for the remission or forgiveness of past sins; that is to say, all sins

up to the time of baptism. Now we have one question to settle here before we proceed, and that is, we wish to know what idea the gentleman intends to convey by the word *for remission*, whether he means because of, or *in order to*. We hope he will explain himself upon this subject. Will you be so kind, sir, as to tell us how you wish to be understood here? Thank you, sir. He say's he understands the wordier in the proposition, to mean *in order to*. Well, this is just what we supposed, but we wished to have it directly from himself, in order that we might know against what we were contending. Now we wish it distinctly understood, that we demur against the whole theory taught in the language of the present proposition, for reasons that we will now attempt to show. We wish you to remember, however, that every point introduced in this discussion must, according to our rules, be proved from the sacred Scriptures, as we have them revealed in our common, or King James' version of the Bible. Now, if my friend fails to prove by plain pointed language of the Bible, that immersion is *in order* to the forgiveness of past sins, then he fails to sustain the affirmative of the present proposition. Well, my friends, he must and will forever fail, for there is not one text in all the book of God, that teaches this doctrine. We intend to show you, God being our helper, that the pardon of sins that are past, as well as those that are to come, flows to sinners upon very different principles, and does not depend either in *whole or in part upon the act of immersion*. We object to the doctrine of the proposition, first, because it contradicts God's holy word; secondly, because it destroys the efficacy of the blood of Christ; thirdly, because it damns all who are not baptized. These points we shall attend to, perhaps blended together, as we progress with the discussion. We wish you to remember distinctly, that the gentleman has already admitted three very important items in our favor. The first was, that baptism does not always mean immersion in water, but sometimes meant an overwhelming in trouble and sorrow. To use his own language, the audience might be overwhelmed or baptized in smoke. Well, this is all true, but a very fatal admission for my friend, as he will see before we are done with the subject. The next admission was,

that there was no remission of sins *only through the name of Christ*. His third admission was, that there was no remission o<sup>^</sup>sins *only through the blood of Christ*.

Here, then, according to the gentleman's own showing, we have three channels differing widely in their nature and design, through which the *gnce* of pardon is extended, to wit: *the nmne of Christ, the blood of Christ, and water baptism*. Well, it is one thing to positively affirm a proposition, but it is a very different thing to prove it. The gentleman has affirmed the three positions above named, but he has not yet proved them, neither will he until he gets a new translation. He will surely find ample room here for a full display of his learning and talents, and all the logic he can summon to his aid, Hedge's not excepted, and will even then fail to convince this audience that such a mass of contradictions are true, or in harmony with the Holy Scriptures. The gentleman told us that there was a data by which all men could tell precisely when they entered the kingdom of Christ, and that was when they were baptized into the name of Christ, and that there is no salvation out of this kingdom. Hence the argument of my worthy friend ran thus: that in order to get the benefits of the name and blood of Christ, we must come into the kingdom of Christ, which we can only do by being immersed into it.

Now, my audience, the gentleman has fully revealed himself. He is simply an advocate for the doctrine of salvation, through or by the water; for, says he, we cannot get into the name or receive the benefits of the blood of Christ outside of the kingdom of Christ; and we cannot get into the kingdom only by being baptized. We have often heard of this watery path to the celestial city, but Elder Franklin, is the first man we have ever heard publicly advocate the doctrine that without immersion there is no salvation. But the gentleman thinks we refer too often to the doctrine of the Regular Baptist. Well, when he will let us alone, or tell the truth about our doctrine, we will stop, and not till then for we intend to follow him into all the dark places where he tries to conceal himself. The gentleman told us that all spiritual blessings were treasured in Christ. Well, this is true; but if he had read

the connection in which this remark is found, it would have given much light on the subject. Paul says, "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 has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world." Well, what was the object of Jehovah, in thus blessing the saints at Ephesus and the faithful in Christ, with all spiritual blessings in Christ, and choosing them in Him before the world began. Evidently it was, as the Apostle says, "That they *should be holy*, and without blame before him in love." Now, if sinners were blessed with *all* spiritual blessings in Christ, before the world began, was not forgiveness or pardon one of those blessings? Surely my friend will not deny it; and if this be true, surely pardon does not come through the water, but through the blood of Jesus Christ as declared by the Apostle in the 7th verse of the 1st Chap. of Ephesians, which reads, "In whom we have redemption through his *blood, the forgiveness of sins*," &c. The Apostle also remarks, in second Timothy, Chap. i. 9. "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began." Now mark, the text does not say given *to Christ for us*, but given us in Christ before the world began; hence it is evident that the great work of man's salvation was all arranged, settled and prematurely fixed before the world began; that they were there blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ, and that grace was given them there, which secured a glorious manifestation of pardon to all the heirs of promise in due time, through the blood of the new and everlasting covenant, that was ordered in all things and sure.

But the gentleman assumes another very strange position indeed, and that is, he says a man may be changed in heart and character, and not be a saint. Hence, said he, baptism to a man that is not changed in heart and character, is worth nothing or indeed useless. Hence, my audience, you can get a glimpse at the gentleman's beautiful consistency. The sinner may be so effectually wrought upon by divine power as to produce an entire change of

heart, so that he now loves the Lord with his whole heart, hates and abhors sin so much that it produces an entire change in his character or course of moral conduct, and yet not be a saint of God. Why, what is wanting? Oh he must put on the finishing touch himself. And what is that? Why, he must be immersed, or farewell heaven to him. Well, my friends, where do you suppose our friend will put the poor fellow. Surely he cannot go down to hell. Oh, no; he hates sin, he loves God, he walks humbly before Him, and as such he cannot possibly go to the bad place; and he cannot go to heaven, because he has not been baptized. We suppose our friend has to endorse Roman Catholicism at least for present convenience, and stow the poor fellow away in purgatory awhile; and if they have no water there to baptize him in, of course he must remain there. Now, if we cannot find more consistency and good sense in the swamps of Indiana, among the blue-stocking Baptists than this, we are greatly mistaken. My dear friends, is it not awful to think where a false zeal will sometimes lead smart men. You see however what it has done in the case now before us.

The gentleman next tells us that we must be a member of the *body of Christ*, or we never can be saved. Well, this is also true; we are glad that our friend occasionally acknowledges the truth. We have been told again and again, that there was no salvation outside the *kingdom* of Christ. We are now told there is no salvation outside of the *body of Christ*. We suppose we will next hear that there is no salvation out of the *Church of Christ*. Well, we suppose that by the terms *kingdom*, *body*, and *church*, the gentleman means precisely the same thing. If he does, then we are together upon this subject, so far as visibility is concerned, but we differ widely with regard to none being saved, but such as are in the kingdom or church visibly; and we differ just as widely with regard to the manner in which persons are inducted into the mystical body of Christ. Now, the learned gentleman has, time and again, declared in your hearing that there is no means by which we can possibly get into the *kingdom*, *name*, or *body* of Christ, only by being baptized or immersed into them. Well, he has also told us that this



immersion is nothing more or less, than an overwhelming of the individual in water; and when we are thus baptized into the name of Christ, the kingdom or body of Christ, we there find the blood of Christ, which cleanseth from all sin. Wow if these things are true, surely we ought to know it, for much depends upon a correct knowledge of the medium through which sins are pardoned. But if they are not true, we should shun them as we would the deadly poison. Well, all that is necessary to prove to you that this whole theory is false, is for us to open our battery, and let loose upon this building of trash, the cannon of God's holy word charged with eternal truth, which is a sharp two-edged sword and cuts every way; and if our friend does not feel the effects, it will evidently be because he is wholly destitute of feeling.

We now invite your attention to the language of the Apostle, recorded in first Corinthians, Chapter xii. 12, 13, which reads, "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body, so also is Christ, for by one *spirit are we all baptized into one body*, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free and have been all made to drink into one spirit." Now you see my friends that after all the gentleman's loud boasting about his method of getting into the body of Christ, and the impregnable superstructure that he has reared for its defense, one single discharge from Heaven's artillery demolishes the whole, and so completely unmasks the gentleman's theory, that every intelligent lady and gentleman here must see its deformity. The Apostle tells us in the quotation above, that there are many members and but one body, and as this is true, so also is Christ; clearly proving that there are many members in the body of Christ, and yet but one body; and he clearly defines the manner of entrance into that, and it matters not what the condition in life may be, whether Jews or Gentiles, bond or free. There is but the one way of getting into that one body, and that way is very different from the course pointed out by Mr. Franklin. Hence the Apostle says "for by one *spirit are we all baptized into one body*." Here, then, we have the views of the Apostle as to the manner of

getting into the body of Christ, and it must be admitted that the Apostle understood well what he said, and could not possibly be mistaken upon the subject. But the gentleman urges the propriety of baptizing *into* the name of Christ, and quotes the language of the Apostle where he says "for as many of us as have been baptized *into Christ* have put on Christ." and he tells you that we are not in company with the Apostle. Well, we are in company with the Savior in the great commission for he says "baptizing them *in the name* of the Father and of the Son," &c. Hence, Jesus commanded them to baptize *in his name* and not into the name. Here, all that has been said about baptizing into the name, has been a perfect, quibble and nothing else. But we are told that there is no such thing as the influence of the spirit outside of the body of Christ. Now, if this be true, we would inquire by what influence are men lead into the body of Christ. Does the wisdom of this world direct men thither? Does the carnal mind of the ungodly lead them to the kingdom of Jesus Christ? Surely not; the Savior says "except a man be born again he cannot *see the kingdom of God.*" My friend says no man is born again until he is immersed. Now if this be true, and he cannot see the kingdom until he is born again. What are the facts in the case? Why it is evident that they go into the kingdom blind; and if there is no influence of the spirit outside the kingdom or body of Christ, how do those "that are blind find the way? Here is a puzzle for the gentleman. We hope he will attend to it in his next speech, for sure it is there needs some explanation upon this subject. The gentleman has at last found one connection of Scripture, as he supposes, in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, 37th, 38th, 39th, 40th, and 41st verses, that will sustain his theory. Well we will attend to this connection in due time for we have nothing to fear from any thing that is found in the Bible. We have now driven the gentleman to his great rallying place, the connection upon which he principally relies for success upon the present proposition. Well, we shall be mistaken if the gentleman is not as anxious to get away from the second of Acts as he has been to get to it. We will now read the connection, beginning at the 37th verse:

"Now when they heard, this they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, men and brethren what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized," &c. Now, before we proceed further, we would just remark that if we were surrounded with the same circumstance's that Peter was, we would try to teach just as Peter did. Let it now be distinctly understood, and it should never be forgotten, that the characters addressed by Peter were pierced in the heart, and so powerfully were they wrought upon that they were made to cry out. Just let us now step back a little, and inquire if there is no influence of the Holy Spirit outside of the kingdom or body of Christ, what was it that made this vast multitude cry out so earnestly, "Men and brethren, what shall we do." Now it must be evident to all candid minds, that those persons were truly convicted for sin; had a discovery of their awful and justly condemned state as rebels against God; beheld his awful justice about to be executed upon them as the violators of his holy law. Now in view of all these things they were made to cry out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do." The Apostle very justly informs them. He says in answer to their enquiry, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Here we shall have use for the gentleman's definition of the word *for*; he says it means *in order to*. Now we deny this being the true meaning of the word, for in this text it may be rendered *in order to* in some cases, but most generally is to be understood to mean *because, because of, or in consideration of*. Now, we take the ground, that *for* in this place simply means *because of*. Now, any substitute that will give the same idea or make as good sense as the original word, is a good substitute; but if it does not convey the same idea, or make good sense, then the word substituted will not do. We will now introduce a few examples. It is said in the

Scriptures "who was delivered for our offences." Now let us read the text according to Mr. Franklin's theory, and it would read thus, "who was delivered *in order to* our offences." Now you all know this would not do.' Well, let us now substitute *because of* and it would then read, "who was delivered *because of* our offences." This substitute conveys precisely the same sense that the original word *for* does. Hence it is a good substitute in this place, but again it is said "*for* we have not followed cunningly devised fables." How would this look to read "*in order to* we have not followed," &c. Now all present are ready to say, it looks very bad indeed. Well, just substitute *because*, and you have precisely the same sense. We will introduce one more which will serve for the present. It is said in the new covenant, "*for* all shall know me from the least to the greatest." Let us now read to suit Mr. Franklin, "*in order to* all shall know me," &c. Now it must be evident to all present that such a substitute will not do. Well let us read the text with our substitute and we will have good sense at least, "*because* all shall know me from the least to the greatest," &c. You, my audience, can examine this subject more fully at your leisure, and the more you examine it, the more thoroughly you will be convinced that *for* must frequently mean *because* or *because of*. Then we have the gentleman's strong text explained upon common sense principles, by which we show you that Elder Franklin has no proof for his theory in this text. But again mark the language used by the Apostle in the 41st verse, "then they that gladly received his word were baptized," &c. Now what do you suppose, my audience, was the cause of the great rejoicing among these people who had been pierced in the heart? We naturally suppose that their rejoicing grew out of an evidence of pardoned sins, for we know of nothing else that would have been likely to have produced it. We wish you to remember particularly these three important facts: first, the people addressed by Peter were pierced in the heart; secondly, the word *for* in this text means *because of*; thirdly those pierced in the heart were made to rejoice, and surely there is nothing that would be more likely to cause them to rejoice than a mani-

festation of pardoned sins through the merits and blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Hence, with this view of the subject, you see, my audience, that the gentleman's strong hold is broken up, and he completely dislodged from his resting place, and as such he must seek for proof to sustain himself somewhere else, for sure it is he has none in this connection. But the gentleman seemed to possess some foreknowledge, or at least was possessed of the spirit, of prophecy, for he told us during his speech this morning, that w" would have to offer an apology to the audience for our entire failure to day. But we think the gentleman is a false prophet, for we have no apology to offer, for we have made no failure, neither will we fail to chase our friend sufficiently close for his convenience to the close of this discussion. He has discovered the error of his views in a former speech, and comes out and says that he never said the sinner's regeneration was in Ills own hands. Now, we appeal to this audience to know if the gentleman did not say that God had given every man power to be regenerated, and if we ever readied the fair clinics of immortal felicity, we had to *work* for it. No doubt the gentleman would be glad if he had those remarks back again; but he supposed he had such a mass of ignorance to contend wit!), that every departure from the principles of common sense and the Bible would be passed unnoticed, but he has found himself so much mistaken that it renders him very uneasy. We now inquire of you, my audience, what passage of Scripture has the gentleman introduced to prove that baptism is *in aيدر to the forgiveness of sins*. ^of *one*. Well he has promised to prove this point, and to prove it by the sacred Scriptures as taught in our common version of the Bible, and for that purpose he has referred us to the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, which no doubt comes as near proving his proposition as any he can find. Well, in that whole chapter there is not *we word said about baptism in order to the forgiveness of sins*; and we tell you now, as we have before told you, that he never will find one text in all the book of God, which will prove the doctrine of baptism *in, order to* the forgiveness of sins. It is not only true that the gentleman is out of Scripture

proof, but it is also true that he is out of argument. This is evident from the fact that he has introduced the same argument twice in his first speech; he now tells the second time that a man may be changed in heart and in character, and yet if he is not baptized he cannot be saved. Well we will venture to prophecy that he will not introduce this argument again, for by the time he gets this man, who is changed in heart and character, stowed away in another world, he will be willing to drop the subject, for we have already shown you that according to our friend's theory, he can neither go to happiness or misery, but must necessarily stop in the Romans' purgatory, and if he cannot meet with an opportunity to be baptized in that country, there he must stay. We hope the gentleman will lxi this up in his next speech, and be very particular in defining what kind of society such a man would be adapted to, *for he can no longer live in and enjoy the society of the wicked*, and he cannot be admitted into the company of the saints, simply because he has not been baptized.

We now ask, if the gentleman's theory be true, what becomes of all such as are so situated that they cannot possibly be baptized. Have we not good reason to believe that thousands are brought to repentance and the knowledge of the truth upon their death beds, many of whom greatly desire to be baptized, but their peculiar situation forbids it and renders it perfectly impossible; *and because they cannot*, notwithstanding they sincerely desire to be baptized, they must perish forever. Now, my dear audience, can you possibly persuade yourselves to believe that a God of strict justice would act thus with his creatures? Surely if they really do desire to be baptized, the desire is a good one, and came from God. Then He has given the desire, and yet renders it perfectly impossible to gratify that desire, and damns the sinner because he does not comply. But this is not all; have we not reason also to believe that there are multiplied thousands of the human race, both in the lands of Christendom as well as in Heathen countries, who are brought to the knowledge of the truth, in various and numerous corners of the earth, who have no opportunity whatever to receive the ordi-

nance of baptism, and because they *cannot*, they must all be damned forever,

O, what a God-dishonoring doctrine, how the soul sickens at the very thought! God has appointed the bounds of the habitation of men; he has in his providence placed a very large portion of his creatures in countries far remote from the preached gospel; they are so situated that they have not the written word of the Lord, while there are millions of them who could neither read or understand it if they had it; they have never heard of the glorious Jesus either through the preached gospel or written word; nay more, they have never so much as heard of the organization of the gospel kingdom or Church of God upon earth. Neither have they ever heard of the holy ordinances of the gospel given to and enjoined upon the church, but are perfectly ignorant of the whole system, because God in his providence has so situated' them that they cannot be benefitted by the gospel or written word; and yet, strange to tell. Oh, publish it not among men, that we have those among us, in this nineteenth century, who stand up in the sanctuary of God (as he is pleased to call it) and proclaim that the very God who has so situated this portion of the race, will now damn the whole of them for not doing what he has put entirely out of their power to do. Now, the gentleman has been boasting of his exalted views of the goodness and mercy of God, and of his great love to the race, and now after all tells you in plain words, that God has withheld the blessing of the gospel and written word from far the largest portion of the race, and then damns them because they do not do what the gospel enjoins. May heaven save me from a system that thus dishonors the God of the Bible, destroys the efficacy of the blood of Christ, and sends millions to hell every year for not doing what God has put out of their power to do. I am sure this intelligent audience will not receive as true such a system as this; one that is fraught with so much evil to the race and reflects so much dishonor upon the character of the great God. But my worthy friend is not yet satisfied with the second of Acts. He tells us that he has at home eight different translations of the Bible, and they all agree with

his views on the second chapter of Acts. He also has told us that his views are right according to the Greek lexicons. Well, this may be true or it may not; there are but few here who know any thing about Greek, and we seriously doubt our friend's knowledge of it. But be this as it may, we have shown you the plain common sense view of the subject, and we have given you several examples by which you are able to determine for yourselves whether Mr. Franklin or ourself is right upon the subject.

It matters not with us if our friend had sixteen translations, and twenty-four Greek lexicons, backed by all the logic he can raise, even Mr. Hedge's, not excepted, and after all he will never make this audience believe the doctrine of baptism *in order to* the forgiveness of sins. But the gentleman was made to wonder if it could be possible that we would take the position that sins were pardoned before repentance, and even challenged us to admit the position. Well, for the gentleman's special accommodation, and because we verily believe the doctrine, we now affirm that the pardon of the sins of God's people precedes their repentance. Hence the language of Jehovah to the Prophet Isaiah, 40th chapter, "comfort ye, comfort ye my people, SAITH your God, speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, *her iniquity is pardoned,*" &c., in the present tense. But, says the Apostle Peter, when speaking of the sufferings of Jesus, "He himself *bare our sins in his own body on the tree.*" Now what good did his bearing our sins do if he did not bear them away, and surely if he bore them away they are not charged to us, and as such they are forgiven.

But what SAITH the Lord by his servant Daniel? Hear him: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, to finish the transgression, and *to make an end of sin,*" &c. Now if sin was then ended, so far as God's people were concerned, it was no longer charged to them; and, consequently, was pardoned. Well, how were they pardoned? in or by immersion? Not so; but by the blood of Christ! Hence, the language of the Apostle: "*The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin.*" Not one word here about baptism, in order to the forgiveness of sins. Now be it remembered, that we do verily believe in baptism



for the remission of sins; but we deny the doctrine of baptism, *in order to* the forgiveness of sins. There is one thing the people should bear in mind, and that is the proof of the present proposition devolves upon my friend, Mr. Franklin, while all that we have to do, is to deny. Well, our friend has occupied one hour, and has not introduced yet one text that says anything about baptism, *in order to* remission. He has another hour, and you will see, he will continue to fail, for the very best of reasons, because there is not one text in the Bible that speaks of baptism *in order to* the forgiveness of sins. We have proven by the Scriptures of eternal truth, that the pardon of sins is in, by, or through the *blood* of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; and through this medium and this alone, is the pardon of sins made manifest. Well, we have also proven, by the admission of our friend, that sins are pardoned through the blood of Christ; and surely the Bible and Mr. Franklin are not both wrong on this subject. We now remark, *that our sins were pardoned before we believed it, or, we believed a lie when we did believe it;* and, if pardoned before we believed it, *how long before?* Here my friend will fail again, for he will never answer this question. Well, all true saints profess faith in Christ, and to have received an evidence of the pardon of their sins before baptism. Well, all these have been led to believe a lie, or Mr. Franklin is evidently wrong. Well, we cannot possibly admit that so many thousand saints have been deceived upon this subject. We now remark, in conclusion, that the act of pardon is one thing, and the manifestation of pardon is another—and the act of pardon always precedes its manifestation. Hence we maintain, that sins are pardoned by virtue of the blood of Christ, which pardon is manifested, revealed, or made known by the Holy Scripture, the work of regeneration; hence the language of the Apostle: "*Without the shedding of blood there is no remission.*" Now, had the Apostle said, without an immersion in water there is no remission, then my friend would be right; but as it is, he is evidently wrong, for sins are pardoned through the blood of Christ, and not through the water. Therefore, baptism *in order to the remission of sins, is not taught in the Bible.*

Time expired.

## **MR. FRANKLIN'S SECOND SPEECH.**

### **THIRD PROPOSITION.**

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I can have nothing to do with the personal reflections of the gentleman. I am not responsible for what individuals may say of him privately, or in the streets. He may give whatever attention he may think, demanded, to matter of this kind, but I shall spend no time in this way. The people here are acquainted with him and his course, with reference to temperance, and are themselves responsible for all they say with reference to him. I have made no personal attacks upon him. I wish my own position well defined upon intemperance. I am not only opposed to preachers visiting doggeries, but think that both preachers and people, every time they take intoxicating drinks as a beverage, give countenance to one of the greatest evils in the world, and injure the Christian religion. My doctrine is, touch not, taste not, handle not the unclean thing.

The gentleman has thought it incumbent upon himself to define his position on good works. He believes, with his creed, that good works are the fruits of the faith of God's elect, and follow after the new birth. I have no objection to this, when the words "God's elect" have the Bible meaning attached to them. What the Bible calls good works, are no part of regeneration or conversion, but follow after; such, for instance, as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, as mentioned Matt., xxv, 3.8. These are no part of conversion, but the practice of Christians, the lack of which, is the Lord's own reason for rejecting them in the great day. I still insist, that though my worthy friend says he is favorable to good works, he makes them of but little importance, as he denies that they are conditions of acceptance with God.

The gentleman has fallen into much perplexity in regard to persons, who are changed in heart by faith, and changed in character by repentance, and inquires what we will do with them. We do not expect to do anything with them, unless we can induce them, by kind persuasion and argument, to go on, not simply to be baptized, but to do the whole will of God. But, we say without hesitation, that if a man is changed in heart and character, and then should stop and refuse to obey God any further, he would be lost. We go further, and say that if he were changed in heart, in character, and would be baptized, and then stop and refuse to obey God any further, that he would be lost. His baptism could not save him, if he should prove disobedient afterwards.

As it regards special cases, such as may believe in their last sickness, be changed in heart and character, but unable to be baptized, they are exceptions to general rules, laid down for the action of mankind at large where they have the ability to obey the law, and have nothing to do with our proposition. If in these special cases, the law maker should grant a special favor, independent of the law, it would by no means interfere with the general law, nor with our proposition. How Infinite Wisdom may dispose of such cases, he has not informed us, nor am I anxious to know. If we can determine the general law to man, designed to be preached to the world, and declare it, that is all we have to do. We must leave the balance to God. The matter with us is to determine the general rule, not the exceptions, and the manner to carry it out.

My worthy friend is still battling against the idea that a man can determine whether he shall be regenerated or converted, and become a Christian or not. He is still sore of yesterday's work, and would like to improve upon it. If a man is not regenerated, he cannot be saved; and if it is not in his power to be converted, he is not to blame. How can he be justly condemned for that which he cannot avoid; Will Mr. Hume say, the Lord will condemn a man for not being converted, when he *could not be converted*? Will the Lord punish men in hell for not doing what they *could not do*? Will Almighty God punish men because he would not regenerate them? If man cannot determine

whether he will serve God or not, he is not an accountable and responsible being.

I come now to the point more immediately before us. I have rarely seen a man writhe so under argument. The gentleman evidently felt his incompetency for the task this morning. He has tried the strength of his lungs, the power of evasion, false issue, sophistry, persuasions, and threatenings. But all to no avail. His assurance and bravado could not carry him through. His maneuvering was manifest to every discerning mind. Let us, then, look after him a little. He admitted while I was making my opening speech, that salvation was in the *name* of Christ; that it was through the blood of Christ, he also conceded. He also consented that it was in his body. In the place, then, of my holding out the idea that one method of salvation was in the name, another in the blood, and another in the body, I should have these all meet together in one salvation, or in one system. I showed you that the man must come into the name, to the blood, to the spirit, the life, and into the body at the same time. The life, spirit and blood are in the body, and the name is upon the body. These all center at one point. When we find how a man gets into the name, we find how he gets into the body, to the blood, the life and spirit. I showed you that the man changed in heart and in character, is *baptized into the name*—baptized into Christ, or into his body. Has he refuted this? Has he touched it? Certainly he has not.

The name of Christ, his blood, his life, his spirit, his grace, and all spiritual blessings are found in Christ—in his body. Hence, the sinner by faith, repentance, and admission into the body, comes to the full enjoyment of all spiritual blessings in Christ—where all concentrate *in his name*, in one complete salvation from all past sins, by *one system* or *one plan*.

The worthy gentleman says, if he could find an audience in the same condition as those who heard Peter on Pentecost, he would preach the same to them. This is sufficient. We only want him to preach the same to those pierced to the heart, as they were. But he has gone further, and says, "we believe in baptism for the remission

of sins." "Well, here is where I have been mistaken. This is precisely what I expected him to deny. This is precisely the doctrine that I affirm, and the main point is in the precise words of my proposition. I affirm that baptism "is for the remission of sins." He says, he believes in baptism for the remission of sins. "What is he then debating about? He explains that he does not believe in baptism, *in order to remission*. There are no such words as, "in order to" in the proposition. The proposition affirms, that baptism is *for* the remission of sins, and not that baptism is *in order to remission*. The proof is in the precise words of the proposition, and if the language means *because of*, in the proof, it does in the proposition. It is no matter what the language means, as it is the same in both the proof and the proposition.

I have had considerable experience in debating, but I never before had an opponent admit—nay, say he believed the very language I affirmed, and then attempt to creep out by raising a dust about what the language meant! This debate is not about the *meaning* of "baptism for the remission of sins," but whether that doctrine is *true*. I affirmed it, and made one speech to prove it; and in my opponent's first *reply*, he gives up the whole point in controversy, by saying he *believes in baptism for remission of sins*.

Having given up the point in debate, and started up a new point not at all involved in our proposition, if we have any debate, I must show t\*hat he is egregiously in the dark about the meaning of both our propositions, and the proof of it. The word *for* cannot mean "because of," for the command to repent and be baptized, includes two things to be done for one object. The two things to be done are to *repent* and be *baptized*. The object these two things are to be done for, is the *remission of sins*. Here my worthy friend, though he had thrown out so many unkind thrusts, at "learning," "Hedge's Logic," "criticisms," and "new translations," turns critic, scholar, logician, and translator, and falls out with the *precise words* of the common version of the Scriptures, and offers us a new *translation*. "For the remission of sins"—Acts ii: 38 means "*because of* remission of sins!" What an im-

provement this learned translation will be! When Peter's hearers were pierced in their hearts, in agony on account of their sins, he commanded them, according to this "Old Baptist" translation, given by Mr. Hume, to "repent and be baptized, *because* of the remission of sins!"

As we said before, the *repentance* and *baptism* were for the same object. That object was remission of sins. Mr. Hume's *new translation* requires them not only to be baptized but to *repent, because* of remission of sins, or because their sins were pardoned. I had always supposed that it was a reason of rejoicing to have remission of sins, but Mr. Hume, in his manufacturing of Scriptures, makes the Lord require persons to repent, because their sins *are pardoned!* Peter told Simon to "repent of this *thy wickedness,*" but I never knew that he actually commanded men to repent *because their sins were pardoned.* I am now getting into "Old Baptist" doctrine, and home-made Scripture. The lawyers used to accuse one another with "chimney-corner law," but this is certainly *chimney-corner Scripture,* and most ridiculous doctrine! Men of old, when pardoned, rejoiced; but Mr. Hume's Scripture requires them to repent because they *are pardoned!*

But this is not the worst. Precisely the same language occurs in reference to the blood of Christ. His blood was "shed for many for the remission of sins." Is this *because of* remission? If it is, they had remission before the blood of Christ was shed, and his blood was shed because they were pardoned! If their sins were pardoned before Christ's blood was shed, that expression of Paul's, "Without the shedding of blood is no remission," is not true. Or, were they cleansed by the blood of bulls and goats? Certainly not; for Paul says, "the blood of these could not take away sins." Was the blood of Christ, then, shed because sins were pardoned? or in order to pardon?

Did Peter, then, command his audience to repent in *order to,* or, *because of* pardon? Beyond all dispute, in order to. Were they pardoned when Peter said they' had taken, and by wicked hands slain the Lord? or was he laboring to convince them of their sinfulness, and lead

them to pardon? When they said, "Men and brethren, what must we do?" what were they after? Was it not salvation or pardon? Most assuredly it was. And Peter, true to the commission that he was acting under, viz: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," or pardoned, commanded them to "repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." They were seeking salvation from sins, which he had just charged upon them, when they inquired what they should do. In accordance with his great commission, he pointed it out to them. Three thousand of them gladly received his word, and submitted to the commandment of the Lord, and were saved from their sins, and filled with the spirit of God, and the hope of heaven.

But still, there is more behind in this corner criticism of Mr. Hume. It has driven him to take the strange and unwarrantable position, that remission of sins is before repentance! It represents the Lord as pardoning the impenitent! Before repentance, men are impenitent; and if the Lord pardons a man before repentance, he pardons him in impenitence. He has, then, the singularity of a *pardoned impenitent* man! For instance, a man is a drunkard. While he is impenitent, practices drunkenness, the Lord pardons him, and thus commands him to repent, because he is pardoned? This is Old Baptist doctrine, I suppose.

But, the proof is as strange as the doctrine. He quotes the words: "Comfort ye my people, saith your God; speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem; say unto her that her warfare is accomplished, her iniquity is pardoned," and then reminds us that it is in the present tense. But there is nothing about *pardon before repentance* in this. He then quotes the words "leave our sins in his own body on the tree," and "make an end of sin," with the words, "the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son cleanseth us from all sin;" and if I could see any force in his application and argument, he aimed to maintain the position that sins were pardoned when Christ died. If this was the case, he not only has the outrageous inconsistency of pardon before repentance, but he has pardon before faith! They were sinners before they were con-

verted, but still they were pardoned. Now, how a man could be dead in trespasses and *in sins*, and have the forgiveness of sins, is what I am unable to *see*.

If I understand him—and if I do not, I hope he will explain—he makes the blood of Christ, at *the time* of his death, cleanse all the elect from all sins, and brings this as an evidence that pardon is before repentance. If this is his position, his pardon is before faith—before the sins were committed—before the heart was changed—before there was any spiritual influence, or one divine impulse— and before millions of the persons pardoned were born! I do not wonder that his brethren appeared discouraged, when they saw him plunged into such absurdities, by his first attempt at translating Scripture. I should not wonder if he should be warmly opposed to new translations, after his getting his fingers burnt. His misfortune, however, is, that he attempts to alter the translation, where it is already correct, in doing which he has found how dangerous a thing it is for inexperienced persons to handle edged tools. They are sure to cut their fingers.

Our argument stands untouched, and our position not only unmoved, but immovable. I have shown how and where the name of the Savior, his blood, his spirit, and life, meet in his death, his burial, his resurrection, and in his body, where through grace, faith, repentance and baptism, the Lord bestows pardon. His grace brought the whole remedial scheme to man. His blood is the great procuring cause. Faith in his name brings a consciousness of our sins to our hearts, and makes us acquainted with his blessed name, through which we are to obtain pardon— through his blood, "shed for many for the remission of sins." The power of this faith changes the heart. "Repentance *unto life*," not life *before* repentance, prepares us for pardon. Baptism brings us into *his name*. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them *into the name*" &c. Baptism brings the sinner into *his death*. Therefore we are buried with him, by baptism *into death*. Baptism brings us into his body, or into Christ; "for as many as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have put on Christ." In his death we meet with his flowing blood. In his body, we meet his spirit, his



blood, and his life. In baptism we are in his death, in his burial, his resurrection. From this, we rise to walk in a new life. Here, then, it is the believing penitent comes into the name, into the body, into the blood, the spirit, the life of his Lord and Redeemer, when he is "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," which doctrine, my friend, Mr. Hume, says he believes.

I have then, had much better success than I anticipated. I expected to prove my position, but I did not expect Mr. Hume to say he believed it, in his first speech, in doing which, he has given up the whole controversy! But this he has now done, and he cannot get it back. It is like Nebuchadnezzar's dream. "The thing is gone from him."

Time expired.

**MR. HUME'S SECOND SPEECH,  
ON THE THIRD PROPOSITION:**

---

When we closed our remarks in our last speech, we were discussing the subject of the pardon of sins, the medium through which it was accomplished, and the time when the act of pardon took place. We intend to notice our friend's theory upon this subject a little further, and examine it more critically, by which we intend to show you, if you will give us your attention, that his theory contradicts itself; and that he himself does not believe the doctrine of his proposition.

You doubtless remember the admissions that he made in his first speech: that forgiveness of sins was in the name of Christ, and also, that there was no remission of sins, but through the blood of Christ. Now, we hope you will remember those admissions; and then remember, also, that our friend declares that the name and blood of Christ both, are in the kingdom of Christ, and, as such, we must come into the kingdom, in order to reach either the name or the blood of Christ; and that there is no way into the kingdom but through, or by water baptism. Now, if there is no forgiveness of sins, only through the blood of Christ, as admitted by my friend, then it follows that we are not baptized in order to remission, but we are baptized in order to reach the blood of Christ, through which blood alone sins are pardoned. Hence you see, my audience, that the gentleman himself, according to his own showing, does not believe in the doctrine of baptism, in order to remission; but simply believes, we must be baptized into the kingdom, in order to reach the blood of Christ, without which there is no for-

givenness of sins. We hope this point will not be forgotten. After my friend's labored effort in his first speech, to prove that there was no influence of the spirit, outside of the body of Christ, he now, (being hard pressed,) acknowledges, that those persons in the second of Acts, were directed by the Holy Spirit what they should do. We are truly glad that our friend is coming over to the truth. We hope that by the time this discussion closes, he will be thoroughly converted from the error of his ways, and fully embrace the truth; for that, and that only, will do him good.

But, my friend still contends that all men are called upon to repent, turn to God, and be saved. Surely the gentleman has forgotten, that God himself has hid some things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them unto babes. This agrees precisely with the Apostle, where he says, "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called." And he goes on to give the reason, and declares, finally, that no flesh should glory in his presence. God will not give his glory to another, or his praise to graven images. But we are referred to the 5th chapter of Acts, 31st verse, as proof, that God requires repentance before remission of sins.

Well, let us read the text: "Him hath God exalted with his own right hand to be a prince and Savior; to give repentance to Israel, and the forgiveness of sins." Now, what does the gentleman gain by reference to this text? Nothing at all. What does the text prove? Why, it proves that Jesus was exalted by God the Father, to give repentance to Israel, and the forgiveness of sins. Mark the language. The writer does not say, to forgive the sins of Israel. No; but to give the forgiveness of sins—that is, to make known to Israel that their sins were pardoned, as declared in the 40th chapter of Isaiah. We were next referred to the language of Ananias to Saul, where he said, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Here the gentleman seemed to triumph, from the remark, that here was a sawyer, against which we would be careful not to run. Now, we see nothing in this text alarming, or of which we should be afraid. We do not behave that Paul

contradicts Peter; and Peter said, that 'baptism was not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience, &c. Now, we just suppose, that Ananias directed Saul to obey Jesus, in the ordinance of baptism, and thereby make manifest the glorious truth that his sins were pardoned; or, if you please, be baptized for, or because of the forgiveness of your sins. Now, if this is not what is meant by the direction of Ananias, we are at a loss to know what he did mean. One thing we know, that there is nothing said here about baptism in order to the remission of past sins. But, we are now called to the first chapter of Ephesians. Well, we cheerfully go there. The battle is getting pretty warm now. The gentleman has retreated to his last strong hold. He has been driven from the second of Acts, and now wishes to take refuge in the first of Ephesians. But, we will show you, my audience, that he has no resting place in all the volume of God. No; you will very soon see that he has really as little use for this chapter, as for any other; and that he has to butcher common sense and the Bible both, to get anything were to answer his purpose.

We now remark, that much is to be learned of the true sense of any instrument of writing, by a correct knowledge of the speaker, the subject spoken upon, and the characters addressed. Now, should I write an epistle to the Methodist Episcopal church, in the city of Cincinnati, would the Presbyterian or Christian Church there suppose themselves embraced? and, especially, if they were not named in the epistle? Surely they would not. Well, should I write a letter to a friend, in which I would treat of things in which we were alone concerned; would a third person have any right to claim the letter, or an interest in the things contained in the letter? Most assuredly they would not. With these remarks we will proceed to examine the first chapter of Ephesians, the beginning of which reads thus: "Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, and the fruitful in Christ Jesus." Now, we wish you to bear in mind the fact, that this epistle is dedicated exclusively to the saints at Ephesus, and the faith

ful in Christ Jesus. Hence, there are none embraced here but himself and those to whom the letter is dedicated. There is another important fact, which should be remembered, and that is, the church at Ephesus was composed of Gentile believers; from which nation God never chose an Apostle. Why should we be thus particular? We answer, because my friend admits that the apostles were chosen in Christ, before the world began; and contends that the Apostle Paul was here speaking of himself and the rest of the apostles, while we maintain that the letter was not written to the apostles, but to the saints at Ephesus, and the faithful in Christ Jesus.

Well, why do we thus contend? Because, that Paul says so in so many words. Now, if there was no apostle chosen from among the Gentiles, it is evident that this letter was not addressed to apostles, but to Gentile believers at Ephesus, and the faithful in Christ. Well, what does the apostle say about them? Hear him: "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 mark, the Apostle says that himself and the saints at Ephesus, and faithful in Christ, were all blessed with all spiritual blessings, in Christ; and chosen in Christ before the world began, and what for? Let the Apostle answer: "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," &c. Here we have at least two very important facts brought to view. First, the object of Jehovah in choosing his people in Christ, which was, that they should be holy, and without blame before him in love. Secondly, that they were predestinated unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ; and this, too, according to his own will, and not according to our will, or works. And now, in all this, there is not one word said about the Apostles. Hence, we maintain that the choice and predestination of God, as here brought to view, embraces the whole family of Christ, of which family the saints at Ephesus formed a part; and the faithful in Christ Jesus, make up the full

ness of that family. Hence, this letter is of as much utility to the faithful in Christ, of the present age; as it was to the saints at Aphesis, or the faithful in Christ, in that age. Now, the plain 'simple truths presented in the arguments above, cannot be denied by any intelligent individual. Even the learned Mr. Franklin, with all his eloquence, can never set them aside; for, it is evident, that Paul was not addressing the Apostles in this letter, but saints and faithful in Christ Jesus.

But suppose we admit for the sake of argument the theory of Elder Franklin, that there were none chosen in Christ before the world began, but the Apostles (and he himself says they were,) what will be the result, evidently this; the Apostles were saved in one way and other saints in a different way. Were the Apostles so much worse than other men that they could not be saved as other men were, was it necessary that they should be chosen in Christ before the world was, in order that they might be saved certainly, while others were left to their own choice whether they would be saved or not. Such a view of the divine character of God is too contemptible to be indulged in by any man in a Christian land. We then remark that the Apostle was here presenting the glorious system of salvation which was securely treasured in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ before all worlds, by which all the redeemed shall be brought into the enjoyment of that inheritance, which is incorruptible, undefiled and fadeth not away. Now, the gentleman may twist and screw as much as he pleases, but he can never get away from the positions occupied here. But my friend has certainly forgotten the proposition; the moderator, perhaps, had better read it again, or he is clear out of argument to sustain the present proposition and not feeling satisfied with his effort on yesterday, he is trying to make up the deficit to day, for surely he has spent half his time in his last speech in trying to prove the doctrine of conditional salvation, when he should have been engaged in trying to prove the doctrine of baptism in, order to the forgiveness of sins. But we suppose that he has surrendered this point, the gentleman now for the first time tells us that he believes as much in salvation by grace as we do. But we think it a very strange kind of

grace that has to be purchased by repentance and baptism, "any thing performed by the creature we suppose to be 'the works of the creature. Well, if repentance and baptism are conditions upon which is suspended our salvation, and we possess the power to do or leave undone, then we have the power of saving or condemning ourselves at pleasure, so that all my friend's pretension to a belief in the doctrine of salvation by grace is a real humbug, like all others who say they behave in the doctrine of salvation by grace. But, but what, why the sinner must buy it with his works.

Now, the Apostle says, if Abraham was justified by works he had whereof to glory but not before God, so say we of all who expect to get to heaven, by accepting terms and using means, but the gentleman says if a wealthy father should tell his son that if he would go to Evansville to the bank, where he had a large sum deposited, he should have a thousand dollars, would not this be a great favor or would it not be grace? We answer no, for the money is to be obtained upon condition of the son's going to Evansville. Hence he gives his father all the equivalent he demands, and the rendering of an equivalent, however small, destroys the idea of grace. So it is with my friend's grace.

But the roar of our artillery has alarmed the gentleman so very much that he is again clear off the subject, and has ascertained, as he says, that, we behave men go to heaven without repentance. Now surely the gentleman is alarmed or, perhaps, he has been dreaming, for we have never said any thing about people going to heaven without repentance; no verily we sincerely behave in the glorious doctrine of repentance, and that Jesus is exalted a Prince and Savior, to give repentance to Israel (not to Ishmael,) and we behave further that when Jesus gives a poor sinner repentance, all the devils in hell can't stop him from repenting, and we behave still further that until Jesus does give it, all the preachers upon earth can't make one sinner truly repent of his sins. True the preachers may, and they do, pour out the terrors of the law, at such a rate, that they sometimes scare weak minded, people almost into fits and cause them to make a

profession of religion. But what follows, why in a few days they are back where they were, because they have got over their scare, and find out they have no religion, and like the individual not far from here in one single week after profession was found in the grocery playing cards.

We do not behave this to be the repentance of the Bible, very far from it. But my friend wishes to know why we do not preach like Peter did, on the day of Pentecost. We answer simply because we have never had the evidence of a whole congregation being pierced in the heart. Show us one of this character and then will we do as he did, and while here we would just remark that we behave in praying for mourners when we are satisfied that they mourn from a true sense of their condition as sinners.

But we object to making mourners, and then praying for them, for we behave if we could really make them mourn, on account of sin, we could bring them through without the help of Jesus. But we are told that the Reverends Calvin and Wesley agree with Mr. Franklin in his views, as taught in the proposition now before us. Well, perhaps, this is true and we hope they were both good pious men, but their writings is no evidence here. No wonder the friends of the gentleman labored so hard to get Hedge's logic admitted here, when the gentleman himself tries so hard to screw in some other testimony aside from the Bible. They all dread the Bible, and well they may, for their system is not to be found in it. Only by way of cautioning the saints against it, as a doctrine not to be received by the saints of God. We hope the audience will bear in mind what the gentleman has undertaken to prove, that baptism, when administered by the authority of the Lord Jesus is in order to the remission of past sins.

Well we now state positively, without the fear of successful contradiction, that he has not as yet, introduced one single text that says any thing about baptism in order to the forgiveness of sins, and surely, my friends, you will not behave ii simply because Mr. Franklin affirms it. Well this is all the testimony we are likely to get, for



Greek lexicons, John Calvin, John Wesley and all the rest of the writings of men, and as such we shall have no testimony on the subject. Well, this is full as well as we expected.

But our friend has manifested much uneasiness, on account of our want of human benevolence, and appears to be very sorry that we should wish to confine the benefits of salvation to so few, he thinks we ought to desire the salvation of all the human race. Well, we have no doubt but our feelings are as tender toward our fellow men as are Mr. Franklin's and our desire for their salvation equally as great. But our desire for the good of our race does not lead us into such extravagant errors as Elder Franklin is disposed to run into. We wish to teach plain simple truth and leave the event in the hands of him who manages the destiny of nations, we wish also to be reconciled as far as we can to the will of God in this and all other matters. But in the name of all that is sacred we ask what has this to do with the proposition now before us. Suppose we believed that every body would be saved or nobody, would this prove that baptism is the medium through which sins are pardoned. Now every one here knows that all this boasting about his great love to the race does not prove what he has undertaken to prove, but it evidently shows the weakness of his cause and that he has no Bible or arguments to sustain his proposition and he must fill up his time in some way. Now let it be remembered that the gentleman has not introduced one single text yet, that says one word about baptism in order to the remission of past sins.

But the next argument, introduced by my worthy friend, is masterly indeed, and full as much to the point as any he has introduced during his last speech. Well, what is it? It is nothing more or less than another shameful misrepresentation of our views, known to be such, both by the gentleman himself and the audience. He says we behave that there are no Christians or saints among other orders of professed Christians; none but the little few among the regular Baptists. Now the truth is that we do sincerely behave that there are saints of the Most

High God scattered, among different denominations of professed Christians throughout the world, and this is not all. We behave there are thousands of saints that belong to no order but live and die in the world, who have never been baptized, and yet their sins are pardoned alone through the merits and blood of our dear Redeemer. Does Mr. Franklin's benevolence reach thus far? Does he behave all this? He dares not acknowledge it. He knows better, for he has been engaged for the last two hours in trying to make us behave that there was none could possibly be saved without baptism. Truly his benevolence is enviable. Indeed, is it not well, we ourselves, have no use for such benevolence; and we hope we shall ever be saved from it. While we feel to thank the Lord in our very soul that the salvation of God in Christ is not confined to the little wetting in the water, but is as extensive as his unchanging love and flows to poor sinners through the righteous merits and blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

We have now answered all the gentleman's arguments, and we shall now introduce some plain pointed Scripture to show through what medium sins are pardoned. Zechariah, ix. chapter, 11th verse. "As for thee also, by the blood of thy Covenant, I have sent forth thy prisoners, out of the pit wherein is no water." [Here Bro. Coffee informs us that Elder Franklin said we were wrong in our citation.] We certainly are right. Is it possible that the gentleman is so confused that he cannot read his own Bible.

Here you see, my audience, it is by the blood of the Covenant, the prisoners are set free and not by the water of baptism

But again, Hebrews, ix. chapter, 12th and 13th verses. "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own, blood He entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself, without spot, to God, purge

your consciences from dead works to serve the living God. Now we ask you, my dear audience, could language be plainer. We are here told that Jesus by his own blood, obtained eternal redemption for us from dead works o serve the living God. Well, this is all they need; eternal redemption, and fitted for he service of God and all this is done by the blood of Christ. Not one word here about baptism in order to the forgiveness of sins.

Time expired.

**MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD SPEECH.**  
**ON THIRD PROPOSITION.**

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The doctrine of Mr. Hume, that men are pardoned before repentance is the most ridiculous, absurd and preposterous, of any position we have known any man to take in many years. Indeed, his position not only puts pardon before repentance, but before faith, before the sin was committed or the sinner was born. This is as preposterous as the Romish indulgences. Romanists obtain pardon for sins they intend to commit. But it has been left for Mr. Hume to develop a system, setting forth the absurdity, that men are not pardoned through faith, repentance and submission to God, but not only before faith, repentance and submission to the Lord, or before the sin was committed, but before the sinner existed. His system then, has no justification in it; no pardon of sins. Jesus does not give remission now at all. The elect were all pardoned long ago, and the non-elect never can be pardoned. His system has no present justification on in it.

That my argument remains unimpaired, I need not mention to this audience. The matter is self-evident. But still, I must make a few brief references to the gentleman's last speech. He became so confused, in speaking of his words of Annanias to Saul, that he spoke of them as Paul's own words. Annanias said to Saul, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." I maintain, and defy any man to avoid the conclusion, that the sins of Saul were not pardoned when Annanias uttered these words, but he was told what to do that his sins might be washed

away or pardoned. These words do not contradict Peter or any other part of the Bible. Peter commanded his hearers, as we have already seen, to "Repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." The doctrine is precisely the same in both passages. Pardon is not before faith, repentance or baptism in either passage. The gentleman is right then, in saying that there is no contradiction in the language of these passages, but both of them contradict him.

I cannot let the gentleman pass with his play upon the words of Peter in another passage. I allude to the words, "exalted to give repentance and remission of sins." The worthy gentleman says. "The writer does not say, to forgive the sins of Israel." No, but to give the forgiveness of sins—that is, to make known to Israel that their sins were pardoned. It will require a new translation, however much the gentleman may feel averse to one, to maintain this doctrine or this exposition. According to this, Jesus does not pardon man now, but had pardoned them before, and now gives them their previous pardons! In this new theology, he pardoned all the elect before he ascended the throne, but since only gives the pardons previously granted! His argument, if I understand it, is that the three thousand could not have been baptized for remission of sins and Annanias could not have been baptized that his sins should be washed away, because their sins were already pardoned. If they had known this, I presume they would have felt quite comforted. But the three thousand, not knowing that they were pardoned, were inquiring with intense anxiety, what they should do. And the Apostle, not knowing that they were pardoned, in his discourse, charged upon them the crucifixion of the Lord. Had my worthy friend been present he could have mitigated their feelings and the necessity of the Apostle charging their sins upon them, by simply informing them that they were all pardoned!

The worthy gentleman says he is now called to the first chapter of Ephesians. I do not know who called him to this chapter, but since he is called to it, I shall have to follow him through it. He is so full of Calvinism

that he cannot keep out of it, no matter what his subject is. Of all the expositions of Scripture we have met with, his on this chapter is the most dark and benighted. He seems to think that because the Church at Aphasis were the persons written to, they must be the persons intended by the words "us" and "we," from the fourth to the thirteenth verse. But this does not necessarily follow by any means. I shall, therefore, proceed to show that there is not a particle of Calvinism in this passage, and that the gentleman does not know who the elect of this passage were, nor what they were elected for, and consequently that he knows but little about it.

I am acquainted with there theories upon the chapter. The first makes the pronouns "us" and "me," from the 4th to the 13th verses, mean all the saints. The second makes these pronouns mean all men. The third, and the one that I shall vindicate, makes these words mean the Apostles and Prophets of the New Testament. It is then important that we determine who these elect persons, whom the Apostle here calls "us" and "we," mean. It is manifest, that if we knew who the Apostle meant, and could insert their names, it would make good sense and give his meaning. Or if he meant all the saints, it would make sense and give just the idea the Apostle had, to insert the words all the saints, in the place of the words "us" and. "we." Let us try this and see how it will sound.

Verse 5, he says: "Having predestinated all the saints unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." He does not say here, that he has predestinated all the saints unto the adoption of themselves, but of children. They are predestinated, appointed or chosen, for a special purpose; and that is the adoption of children—the conversion of others. At verse 11, he says; "In whom also all the saints have obtained an inheritance." Had all the saints at the time of this writing obtained [ past tense, ] an inheritance? At verse 12, he says: "That all the saints should be to the praise of His glory, who first trusted in Christ." Did all the saints first trust in Christ? If they did, who trusted him last, or afterwards? But, this

is not the worst. At verse 13th, he says: "In whom ye also trusted, after ye learned the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation, in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise." To what does the word "also" refer? Certainly, to those of whom he had been speaking; as if he had said, "in whom ye saints at Aphasis also trusted, as well as those of whom I have been speaking." Now, it is ridiculous to speak of all the saints, having obtained an inheritance in Paul's time, having first trusted in Christ, and the disciples at Aphasis trusting in Christ, as well as all the saints. At this rate, they were no part of all the saints.

The second theory that I have alluded to, that makes the "us" and "we," or the "elect" of this chapter, mean all men, needs but little attention. The simple insertion of the words all men, for the words in question, will show the absurdity of that position. We would then have the absurdity of the Apostle declaring "That all men should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ." If the men first trusted in Christ, who trusted in him last? But, added to this most ridiculous position, we make the Apostle say, verse 13th: "In whom ye also trusted," &c. Also trusted as well as whom? As well as all men! That is, the saints at Aphasis trusted in Christ, as well as all men. At this rate, they were no part of all men.

But, let us try once more for persons, to insert in this passage. "In whom also the apostles and prophets have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will: that the apostles and prophets should be to (he praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ." There is some sense in saying that the apostles and prophets had obtained an inheritance, first trusted in Christ, and the saints at Aphasis also trusting in Christ, as well as the apostles and prophets. At the 9th verse, he says: "Having made known unto us the mystery." Who were the us, to whom he made known the mystery? He tells who this 'us' were, to whom he made known the mystery, chapter v, verse 3, in the following words "Which (mystery) 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." Here we have the persons the Apostle has been speaking of—those chosen or predestinated. What were they chosen or elected for? The Apostle answers, verse 5th that it was "into the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself." But, Ephesians chapter iii, verse 7, he tells that he was made a minister, or chosen, far more fully and clearly, as follows: "Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God, given unto me by the effectual working of His power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace (of apostleship) given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world had been hid in God; who created all things by Jesus Christ."

In this statement of Paul, we have an object in view, worthy of the election or appointment of the apostles and prophets, viz: To make known the great system of benevolence, hid in the bosom of Jehovah, from the beginning of time—the Gospel of the grace of God. To prepare persons for this work, it was necessary that they should be chosen, predestinated, or appointed; that all spiritual blessings in heavenly places, in Christ, should be conferred upon them; that God should abound toward them in all wisdom and prudence;" "make known to them the mystery of his will;" commit to their hands the inheritance, that they might preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. Such is the predestination of this passage, and you can thus see, that the gentleman has gained nothing by going back to Calvinism.

Mr. Hume makes very light of salvation by grace, if a man must repent and be baptized for it. From his remarks, you can perceive that he is as much opposed to repentance for remission of sin, as baptism for remission. He cannot see any grace in the system, if a man must repent and be baptized. Well, sir, grace or no grace, the Lord said, "Except ye repent, you shall all likewise perish;" and this implies, that if they repented, they should



not perish. And he said, "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and in reference to the same birth, only a few verses after, he says, "Marvel that I said, 'You must be born again.'" That which must he, is indispensable. But the gentleman speaks of buying salvation by repenting and being baptized! This is the most ridiculous idea I have ever heard, except from his brother Williams, in a discussion I held with him, in Lebanon, Ohio, some five or six years ago, on the same point; and his brother Johnson, near the same time, in New Castle, Indiana, in a discussion I held with him, I believe they both alleged that if God required any condition, even the turn of the hand or the wink of the eye, salvation cannot be of grace, but is of works. They consider the salvation bought.

Now, this is supremely ridiculous. Nothing is bought unless an equivalent, or at least, something that goes towards an equivalent, and that makes something in return for what is received, is given. All we could give, if we should give, and do all we could during life, would be no part of an equivalent for our salvation. How infinitely degrading a view a man must take of the great salvation, purchased by the precious blood of Jesus, who talks of our insignificant acts of obedience as purchasing salvation? What equivalent does our repentance return to the Almighty, or how, in reason's name, does our baptism in any sense enrich the Lord? In no sense under the broad heavens. How are these acts of obedience, which are designed as tests of our regard for the Divine Authority, in any part of the Bible regarded as good works? They render no equivalent, in no way enrich the Almighty, do nothing, in themselves, towards saving us; but manifest submission on our part, and bring us to the point where the Infinite One can, in accordance with his holy will, save us. And, in the very connection, where the Apostle declares our salvation not to be of works, he does show that it is connected with baptism. He says: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit. iii:5. It was

grace that brought the Lord from heaven. It was grace that gave us the Gospel. Faith itself is of grace, and repentance too. The very privilege of repenting, confessing, and being baptized, in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins, is of grace. The good works which God has ordained, that we should walk in them, are all of grace. Indeed, the whole system is of grace; and the strength of body and mind we employ in submitting to the requirements of the Lord, are all of grace. All, all should now, and shall be ascribed to the grace of God, in the eternal state—the free and unmerited grace of the ever blessed God.

The gentleman admits that he does not preach as Peter did; but says, if he had a whole congregation, pierced in the heart, he would. This is a valuable admission. I knew that he did not preach as Peter did, but did not expect him to confess it. He says, however, that he would, if his whole audience were pierced in the heart. Peter's whole audience were not pierced in the heart, yet, he preached as he did. And he would have given the same instructions he did, if there had been but three in the place, of three thousand, who were pierced in the heart. Why should the number who inquire what they should do to be saved, make any difference, in the instructions given? I maintain, that when three persons are pierced in the heart, and inquire what they shall do to be saved, they should receive precisely the same answer, as if there were three thousand. But, Mr. Hume boldly admits, that he does not preach the same as Peter did, and gives his reason for it. That reason is, that he never has an audience who are all pierced to the heart! Consequently, those who are pierced to the heart, receive different instructions from those given by the apostles.

This, it appears to me, puts him in the most singular attitude of any man I have seen. He has admitted, since we were on this proposition, that he "believes in baptism for the remission of sins," which is admitting that he believes the very doctrine he is now debating against; and now admits that he does not preach the same the apostles did. What does he preach, then? Where did he get his authority to preach anything else?

Mr. Hume not having met, or replied to my arguments

I have occupied my time in exposing his ridiculous positions, without attempting to advance anything more directly to the main question. His quotations at the close of his speech, to show that we are cleansed from sin by the blood of Christ, do nothing for him. I stated among my first remarks, that none could be cleansed from sin, except by the blood of Jesus. And, I have shown, from the infallible Scriptures, how a man comes to the blood, the name, the spirit, the life, and the body of Jesus, where he has the unfailing promise of his Lord and Savior, that he shall be saved. He who comes there, has the throne of Jesus pledged for his pardon.

Time expired.

**MR. HUME'S THIRD SPEECH.**  
**ON THE THIRD PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS; LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

When we closed our last speech we were engaged in giving the testimony of the Apostle, as recorded in the 9th of Hebrews. We now ask your attention to the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd verses, same chapter, only a part of which, however, we shall quote here, but we wish you to read it very particularly when you retire. The Apostle tells us, in this connection, that the first testament was not dedicated without blood; hence the blood of calves and of goats, with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop were used in sprinkling the book, and all the people saying this is the blood of the testament which God has enjoined upon you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry, and almost all things are by the law purged with blood, Now the Apostle has one grand object in view here, and that is to lead the minds of his brethren to contemplate and realize one grand and important truth. And that was, not that they must be baptized in order to the forgiveness of sins—no, but that whenever there was any act performed that contemplated the salvation of sinners, that *blood* was used for the cleansing of such things as were used on the occasion—all pointing away to the great sacrifice that was to be offered up in behalf of rebel sinners, or, in other words, to the shedding of the blood of Jesus Christ, as of a lamb slain from the foundation of the world, evidently setting forth the grand truth that there was no salvation or remission of sins only through the blood and righteousness of Jesus Christ; hence the language of the Apostle in the close of the 22nd verse, which, is, "and without

the shedding of blood there is no remission. Now if my friend will present such a connection as this to prove that baptism is in order to the forgiveness of sins, these we will surrender the point; but this he will never do, because he cannot, for there is no such place in all the book of God.

Here the Apostle tells us, in plain words, that even the first testament was not dedicated without blood, that the tabernacle and all the vessels were sprinkled with blood, that almost all things under the law were purified or purged with blood, and finally tells us that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission." Now, let the gentleman show one text that says without the baptism of water there is no remission, and we surrender. But you know, my audience, he will never do. It is simply because he cannot. Is it not passingly strange that any man will contend for a system that he cannot prove by one text of Scripture, and especially when there are so many pointed Scripture proofs to the contrary? We now invite your attention to the first Epistle of John, i. chapter, 7th verse, where the Apostle says, "the blood of Jesus Christ, His son, cleanseth us from all sin." Now if this be true, if all sins are washed away in the Blood of Jesus Christ, we ask, in the name of all that is sacred, what sins are left to be washed away in baptism? We would be glad if the gentleman would give us some light upon this subject.

Now, he is a great stickler for the word all, and tells us that it never means a part. Here is a text that says sinners are cleansed from all sin, by the Blood of Christ, and yet, in the face of such pointed testimony as this, he tramples under foot his own definition of the term all, and says it only means a part, for there are some sins to be washed away in baptism. We wonder what sins they are and how many. My friend ought to be very particular here, least he should teach us something wrong upon this important subject and an error here might prove fatal to thousands, hence we hope the gentleman will be very definite in his remarks, and point out clearly what sins and how many are left out in the language of John for he says of sin. My

friend says no, all, does not mean all but only a part, for surely there are some sins to be remitted in or through baptism.

Well, Mr. Franklin, you and John for it. John was an inspired Apostle; we have no evidence that you are, and as such we are disposed to behave the inspired Apostle, and we are sure this audience will do the same. We wish it distinctly understood that Mr. Franklin has not yet found a passage that says anything about baptism in order to the forgiveness of sins, and we are sure he will not until he gets a new translation; perhaps he can then be a little more successful in discussing this subject. We hope the audience will not forget that Elder Franklin has all the proving to do to day, while we have only to deny. Well, if we get no proof only what he introduces we will not be burthened with it. But he has much to say about his debates with my brethren Johnson and Williams, and would fain make us behave that he achieved a great victory over each of them.

Now, we have some knowledge of those men and their talents; this kind of boasting over them may have some effect here, where they are not known, but we doubt seriously whether the people who heard their debate would think precisely as my friend does upon that subject. But suppose all that he has said to be true, what has that to do with our discussion. We would inform the gentleman that he is now engaged with Elder Hume, and not" with Elders Williams and Johnson. We should be glad to hear from the gentleman here in Mt. Vernon. Perhaps his masterly eloquence might effect something, for sure his Scripture proofs will not, because he has none; or, if he has, he has them in reserve, and we guess he will keep them there.

But he is off again on the subject of infants. We had supposed he had as much on that subject as he could manage. Now, there is one thing certain: that Elder Franklin's system will not save them; and unless we can find some other way by which they can be saved they must surely be gone, forever gone; but this audience has not forgotten our oft repeated views upon this subject, that we behave they are saved through the blood of

Christ, and not through the water. The gentleman was disposed rather to make sport of our argument with regard to the promise of the Savior, made to the thief on the cross. He said we could not prove that the thief was 'not baptized. This is not our business, but his business to prove that if he was not baptized his sins were not pardoned, and consequently if he realized the truth of the promise made by the Savior, then he was in paradise with all his sins yet unpardoned. Has he attempted to prove this? He has not, neither will he; but do you remember, my audience, how he sneered at the idea of our bringing up the case of the thief, and said he supposed we wanted to be in company with a thief? Now, my dear audience, so far as we are concerned, we would just as soon be in company with a pardoned thief, if my dear Redeemer was there, as to be in the parlor with the modern aristocracy; yes, we would greatly prefer it, for we are not ashamed to be in any company where Jesus is. No, verily, Jesus alone is company sufficient to engage all the powers of the soul, and cause the broken in heart to rejoice. We are sorry our friend is ashamed of the company of Jesus, because he condescended to pardon a poor thief.

But the gentleman is not alone, we fear there are many in tills age of improvement who would be ashamed to follow the example of Jesus; they would much rather be found in the fashionable circles of' life. Here they can enjoy themselves, but to follow Jesus is too humiliating to our poor proud natures. The truth is, the gentleman is completely hedged up with this case; it is too plain; there is no way of getting round it; hence his acknowledgment "that in extreme cases sins might be pardoned without baptism."

Here the gentleman (as on yesterday) gives up his whole system, for he has contended most strenuously that without baptism there was no salvation. Now he admits there may be in extreme cases. We wonder if all that died from Adam to Christ were extreme cases; we mean all the saints, such as Abel, Enoch, Elijah, Abraham and all the prophets of God, together with all the saints who died during a period of four thousand years? Were all

these extreme cases? Surely they were, according to my friend's theory.

Now, let him make the very best he can of it, he is compelled to admit that there was some other way, by which the sins of those ancient saints were forgiven, than by baptism. We wonder what that way was? Will our friend be kind enough to tell us? Now, we remark that God the Lord never had but one way to save sinners, and that way was Jesus Christ; he never had but one medium through which sins were pardoned, and that was through the blood of Christ; hence the ancient saints possessed faith in a Jesus that was to come, and through his blood their sins were pardoned; modern saints have faith in a Jesus that has come, and through his blood their sins are pardoned; so that sins, in all ages, have been forgiven upon the same principles. Jehovah has not been changing his place of operation in the salvation of sinners; it has from the beginning, ever been the same, down to the present time, and will continue the same until Jesus takes his ransomed children home. But, let us now look at our friend's theory for a few moments. He has said most positively, time and again, "that without immersion there is no salvation; that baptism is in order to the forgiveness of sins."

Now, if this is true, then nothing else is, and consequently all, who die unbaptized, die in their sins, and as such they must forever perish. Well, who baptized the multiple millions of saints, who lived and died before the coming of Christ, or the command to baptize in his name? Why nobody. Then they are all lost in a pile. But, says our learned opponent, "the ordinance of baptism was not then introduced." Well, if this be true, then there was no means of pardon yet introduced, consequently all were damned for the want of the means of pardon. But, again my friend says, "the name of Christ and the blood of Christ are in the kingdom, body, or church of Christ, and we cannot reach the name or blood of Christ only by coming into the kingdom of Christ, and we can only get there by being baptized into it." Well, all theologians agree that the visible kingdom of Christ was organized, on the day of Pentecost; hence, prior to



that time there was no kingdom to be baptized into; hence you see, my audience, that my friend's theory damns the whole race of saints who died before there was a kingdom for them to enter, or the means of inducting them into the kingdom was provided. Do you not see, my friends, that the gentleman has got into an awful 'dilemma, out of which he never can get and sustain his present views? We hope, my audience, that you will not forget the views here introduced, that until Christ came there was neither a kingdom nor ordinances, and as such none were saved by being baptized into a kingdom that did not exist; therefore all who died before there was a kingdom, into which they could be baptized, in order to reach the name or blood of Christ, have necessarily perished. Consequently, my friends, you see plainly that the gentleman has been laboring to make us behave what he himself does not behave, or at least to make us behave a contradiction too palpable for any sane man to receive. You, doubtless, remember that we remarked this morning that we objected to baptism in order to the forgiveness of sins; first because it neutralized the blood of Christ. This is manifest from the consideration of this simple fact: that if baptism is the medium, through which sins are forgiven, then, nothing else is; for there surely are not several ways, differing in their character, through which sins are pardoned, and we have proven positively, from the sacred Scriptures, that sins are pardoned through the blood of Christ. This we did by reference to the seventh verse of the first chapter of Ephesians, which reads, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Now, here is plain pointed testimony, that sins are forgiven through the blood of Christ; and my friend, Mr. Franklin, says the same, and as such it must be true. Now, we remark that he has not yet produced one text that speaks of the forgiveness of sins through water baptism, and we are sure he will not, from the simple fact that there is no such text in God's word.

We told you in the second place, that this doctrine of immersion in order to remission of sins contradicts the word of the Lord. This we have proven from the language

of the Apostle, in Hebrew, where he says "without the shedding of blood there is no remission." We also told you that our third objection to tills doctrine was that it resulted in the final damnation of all who are not baptized.. We now ask the audience if the gentleman has not maintained this position throughout his whole argument? and by this course of reasoning he has proven himself to be one of the worst enemies of the human race, and not only so, but this doctrine is very licentious in its character, because it teaches the vilest wretch upon God's earth that after a life spent in crime and debauchery, if they will only confess the Lord Jesus and be immersed in his name, they will be saved. Now, my dear audience, we wish you to look at the injustice of this wretched system of delusion. Here is the poor man prostrate with disease, wholly unable to get from his bed or help himself in any way; he becomes deeply impressed with a sense of his condition as a sinner; he is led to repentance and faith in Jesus Christ; he desires to follow Jesus in baptism, but his condition is such that he cannot possibly be baptized; he must die without it, and consequently he must sink down to misery and pain, because his God had put it entirely out of his power to be baptized, and yet damns him because he is not. But again, look at that sober, honest, industrious, pious man who has devoted his whole lifetime to acts of kindness, charity, and Christian benevolence; who was taught to believe from his infancy up to hoary hairs that sprinkling was the proper mode of baptism. He now becomes sorely afflicted, his disease grows worse and worse, he finally becomes convinced he must die very soon; his mind now undergoes a great change upon the subject of baptism, he is convinced that immersion is the proper mode, but he cannot now possibly receive or submit to it. He dies, and, according to my friend's theory, down to pain and misery he goes, without remedy, because he has not done what he could not do, while the wretch who has spent his whole life in crime and debauchery, but a few days before his death (when he can indulge in crime no longer) forsakes his former course, professes faith in Christ, and is baptized by immersion. He dies, and to heaven he goes, because his God

had given him a chance to be baptized, and he had done so. But once more, think of the multiplied millions of our race, who have never heard the sound of the gospel, have never read in or heard of the Bible, who have never been taught to believe in the doctrines of Christianity; they have never heard of the ordinance of baptism, consequently they must all be damned together, and why? O, because God had withheld all the means of grace from them, so that they could not possibly be benefitted by them in any way, and now because they have not complied with conditions which they never heard of, they must perish without remedy. And last but not least, farewell to all infants, to all insane persons, and to the multiplied millions of those who have lived and died before the ordinance of baptism was instituted, and all the peodobaptist world, who have lived and died in good faith, but have not been baptized by immersion, and consequently they must take up their abode in everlasting burnings, with that class of society which their soul hated in life—thus perishing the whole for not doing what they never knew was their duty to do. Now, my dear audience, is there a soul here who does not abhor such a doctrine as this? Is there one here, whose soul does not sicken at the thought of the shameful and God dishonoring 'picture, just drawn in your hearing? Well, this is the gentleman's boasted philanthropy for our race, O, how the race ought to love the good man! Surely he will share largely in their human sympathies, or perhaps they will reward him well, in donations, for his exalted benevolence toward them; may Almighty God save us and this dear people from such shameful delusion as this. We have often heard of the injustice of Jehovah, in the glorious doctrine of election and predestination; we have also often heard the tongue of slander and misrepresentation let loose against the people who believe in the doctrine of God's divine sovereignty, because they maintain that Jesus will save his people and that the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free; but if we have ever heard any system advocated by any class of men, that exhibited more injustice in God, or was fraught with more awful consequences to our race, than the system advocated

by Mr. Franklin, we cheerfully acknowledge that we know not what, where or when it was; for if there is such a thing to be found anywhere as injustice, it is found in the doctrine taught by my friend. If there is any system on earth that is wholly without the milk of human, kindness, or human benevolence it is the system contended, for by Mr. Franklin. If there ever was a system, advocated by men, that reflected dishonor and disgrace upon the character of Jehovah and upon the Holy Bible and upon the sacred doctrine taught therein, as well as upon the whole system of the Christian religion, it is the doctrine we have been hearing for the last two hours, from the influence of which we hope the good Lord will save this people. But, my time is nearly out, and we must hasten. Remember, dear friends, that the gentleman has agreed to prove from the sacred Scriptures that when baptism was administered by the authority of the Lord Jesus, it was in order to the forgiveness of past sins. Has he done it? Has he shown you one text to the point? You know he has not, consequently he has most signally failed. Yes, my audience, and he will forever fail to establish such a theory as this by the Scriptures of eternal truth. That he feels himself desperately defeated on the present occasion is manifest from the fact of his loud boasting and challenging. We perfectly understand the gentleman, and we know the motive that has led to it; but the people here have both seen and heard wise men before, and they cannot be gulled by such puffing as we heard in the close of the gentleman's last speech. We have heard just such crowing before, by one of our friend's brethren at Newburgh, when all present, except a portion of his own brethren, acknowledged him badly defeated. We know this people will properly appreciate the gentleman's remarks, while it stands confessed now, in the heart of every lady and gentleman here, that our friend, Mr. Franklin, has failed to prove the doctrine of his proposition. We told you that the roar of heaven's artillery would drive him from his stronghold, demolish his cob house and burn up his nest. Well, you see it has all been accomplished, and the gentleman left, without any resting place either in the hearts of this people or in the Bible.

Time expired.

## **MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTH SPEECH.**

### **THIRD PROPOSITION.**

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Hume is sadly behind the times. His arguments might have served to prejudice some minds, in some of the more unenlightened sections of country, about twenty years ago. But, I think, it is too late in the day for such a speech as the one you have just listened to, with this audience, to produce much effect. Especially, am I astonished at the gentleman's statements. I can only account for them upon the ground, that he is so confused that he really thinks he is correct. He has stated over and over again, that I have brought no Scripture to prove my proposition. Has his memory entirely failed him? One would think so from his shyness of the Scripture already introduced. I have called his attention to our Lord's commission to his apostles: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Here our Lord requires two things to be done, and promises that he who shall do them shall be saved. The word saved, in this passage, no doubt, means pardoned. The promise is, that "He who believes and is baptized shall be pardoned." What has Mr. Hume done with this passage? I say nothing only what every man must feel as conscious of, as that he is in this house, when I say he has done absolutely nothing.

I have called his attention to the words of Ananias to Saul: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." This passage has the washing away of sins, or pardon, not before repentance, as Mr. Hume has it, but in baptism, and no man under heaven

can avoid the conclusion. Peter said of Noah and his family, that they were "saved by water," and adds, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." What has Mr. Hume done with this? The response is, nothing. What is the word "saved" here with baptism for, if God does not save or pardon men in baptism? Can he or any man tell? I aver that he cannot. The Lord says: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Alluding to the same thing, a few verses afterwards, he says: "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again," Here the Lord defines being born again to be, being "born of the water and the Spirit;" and, alluding to the same thing, says, that "YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN." That which must be, is indispensable. This is equivalent to what he had said before: "Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Has Mr. Hume examined this, or in any way disposed of it? By no means.

Has the worthy gentleman given the least attention to the passage I quoted, making a distinction between baptism and works of righteousness? He certainly has not. In the same passage, where it is asserted that we are "not saved by works of righteousness which we have done," it is declared that "according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and receiving of the Holy Spirit." It is not the "washing of regeneration," that saves us, but "according to his mercy, God saves us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." It is the height of folly for any man to try to escape the conclusion, that "the washing of regeneration" here, is baptism. It cannot be a figurative expression, representing the work of the spirit, for the work of the spirit is mentioned separately. In connection with this, I must make one more reference to Saul's conversion. When the Lord appeared to him, he asked, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" The Lord did not tell him after the manner of Mr. Hume: "You cannot do anything;" but he said to him, "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee, what thou must do." That which the Lord

says a man must do, is indispensable. What was it, then, that he must do? Ananias, as we have before seen, commanded him to "arise, and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord." This is what he must do.

Mr. Hume admitted while I was making my first speech, that all must be saved through the name of Christ, by his blood, and in his body. Where, then, do they get into the name? The baptismal formula is the only one in the New Testament containing "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Persons are, then, baptized into the only name given under heaven, or among men, whereby we can be saved. But we must come not only to the name, but to the blood; for none are cleansed except by the blood of the Lamb. His blood flowed in his death. How, then, does the penitent believer get into his death, so as to come to his blood? The apostle informs us in the following: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?—Chapter vi: 3. This passage contains two important items. One is, that baptism introduces the penitent believer into Christ, or into his body; and the other is, that it brings him into his death. "When he is in his body, and in his death, he is to his blood, to his spirit, and to his life. Hence, Peter, on that distinguished day of Pentecost, under the guidance of God's own inspiration, said to the believing penitents, who cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

The apostle here commands baptism to be administered for the precise object, affirmed to be its design, in my proposition. I simply affirm its design to be the same the Apostle commanded them to be baptized for, viz: "for the remission of sins." Am I right, when the Apostle commanded persons to "be baptized for the remission of sins," to affirm that it is "for the remission of sins?" If the Apostle was right, I am right, for I have the identical language of the Apostle, upon the precise point in dispute.

There is no necessity of any dispute about the words

"in order to," for we have no such words in the proposition, or the proof. It is "for the remission of sins," in the proposition, and "for the remission of sins" in the proof. If any proposition, then, can be proved, I have proved mine—that baptism, when preceded by scriptural faith and repentance, and administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is for the remission of sins."

I think Mr. Hume should not, henceforth, say anything against works. If he gains anything in this controversy, it will most certainly be by works. He certainly tried what force there is in strong things, in his last speech. If stentorian sound, and oft repeated assertions could prove anything, he certainly is entitled to some credit. Or, if profuse perspiration could establish any doctrine, his must be established. In a word, I never saw a man give stronger evidence, in that which speaks louder than words, than he did, that, if saved at all, it must be by works. He appeared fully to appreciate the command, to "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." But, still, it would not do. He seemed conscious that it would not pass with the audience. At this critical moment when, like a steam boiler, he "was swelled to bursting nigh," he luckily thought of the thief on the cross, and, as if he feared, if it were possible, we would deceive the very elect, he determined to enlighten us. He informed us, that the thief was saved without baptism. How he found out that the thief was not baptized, I cannot tell, nor does it in the least matter in our argument, as I have affirmed nothing about pardon or salvation, except in the present tense—in the Christian Institution. I have not affirmed that baptism always was for the remission of sins, but simply, that it is now, in the Christian dispensation. All that parade about none of the ancients being saved, if my position is true, was nothing but a wild freak of the imagination of the gentleman, in his excitement. I have said nothing about the ancients being lost because they were not baptized; nor did any such nonsense ever enter into my head. In that day, there was no such an ordinance as baptism, and I have affirmed nothing in regard to that time; nor have I affirmed anything in regard to



the number that will be saved in our day. All the gentleman has said about this, he has said on his own responsibility.

I have affirmed nothing but a distinct item, concerning the law of Christ. That item is, that baptism is "for the remission of sins." This I have established, from the most unequivocal language of Scripture; and, the gentleman in his very first speech said, he believed in, baptism for the remission of sins, in doing which, he gave up the controversy—yielded the precise point in debate. He is, then, logically, my prisoner; and I can dispose of him as I choose. In this critical dilemma; he caught the idea of trying the sympathies of the ladies, and reminded them that if this doctrine is true, infants will be lost, if they are not baptized. But, this will not go off with the people here, for they do not believe that infants are sinners, and, therefore, if baptism is for the remission of sins, they do not need it. But, he is the last man who should mention infants, for he believes they are sinners; and that some of them are non-elect, and that such never can be saved—never can be converted, and brought to the kingdom of God—that Christ never died for them; and, that they never can be saved, in time nor eternity. Their mothers may weep over them, and implore God to have mercy upon them; but, he will not hear, and never will have mercy upon them! He is truly benevolent, in trying to induce persons to believe that they can be saved, without obeying the plain simple gospel of Christ; but, he forgets that he believes that the non-elect in our midst, may cry for mercy, repent, plead with God to the day of their death, and that the holy and blessed God will not hear them, nor save them, in time nor eternity. He would have you believe, that it is a most unmerciful thing, for God graciously and freely to offer pardon to every creature who would believe in his Son—the Lord from heaven—repent of his sin, confess the Lord Jesus, and be baptized. But, we must consider it a most benevolent scheme, that passes by a portion of the human race without ever making it possible for them to be saved! According to his system, all that are lost, are eternally lost and punished, because God never loved them—Christ

never, died for them, and because they could not come to God! My system condemns a man who is invited, persuaded, entreated, and expostulated with, to come to God, who can come, but will not. But, Mr. Hume's system condemns men who could not come and be the servants of God

Driven from every other hold, the gentleman calls to mind the pagan, who had never learned the Gospel. But I have affirmed nothing concerning the pagan. I have simply affirmed, concerning the plain teachings of the infallible Scriptures. I am not responsible for his deductions from my premises. He may be horribly blinded and mistaken in his deductions. We can never learn anything of what the law of God teaches, by referring to the nations who never knew the law. The place to find what the law of God teaches is in the Bible. I have gone there and found the very language of the main point in my proposition; and no power, this side of the eternal throne, can set it aside. I can and will, if objections can be found, stand here ten days, and answer all the objections the gentleman and all the opposing preachers in town can produce. I know the strength of their "artillery," as the gentleman calls it; and have encountered it, more or less, for the last eighteen years. It is all so old that it has become threadbare and bald. His objections are perfectly antiquated and obsolete.

The gentleman, in his pious emotions, implores heaven to save him from this doctrine. He allows it is most dangerous. I should like to know how any doctrine could be dangerous, if he is correct in his positions. The non-elect cannot be saved, and the elect cannot be lost! What harm can any erroneous doctrine do? It cannot be the means of any one being lost. Or what good can any good doctrine do, according to his position? It cannot be the means of saving any one. What good can all his preaching and debating do? It can amount to nothing, if he is not horribly mistaken in his main positions. It is worth his while, then, to sound the warning voice against dangerous doctrine! But, the truth is, he is horribly shaken, and fears that his efforts will not answer his purpose. He dreads the intelligence of this community.

Is there anything unreasonable in the Infinite One requiring his intelligent creatures to believe on him? Certainly there is not; hence he

says, "He who cometh to him must believe that he is." Is there anything derogatory to his character, in his requiring his creatures to repent? Surely there is not. Hence, he says "Except ye repent ye shall perish." Nor is there anything unreasonable in his requiring a man to be baptized. Hence, when the Lord speaks of the command he intended to give Saul, he says, he shall be "told what he must do." Nor is there any reason why the Lord should not promise, and fulfill his promise, to pardon a man in baptism, as well as at any other period. And why does it interfere with his benevolence any more to promise pardon in baptism, than in anything else? Can any man show? My worthy friend has thought of the sick man, who cannot be baptized. Indeed, and why did he not think of the dead man, who cannot believe? Why did he not think of the non-elect, who cannot repent?—who cannot believe? Why did he not think of the non-elect who cannot come to God at any period, while on earth, or in the world to come? If a man sins against God as long as he has strength, and even till he is unable to render service to Him, must he still be saved, or the benevolence of God be despised? But, suppose the gracious Lord should, in a special case, where one had repented of his sins, grant him the remission of his sins, without his baptism, where it was impossible, would that nullify a general law? I do not say He will do this, for I know nothing about it; nor does any other man on this earth. The throne of the King eternal, immortal and invisible, is pledged for the salvation of the man who believes and obeys the Gospel. If the word of the everlasting God shall stand, such an one shall be saved. If the oath of the Almighty shall remain immutable, the obedient man shall be saved. Those who die without this promise, will find their prospects enshrouded in darkness and surrounded in doubts.

Will you, my dear hearers, have the immutable promise of the new and everlasting covenant confirmed by the oath of the Almighty? It says: "He who believes, and is baptized, shall be saved, and he who believes not, shall be damned." It will be of more importance to us, to have His promise, "SHALL BE SAVED," than all the feeling, and thinking, and guessing on the Lord's earth.

## **MR. HUME'S FOURTH AND LAST SPEECH ON THE THIRD PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS—LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

We have now arisen for the purpose of closing the discussion on the third proposition, which has involved matters of deep and vital interest, not only to this audience, but also to the world of mankind at large. It is admitted, upon all hands, that the race of men have become involved in sin and condemnation; that such is their condition in consequence of the same, that they are by no means qualified for the enjoyment of a pure, celestial world; that they must be delivered from condemnation, and realize the pardon of their sins, or they can never enjoy that kingdom prepared for the righteous. And now, with regard to the medium by or through which this is accomplished, there appears to be a great diversity of opinion, as has been manifest during the present discussion. It is evident that we are not both right in our views upon this very important subject. It would be wisdom on the part of the audience to examine this subject very carefully, and endeavor to arrive at the truth upon the same; for sure it., is, that without a correct knowledge of the glorious medium through which sins are pardoned, and we enabled to receive our personal or individual interest therein, we can never be happy, either in this life or that which is to come. You have now heard this subject discussed at some length, and the different views entertained by Elder Franklin and yourself. You have had exhibited in your hearing, perhaps the most pertinent arguments and scripture proofs that each party has been able to introduce in support of his favorite theory. We are not now allowed to introduce any new argument; consequently you have now before you all the testimony and arguments upon which you have to make up your decision. It is for you now to settle the matter in your own minds, whether the pardon of sins flows to the rebellious through the merits and blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, or through

water baptism, as has been contended for by Mr. Franklin. We are perfectly willing, on our part, to acknowledge that we have heard nothing from the learned gentleman that has tended in the least to convince us that baptism is in order to the forgiveness of sins. Indeed, we have been somewhat disappointed on the present occasion, for we had supposed that we should hear something, either by way of argument or scripture proof, that would at least have some appearance of the doctrine maintained by the gentleman, but; we have not heard it; and as such, we are compelled to believe that there cannot be either sound arguments or scripture proof introduced to sustain such a theory.

We told you this morning, in our first speech, that the gentleman would not find one text in the Bible to sustain his proposition. You have found this to be true to the very letter. Truly, he has referred us to a few passages of scripture, in which the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins is taught; but in which of those passages do you find that baptism is in order to the remission of past sins? We now say, fearlessly, that such doctrine is not taught in a single text introduced by our friend; and we say further, it is not taught in all the volume of God, and as such, cannot possibly be true, and therefore should not be believed by the people; for we should receive nothing as true on the subject of the Christian religion, but what is clearly taught in God's word; for that is a perfect rule, both for our faith and practice, and the truth is so clearly taught in that good book, that we do not have to prove our position by inference, but by plain, positive declarations, which cannot be misunderstood.

Men are seldom convicted in criminal prosecutions by circumstantial or inferential testimony. Such a course would be highly prejudicial to the best interests of our race. But when the testimony is positive, and the court or jury fails to convict, then there is room to suspect that there is some dishonesty on the part of those who have jurisdiction over the case. Well, this is equally true with regard to the great question before us. We would act wisely in requiring pointed testimony in a matter that involves our eternal destiny. Has our friend produced this positive testimony? *We say he has not.* All his testimony has been inferential, and some of that very far-

fetches; while "we have shown you by plain, pointed scripture testimony, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin. We inquired of the gentleman what sins were left to be pardoned by or through Baptism. But he did not think proper to answer the question—perhaps because he could not answer it without showing that all did not mean all, and that would not correspond with his doctrine upon other points. But every honest mind in this house is compelled to acknowledge, that if the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin, then Mr. Franklin is wrong in his views about baptism in order to the forgiveness of sins. We have shown you that our friend has no proof for his theory in the second of Acts, which was his Stronghold on this proposition; for it is as clear as the sun at noonday, that the word for in that text simply means because of. All the circumstances that surround the case prove this position; for those individuals were pricked in the heart, and so pungent was their conviction, that they were made to cry out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Now, the very fact of their crying out, and making the solemn inquiry, "What shall we do?" is enough to convince us that there was divine life in the soul by which they were led to a discovery of their condition as sinners, and produced this anxious solicitude of heart which is manifested in the inquiry, "What shall we do?"—to which inquiry Peter gave a very correct answer—just such an answer as every gospel minister in his senses would give under the same circumstances; and yet he did not tell them that they must be baptized in order to reach the name or blood of Christ, or their sins could not be pardoned. No; Peter knew better. He understood the plan of salvation more perfectly, and so did those pierced in the heart, which is clearly manifested in what followed. Hence we are told, that they that gladly received his word, were baptized. Now, we told you in a former speech, that this gladness could not have proceeded from any other cause than that of a knowledge of pardoned sins. Every true saint in this audience and in the world, knows well that there is not much gladness or rejoicing while laboring under the bitter pangs of the new birth; and they also know that when the pardon of their sins was revealed or manifested to them, there was great

rejoicing indeed, and such gladness of soul that they had never before witnessed or realized; and, consequently, when those persons were thus made to rejoice, they were baptized, and not before: and so it should be yet. None should be baptized but such as have been made to rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, under a feeling sense of their sins being forgiven, and their pardon sealed in heaven. We have shown you that all the evidence introduced by the gentleman was by inference, and that it was not only unsafe, but even dangerous to predicate our faith upon a subject so vastly important upon such inferential testimony, and the more especially when we have such a host of pointed testimony to the contrary. Now, all must admit that it is much safer to rely upon pointed and positive testimony than upon circumstantial or inferential testimony. Well, we have shown you in so many words, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin. Has my friend shown you the text that said baptism cleanseth us from all sin? He has not. We have shown you that Jesus has, with his own blood, purged our consciences from dead works to secure the living God. Has the gentleman shown you text that said our consciences were purged from dead works by baptism,? You know very well he has not. We have shown you that Jesus, by his own blood, entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. Has the gentleman shown you the text that says Jesus entered into the holy place by baptism, having obtained eternal redemption for us? No; he has not. Well, we have shown you, in plain words, that without the shedding of blood, there is no remission. Has our friend even attempted to show the text that says, without baptism, there is no remission? or has he attempted a reply to this text, or either of the above-named passages? No, my audience; you know full well that he has done neither. Well, ask yourselves the question, Why has he not? Your answer must be surely, because he cannot, and as such ought to be sufficiently honest to acknowledge that he is wrong, and ask forgiveness at the hands of this people. We told the gentleman that he should be saluted with the thunder of our artillery until the close of this discussion, and we intend to make our words good.

We have shown you that the gentleman did not believe the doctrine of his proposition himself; for he has attempted to prove that baptism is in order to the forgiveness of past sins, and then tells us that forgiveness is in the name of Jesus Christ! And then, lo, and behold! he affirms that there is no forgiveness, but through the blood of Christ! Now, did any man ever hear such a bundle of contradictions as is here presented? We told you, that, if remission came through the water, then it came in no other way. But we have proven, both by the Bible and Mr. Franklin, that forgiveness of sins comes through the blood of Christ, and this is just what we believe, and what we are contending for. But this is not the doctrine set forth in the gentleman's proposition; hence you see, my friends, he has surrendered the whole ground.

But you doubtless remember that our friend argued that we must be baptized into the kingdom, church, or body of Christ, for in this body was the blood of Christ, and through this blood we must be pardoned. Well, you no doubt remember, that we showed you, by the language of the Apostle to his brethren in Corinth, how and by what, saints were baptized into the body of Christ. Hence the language of the Apostle—"For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Greeks, bond or free;" evidently showing that none, no matter what their condition in life might be, could come into the body of Christ only such as were baptized into the body by the spirit. We told you that this text, alone, forever set aside and destroyed all the arguments introduced by Mr. Franklin, and we suppose he thought the same, or surely he would have made some reply to this important text, but his silence on the subject has led us to believe that he well knew he could make no satisfactory reply, and as such, he had better pass it by in perfect silence, as he has done many other passages during this discussion. Truly the battle is waxing very warm now; and we guess the gentleman has not only heard the thunder, but felt the effects, in every nerve of his mortal system, of the deadly discharge of our bright shining artillery, that is continually bursting upon him at every point. Well, we can assure the gentleman that the thunder of our gospel cannon, charged with the eternal truth of



God's holy word, will be heard sounding louder and louder, until the final Amen of this discussion.

We now affirm, that there has not been one single passage of Scripture introduced by Mr. Franklin to prove the doctrine of baptism in order to the forgiveness of sins. We have proven positively that sins are pardoned through the blood of Christ, and that without blood, there is no forgiveness. We have proved this point, both by the Bible and Elder Franklin, and as such, it will not surely be gainsayed. But notwithstanding all this, my friend continued to urge to the very last, that without baptism there could be no salvation. We have showed you, however, how very contrary this doctrine is to the written or revealed word of God; and we have also shown you how very repugnant this doctrine was to the feeling of every lady and gentleman in the audience, in whose heart there remains a single drop of the "milk of human kindness." Surely such a system is enough to excite the hatred and indignation of all the race of mankind. Yes, truly, the soul revolts at the very idea of all unbaptized persons having to dwell in everlasting burnings, because they have not been baptized. We showed you in our last speech the awful God-dishonoring, soul-destroying tendency of such an accursed heresy—a doctrine that surely dishonors the God of the Bible, and should be hated of all men. Our very soul within us is made to mourn at the thought, that there are, in this enlightened age, learned and eloquent men, who are not ashamed thus to impeach the character of Almighty God, and insult the good sense of intelligent people. What! that all who die without being immersed, are sent down to the regions of darkness and despair! O! tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Mt. Vernon, that we have a great and wise man here, from the Queen City of the West, who stands up boldly in the presence of this intelligent audience, and affirms that all who die unbaptized, sink down to hell! And they must be baptized by immersion, too! Have all who are not immersed, gone, world without end?

You have not surely forgotten, my audience, the argument we used in a former speech, that the great God in his providence had so arranged his creatures, that far the largest portion of them were so situated, that they had

never heard the sound of the glorious gospel—of the SON of God. They never saw or read the Holy Scriptures, or written word of the Lord; and if they now had the Bible, they could neither read or understand its holy doctrine or commandments. Multiplied thousands of such are dying every year,—and strange to tell, they must all be damned for not doing what they never knew they ought to do—for not submitting to an ordinance which they never heard of in all their lives! It does seem to us that no man in his sober senses can believe or teach a system so derogatory to the character of a holy God, and so prejudicial to the dearest interests of a vast portion of the human race. Now we have heard much said during this discussion about Christian benevolence on the part of Mr. Franklin: but we hope that God will ever save us from such benevolence as this. We have also called your attention to the fact, that if our friend's theory be true, then all who died before the coming of Christ and the organization of his kingdom, are forever gone. We called upon the gentleman to inform us how those ancient servants of the Most High God were saved; but the question was too simple, we suppose, to merit an answer from our learned opponent, or otherwise he was unable to answer it. Perhaps the latter was true; if so, he is excusable; but we still maintain, that if the gentleman's theory be true, all those who died before the ordinance of baptism was instituted, are forever lost! And why? We answer, for the want of some means by which sins could be pardoned; for, if baptism is in order to the remission of sins, then where there is no baptism, there is no remission of sins, and as such, there could be no forgiveness of sins—at least, until the days of John the Baptist; consequently, all who died before his day are now in the regions of keen despair. But this is not all. 'So; the thunder of heaven's artillery is reechoing louder and louder, and its effects felt plainer and plainer, and soon, very soon, will the destruction of such a system of delusion become visible to all present. Just then think of the poor dying man who is led to repentance, and to realize faith in the Son of God. He greatly desires to be baptized in the name of Jesus; but God has so" awfully afflicted him, that

it is utterly impossible for him now to be immersed. And notwithstanding all his sore repentance, his faith in Christ, his desire to be baptized, down to hell he must go, for not doing what his God had put completely out of his power to do! What think you, my friends, of such a system as this? Can you love it much? Surely you cannot.

But let us go a little further, and behold that honest, humble, good man, who has been taught all his life to believe that sprinkling was the proper mode of baptism. He acts from the very best judgment he has, and can believe nothing else. He is now brought down to the bed of death; he still continues steadfast in his former faith. He dies and sinks down to eternal pain, simply because he did not let some other man keep his conscience for him, and do what they were pleased to direct; while the man who has indulged all his lifetime in crime and debauchery, until he can enjoy it no more, comes forward and says, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and I want to be immersed." He is immersed, and in a few days he dies, and is admitted into the presence of the Savior. Here you have the good man in torment, and the wicked man in heaven. Such, my friends, is the system advocated by Mr. Franklin.

And now, in conclusion, to wind the whole matter up, upon his theory, we may say. Farewell to all who died before the coming of Christ! Farewell to all the multiplied millions of heathen, who have not the gospel and its ordinances! Farewell to all the pious pseudo Baptists who have lived and died strong in the faith of their ancestors! Farewell to all infants! Farewell to all idiots! And, in a word, farewell to all, in every age, and in every country, who have not, or may hereafter not be baptized! Dear friends, can you believe it? We know you cannot. O blessed Jesus! is this the doctrine taught in thy holy word? No! verily it is not. But all who have been redeemed and pardoned by thy precious blood, in every land, of every grade, of every age, and of all classes, shall be finally brought in to the enjoyment of that rich inheritance, which is "incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." There "the wicked shall cease from troubling, and the weary will be at rest." May God grant that we may all be among that happy number.

**MR. FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS,  
FOURTH PROPOSITION.**

---

**FOURTH DAY.**

THURSDAY, 9 ½ O'CLOCK.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

The proposition we are to debate to-day is one of transcendent importance. It relates to the possibility of a child of God falling from the favor of God. This question is of immense importance in its moral bearings upon the professors of religion, as we shall see in the progress of, the investigation. No one under the belief that he never can fail of the favor of God, can be expected to have the same regard for his conduct and the same earnest and deep solicitude to do the will of God, as one under the impression, that, by his misconduct he may ruin himself forever. But we hasten to the proposition just read by the President moderator. In this proposition I affirm, that "Any saint in the Church of God can apostatize from the Christian faith and be finally lost."

This proposition is exceedingly plain and simple, and needs not that I should consume much time in defining its terms. It is like our second proposition. The whole argument turns upon the word can. We all agree upon the word "saint." We also understand the meaning of the words "Church of God." The simple question is, can any saint or member of the Church or kingdom of God on earth, apostatize from the Christian faith and be finally lost? I affirm that any saint can apostatize. My worthy friend denies it. As heretofore, the dispute is upon the words can and cannot. I shall, therefore, without further preliminary, proceed to prove my affirmative proposition.

I. My first argument is founded upon 2 Peter, i. 1-11. I shall now give the gentleman a few articles of faith, or if he pleases, conditions, not of admission into the church, but into heaven. Let us hear the Apostle: "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that you shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things, is blind and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore, the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, you shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

In the verses preceding these words, the apostle specifies whom he addresses. They were persons who "had obtained a like precious faith with the apostles," "who had obtained all things that pertained to life and godliness, "who had been made partakers of the divine nature," and "escaped the corruptions of the world through lust." These, beyond all dispute, were saints. The Apostle, then, admonishes them, as such, "giving all diligence," to add the seven conditions just read, viz: virtue, or courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. "What for? Why must a man have courage, knowledge, temperance, etc.? Because, these are conditions upon which we shall enter heaven, if we ever enter at all. Ignorance is not a qualification for heaven, nor for usefulness here, but a man must add knowledge. And that is not all; he must add temperance. He is not to appear temperate, but to be temperate, and maintain the highest degree of temperance.

But if a man shall maintain the whole seven of these Christian graces, what will the result be? The Apostle says, they shall make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. What if a man shall lack these graces? The Apostle says, he shall be blind, and forget that he was purged

from his old sins. He then admonishes the disciples, to "make your calling and election sure," in the place of laboring, like my worthy opponent, to make them believe that it was made sure from eternity; and adds, "for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." What is the meaning of the word "if," in this sentence? "If ye do these things ye shall never fall." Every affirmative implies its negative. When the Apostle says, "if ye do these things, ye shall never fall," he virtually says, if ye do not these things, ye shall fall. I am anxious to get the gentleman to understand the meaning of the word "if." It implies a contingency or condition. If ye continue in these things, ye shall not fall, but if you do not, you shall fall.

If, then, the doer of these things shall not fall, what shall the result be? The Apostle answers: "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." Here we find the Apostle showing the way to heaven. He first shows the Christian how to abound in faithfulness or usefulness in this life, and what position to occupy, that he may never fall, but make his calling and election sure, and concludes the whole by assuring him, that so he shall gain an abundant entrance into heaven itself. This passage, then, shows that the entrance into heaven, is conditional, and that a saint, by failing to comply with the conditions, might fall, and thus fail of salvation, or be finally lost.

Christianity is a complete system, agreeing in all its parts. It is perfectly harmonious throughout. It is not like Mr. Hume, at every point of the compass. He appears to feel himself under no obligations to harmonize the gospel, but brings forward one passage to refute another. I do not believe that the Bible contains contradictory expressions. I believe every passage, in its fullest force, and feel fully satisfied, that any one passage harmonizes with all the balance. But, the worthy gentleman never makes an effort to harmonize the passages I introduce with his position. I must show its harmony, or it must be exposed to this community as a contradictory book.

II. I shall commence my second argument by showing that some that Christ died for, or that were *bought* by

him may be lost. To this point, I quote 2 Peter, ii. 1: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord, who bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." Here is an awful lesson to all who deny the possibility of falling from grace. Here the Apostle is speaking of some whom the Lord bought. Did he buy any but the elect? Not according to Calvinism. Well, here were some that the Lord bought; some that were once in, grace, and the Apostle accuses them of bringing into the church damnable heresies, and denying the Lord that bought them. What shall the result be? The Apostle says, they shall bring upon themselves swift destruction. This destruction is not something that they could not avoid; something that they were bound to run into, and never had the power of escaping; but something that they bring upon themselves. The cause of their destruction is not found in the fact that the Lord did not buy them, or did not die for them; but in the fact that they denied him after he did die for them, and thus brought upon themselves this destruction. No Calvinist ever did or ever can escape from the force of this passage.

Let us hear Paul, Rom. xiv. 16: "But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." Here we find the Apostle charging the disciples not to destroy a brother for whom Christ died. In this passage, the doctrine is clearly taught, that, one for whom Christ died may be destroyed, and that, too, by the misconduct of others. What a great Christian lesson Paul here teaches. Even meat, which he elsewhere admits to be good, and not to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving, is not to be used, if thereby, a brother is made to stumble. Destroy not your brother with your meat, nor with your drink. Paul admits that those for whom Christ died, may be destroyed. Why is Mr. Hume, with his brethren, down upon heretics? According to his doctrine, a heretic can do no harm. He never can destroy the sheep! What a set of watchmen, upon the walls of Zion, he and his brethren are? They admit feat they can bring none into the kingdom, and none in it,

can ever get out of it. The worthy gentleman says it is his mission to "feed the sheep;" but, then, these elect sheep cannot die—cannot starve, or perish, whether he feeds them or not. He stands upon the walls of Zion and watches them, though he knows none of them ever can escape from the fold, and none but sheep can ever get into the fold; and feeds them, knowing that they can live without his feed, as well as with it. No wonder he and his brethren preach for nothing. Their preaching is not worth anything. He does not believe like James, that he can save a soul from death.

Paul says, "But keep under my body and bring it into subjection; lest, that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." 1 Cor. ix. 27. I want Elder Hume to feel like Paul; that he should keep his body in subjection, lest, having preached the gospel to others, he might be a castaway. He should remember the admonition of the same Apostle: "Let him that standeth, take heed, lest he fall." If we could inspire him with the same feeling with the Apostle, his splendid talents would prove of some use to the world, and not be wasted in feeding sheep who could live without his feed as well as with it; and in watching a flock that never can go astray. This thing of a man spending his time in watching a flock, that he cannot, by any possibility, increase in the least, and that cannot decrease if he were on the other side of the Atlantic, must be working merely for the love of work; and not because his work can be of any service to one soul of Adam's race.

But I shall proceed with the argument, by referring to Heb. iv. 4. Paul had just made a reference to the vast number who came out of Egypt, but through an evil heart of unbelief, fell in the wilderness. With these in his mind, he says: "Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." This is an exhortation, I presume, that my worthy opponent, not only never gives to his hearers, but he frequently tries to make them believe that they never can fall. He tries to make them believe, that they never can fail to enter into the rest for the saints. Paul believed no such doctrine, and admonished, his brethren to fear, lest they fail to enter into that rest; but



he never tried to make them believe, as Mr. Hume does, that they never could fail. Let us hear Paul again. He says:

"Follow peace with all men and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord; looking diligently, lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat, sold his birthright. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected; for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." Heb. xii. 14-17.

Here is a special exhortation against apostacy, and my friend must believe that Paul labored to prevent something that never could occur; or, admit that there was danger of their apostacy. None could fail of the grace of God who never were in grace, and none who fail of the grace of God can avoid being finally lost. Here, then, we find Paul anticipating the danger affirmed in my proposition; apostatizing from the Christian faith and being finally lost; hence, he exhorts his brethren to follow peace and holiness, without which no man can see the Lord. He further assures them, that they should look diligently lest any man *fail of the grace of God*. Will he insult the Apostle, and declare that no man can fail of the grace of God—that those once in grace shall always be in grace, and those not once in grace can never fail of that grace which they never had? No man ever did or ever can harmonize this passage with his doctrine. It is, however, in the exact spirit of my proposition. It contemplates the danger of men falling from grace. Mr. Hume's doctrine, as stated by the eccentric Lorenzo Dow, is that,

"You can and you can't,  
You shall and you shan't,  
You will and you won't:  
You'll be damned if you do,  
You'll be damned if you don't."

In this same connection, Paul makes an argument against apostacy, from the case of Esau, who voluntarily sold his birthright, and, though he sought it again with tears, he could find no repentance. It was gone. He

had a birthright, and Calvinists have regarded him as one of the non-elect. The non-elect, if we understand it, never had a birthright, but Esau had one and *lost it*, which it is said the elect never can do. Eternal life is the birthright of Christians, and Paul makes the circumstance of Esau losing his birthright, a warning to Christians to take heed that they lose not their birthright—eternal life.

I shall proceed to John xvii, 12, to find one of the elect that was lost. Certain persons are here said to be given to Christ. These are considered the elect. The Lord in speaking of them says, "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name ; those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the Scriptures might be fulfilled." Here is a clear admission from the Lord's own lips, that one whom the Father gave him, one of the *elect*, *was lost* If one of the elect was lost, more may be in the same way. How, then, was that one lost? Luke, in giving an account of the casting of lots to indicate the one who should fill his place, gives us the prayer that was offered on the occasion, where the manner in which, or the means by which, Judas fell and was lost, is set forth. Here is the prayer:

"Thou, Lord, who knoweth the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas *by transgression fell*, that he might go to his own place." Acts i, 24, 25. This passage explains how one of the elect fell and was lost, *by transgression*. If, then, one of the elect, by transgression *fell* and was *lost*, the balance had better take a word of admonition, lest more should be lost through the same means.

What an unfounded conceit it is, for men to conclude that they are the elect—the especial favorites of heaven, to whom God has manifested himself, and for whom Christ died—while He passed by their neighbors, without making the least provision for them! This special few are so effectually called, so unchangeably chosen, and so thoroughly sanctified, that they never can apostatize nor in any way depart from the Christian faith! They were

irresistibly called, converted by an irresistible power, without any consent or volition of their own, any more than any other machine—forced by an eternal necessity over which they never had the least control! Nay, more, they cannot by any possibility turn away from God! They are bound by an irrevocable necessity to remain in the true faith, to be the servants of God, and be received up into glory. It never was in their power to be lost.

But how different the non-elect! they never had it in their power to be saved. It was never possible for them to serve God! According to the doctrine of the worthy gentleman, they were totally depraved—'o ally corrupt, and never could repent or turn to God! It was never possible for them to cease sinning. They may cry to God for space for repentance; strive with every power of their souls to escape the impending vengeance; they may plead with God with their dying breath, but it is all of no avail! Christ did not die for them; did not shed his blood for them; made no atonement for them. For them there is no escape. They must be punished forever for sins, from which they never could reform. Such is the character of the God he would have you believe in and adore. He condemns men forever for sins which they could not avoid, or, which is the same thing, for not performing an impossibility.

But, I must go back to John xvii, and see if I can determine who those were that were given to Jesus Christ. In this chapter, we learn, that certain persons were given to Christ. The matter with us is, to determine who these persons were. The Universalist says they were the race the whole human family. The Calvinist says, they were all the saints. I say that they are both mistaken, as a brief examination of the passage will show. Let us, then, spend a few minutes in looking over this chapter. This passage is a prayer of our Savior to his Father. He says, verse 6: "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world." From this expression, it is clear that those given to him were not the whole world, for they were given "out of the world." This is a metonymy of speech, in which the word "world," (Greek *kosmos*) indicates the inhabitants or people of the world. The import of the expression is "those which

thou hast given me out from among the inhabitants of the world." Those, then, given him, were not the whole world, but given him out from among the people of the world. This is confirmed by the fourteenth verse, where he says, that "the world hated them, because they were not of the world." It is clear, then, that he did not mean the whole world, but some given of it out the world.

Did he mean all the saints? He certainly did not, for he says, verse twentieth, "Neither pray I for these alone." What class? Those whom the Father gave him. Who else does he pray for besides those? He says, "but for them also who shall believe on me through their word." He prays for those the Father gave him, and not for them alone, but for those who should believe on him through their word. Here we have two classes. 1. Those whom the Father had given him. 2. Those who should believe on him through their word. But these two classes include not the whole human family; for when he mentions those who should believe through the word, he specifies the subject of his prayer, viz: That the believers may be one, that the world may believe that the Father had sent him. He makes three classes. 1. Those whom the Father had given him. 2. Those who should believe through their word. 3. The unbelieving world. The first, class were the apostles. The second class were those who should believe through their word, or all the saints. The third class, the remainder of the human race. The first class were given to the Lord for the apostolic office. These are the elect of this passage. But I must return to my argument.

III. I shall now proceed to show that some of the elect have been lost through unbelief, and that some of those who were not of the elect, have been constituted elect. Let us hear Paul. He says: "Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, the brandies were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high minded, but fear: For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee." Rom. xi, 18-21. The Jews were the natural branches, who had been broken off, through unbelief.

They were the elect; the natural branches, in the original stock, which was Abraham. But they were not all Israel who were of Israel; nor is that the seed which is so counted according to the flesh; nor are all the natural descendants according to the flesh, children. Christ is the seed, and all are counted in him. Some of the natural branches, the proper fleshly descendants of Abraham, are broken off and not counted children—not elect, because of their unbelief. Here, then, we have some who were in Abraham, the original stock or father of the faithful, who were elect, but who were broken off through unbelief and become non-elect.

The Apostle recognizes this fact, and proceeds to recognize another, which is, that when the Jews, the natural branches, had been broken off, the Gentiles, the non-elect, through faith, but contrary to nature, were grafted in and constituted the elect, children of Abraham. But the Apostle, instead of flattering them with the soothing unction, as elder Hume does his adherents, he cautions them to take heed and not be boastful, for if God spared not the natural branches, he may not spare you. If he broke off the natural branches for their unbelief, be careful, lest you, who are grafted in contrary to nature, be not spared.

Let us hear Jude. He says, "These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear; clouds they are with out water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, and plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." Jude, 12. In this passage, we have twice dead and plucked up by the roots. These trees had once been alive and growing. This is figurative language, in which trees stand for people. John the Baptist used a similar figure of speech, when he said, "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire." These trees had been alive once, but, because they did not bring forth fruit, the man of God threatened them with fire, under those figures. 1. Trees without fruit to be burned. 2. To be baptized with fire. 3. Chaff that shall be burned with fire. Jude speaks of trees without

fruit, twice dead, and plucked up by the roots. That these trees had once been alive, the gentleman cannot deny, and that they were dead when Jude spoke of them is equally evident. And from the strong language applied to them, being twice dead, we think it will puzzle him, or any one else, to show that they will ever live again. Who ever knew a tree, twice dead and plucked up by the roots, that ever lived again? I presume no one ever did.

Unless, then, Mr. Hume can show that these had never been living trees, or else, that they were not entirely dead, and that they will live and flourish again, I have found here a clear case of falling from grace. I hope he will not overlook this passage, but come to it and meet it manfully.

I invite the attention of the gentleman to Galatians v. 3, 4. "Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." How some men have worked themselves into the belief that there is no falling from, grace, if they have any regard for the Scriptures, we are unable to see. The Apostle is here speaking to the Judaizer, and admonishes him, that, if he is circumcised, Christ shall profit him nothing, and he shall be a debtor to keep the whole law, and that such a man, having gone back under the law, has fallen from grace. Could a man have fallen from grace who had never been in grace? Surely not. The gentleman cannot show how any man can fall from grace who was never in grace, and he cannot show how a man can fall from grace, and his doctrine, that a man cannot fall from grace, be true. The Apostle is here speaking of persons who had been converted to Christ, but were inclined to go back under the law, and he most solemnly warns them, that, if they do this, Christ shall profit them nothing, and they shall fall from grace. Will the worthy gentleman attend to this? Would the Apostle have said this, if a man could not fall from grace?

We shall proceed, as rapidly as possible, to our main proof in our first speech, that the gentleman may have a

fair and full opportunity to examine them. I invite his attention to Hebrews, vi. 4-8.

"For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away to renew them again to repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. For the earth which drinketh in the rain which cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God; but that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned."

That the Apostle is on the subject of apostasy here is too plain a matter to be denied by any one, it would appear. And that his language shows, beyond a reasonable doubt, that a child of God may apostatize from the Christian faith, is equally clear. In the first place, there can be no doubt that he was speaking of such as had been children of God, or converted, for he speaks of those who had tasted the heavenly gift, had been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, had tasted of the good word of God and the powers of the world to come; none of which expressions could be applied to any except Christians. Not only so, but he speaks of their failing away! Falling away from what? Not from some unconverted condition, as the Rev. James Matthews assumed in the discussion I had with him on the same subject! From what, then, is he speaking of their falling away? Evidently, from the Christian faith. Would the Apostle speak of their failing away, if he knew they could not fall away? Surely not. This would be making him suppose an impossibility, and admonish the disciples against it.

But again: he speaks of renewing them again to repentance. He could not speak of renewing them again to repentance, if they had not once repented. They had, then, been enlightened, partakers of the Holy Ghost, and, consequently, were the children of God, and, as such, he tells them that, if they shall fall away, it shall be impossible to renew them again to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an

open shame. Here, then, we have it most clearly and unequivocally taught, that one who was once enlightened, or once converted, may apostatize from the Christian faith, and that it is impossible to renew such an one again to repentance: and the Apostle states the case, by declaring the end of such to be burned. Here we find. The doctrine of my proposition in turn. I ask the gentleman's special attention to this. I am certain that neither he nor any other man, occupying Ills position, can ever answer this argument.

Let us proceed to Hebrews; x. 22-29. The Apostle says: "Let us draw near with a true heart,, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our clothes washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering: for he is faithful that promised; and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another; and so much the more as you see the day approaching. For if we sin wilfully, after we have come to the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He who despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace."

The Apostle is evidently here arguing the case for me, and defending my position better than I possibly can do it. He has no sympathy with Mr. Hume's position in this language, but exhorts his brethren "to hold fast the profession without wavering." He did not innate them with the conceit that fast they could not depart from the faith, but implied that they could, by exhorting them to hold; the profession. It is evident that these persons were Christians, for they had made profession, and the right kind of a profession at that, or the Apostle would not have enjoined it upon them to hold it fast. Not only so,



but in the same connection, he speaks of their having come to the knowledge of the truth," and in verse 32 he speaks of their having been illuminated, which shows that they were converted persons: he, then, addresses them as such, and informs them that, if they sin wilfully, there remains no more sacrifice for sin but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries. If this does not point out the road in which a child of God can travel and apostatize from the Christian faith, and be finally lost, we know not what language can do it. It shows, in the first place, that he is speaking of persons once converted to God, and in the second place, that they can sin wilfully, and that if they do this, there remains no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment which shall devour them.

The Apostle concludes this terrible chapter, with the following words: "Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." Would the holy Apostle say, "if any man draw back," knowing that no man can drawback? Was he not, on the other hand, admonishing them against something, of which there was great danger? In the place of trying, like my worthy friend, to make them believe that they could not sin and could not turn back, he feared that they might sin and turn back, and admonished them against it. I would that I could persuade my friend to do the same. But I hasten, before my time expires, to introduce another argument.

IV. We call attention to Rev. iii, 5, 21, 22. Let us hear the word of the Lord: "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels." "To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches."

When the Lord says, "He who overcomes the same shall be clothed in white raiment," he implies as strongly as if he had said in so many words, that he who does not overcome shall not be clothed in white raiment. And when he says to him who shall overcome, that he will not blot, out his name out of the book of life, he implies that if he does not

overcome, his name shall be blotted out of the book of life. You all understand the force of such language. You say to a laborer, if you will chop me a cord of wood, I will give you a dollar; he understands, without your going on to state it, that if he does not chop the wood, he does not get the dollar. In the same way, when the Lord says, "he that overcomes, shall be clothed in white," he implies that he who does not overcome, shall not be clothed in white.

None but a saint ever had his name written in the book of life, and this passage, implies that, by failing to overcome, he may have his name blotted out of the book of life. But I hasten to the close of the book of God, to show that the last words the Almighty ever uttered to man most conclusively prove nay proposition. Here they follow:

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things. God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Rev. xxii, 18, 19.

Can a man add to things written in this book? All admit he can. If he does. God says he will add the plagues to him, spoken of in the book. Can a man take away from the things written in this book? All admit that he can. If he does, the Lord says, his part shall he taken away out of the book of life. None but a saint ever had a part in the book of life, and by his sinning, in detracting from that holy book, he may have his part, which of course he must have in it, taken out of the book of life, and out of the holy city. Here is falling from grace. A man who had a part in the book of life and in the holy city, to have it taken away out of the book of life, and out of the holy city

Time expired.

## **MR. HUME'S FIRST SPEECH**

### **ON THE FOURTH PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—

We are now engaged in the discussion of our last proposition; and, although we have already disposed of three propositions, all of which were very important in themselves, yet none of them possessed more intrinsic merit, or was fraught with more vital importance, than the one now before us, which involves a doctrine that is deeply interesting to all the family of God. While a correct understanding of the doctrine involved in the present proposition, is well calculated to comfort, edify, build up, strengthen, and establish, those who have been enabled to hope in the mercy of God if the doctrine of final apostasy be true, we ought to know it. If our happiness in a future world depends upon our course of conduct it in the present world, we should, by all means, know it; and we should also know, what are the character and number of the particular works we have to perform, in order to secure a seat in the heavenly kingdom. For, if this doctrine be true, very much depends upon a correct knowledge of what we have to do. But, be it remembered, that this proposition, like those already disposed of, has' o be sustained from the Scriptures of eternal truth, or it must fall. Mr. Franklin has affirmed, that any saint in the church of Christ, may apostatize, and be finally lost. This he says he can prove from the Bible; and we suppose, he will try to do it; while it falls to our lot to take the negative, or, to deny the doctrine of final apostacy—and, we might here add, that until Mr. Franklin succeeds in finding some test, to prove his theory, we might remain silent. We will, however, venture to

predict, that you will not hear but one text quoted this day that says anything about saints of God being finally lost. We intend to follow our friend closely to the end of the race; and if there is such a text, we hope we shall see it, for we have never yet seen such an one. This point of doctrine, as well as many others, has been the subject of controversy for years. Much has been said and written upon the subject; and yet, the difficulty is not settled.. We have often been astonished, that any point in Christian theology, so clearly taught in the subject of so much controversy. That the doctrine of falling away from a steadfastness in the faith, or backsliding, taught from Christian duty, is taught in the Bible, is denied by none, but verily believed by us. But, that one born of God, made partaker of the divine nature, by which the soul is prepared to love God, and realize a personal interest in the merits of Christ—that such an one can be finally lost, is a doctrine that we do not believe, neither is it taught in the sacred Scriptures; but, plainly and positively contradicted by Christ himself, as well as by the apostles and prophets. We wish it now to be distinctly understood, that such passages as the gentleman may introduce, that have any bearing upon the point at issue, we will reply to; but, such as have not, we shall pass by, for the simple reason, that we wish to have time to show the fallacy of the doctrine,, from the, plain language of the Bible. Our first position upon this subject is, that all saints are born of God consequently, they are the children of God, and, as such, partake of the nature and substance of the parent of whom they are born and therefore, we maintain that such an one cannot possibly so far fall away as to be finally lost. We hope this position will not be forgotten, while we shall proceed to notice the gentleman's quotation from 2 Peter i. chapter, 10 verse: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence, to make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things, ye shall never fail" Now we ask, what is said here about apostatizing and being finally lost? Not one word nor is there one word of it the whole chapter. We have, already told you, that saints do, sometimes fall from their Steadfastness in the faith, which leads them into many

errors in practice; but this is no evidence that they will be finally lost. We now remark, that however much the child may disobey its parents, or violate the laws of the father's house, which he has ordained for the government of his family, yet, all this does not destroy the relationship. It remains to be a child; and, notwithstanding the parent may very much disapprove of the conduct of the child, yet will he not disown him, but will use every means in his power, to reclaim his disobedient child, and bring him into subjection to the laws or rules of his house. Now, these things are self-evident, and known to be true by every parent in this audience; and, we further remark, that if the parent possessed the power to make the child love him, and render perfect obedience to him, he would be sure to do it. Well, does our heavenly Father possess less affection towards His children, than earthly parents do? Surely he does not. Does he lack power to influence His children to love and adore Him? Certainly He does not. Well, if he neither lacks affection or power to influence His children to obey Him, will He not do it, so far as will in the end result in the glory of God, our Father, and the welfare of His children? This position cannot be denied. We remark, is there a parent in all the wide world, that loves his children, and has the power to do them good, that would see them suffer eternally? We say, there is not. Neither will our heavenly Father punish His children eternally; but he will surely chastise them for every transgression and disobedience—for every departure from the path of duty; yet, nevertheless, His loving kindness He will not utterly take from him, nor suffer his faithfulness to fail. Now, be it remembered, that the Apostle has said that no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church. Here the Apostle teaches the doctrine, that God loves the church as the man loves his own flesh; and, as no man can hate his own flesh, neither can our heavenly Father hate His children or church; and as the man will use every possible means in his power, to protect, and render easy and comfortable his own flesh, even so will our heavenly Father protect, happily and finally, glorify His dear children, in that kingdom prepared for

them from the foundation of the world. But, the gentleman thinks we will need help, before we are through with this proposition, and proposes to aid us himself. We thank him kindly for his proposed assistance; but decline the acceptance of it, on the ground that we believe that we shall be able to get along without, and, being sure that the gentleman will have special use for all his mental powers, before he sustains the affirmative of the proposition now before us; and, after he has exhausted the last mite of his athletic mental abilities, he will even, then need a new translation of the Bible, and the logic of Mr. Hedge, in the bargain, in order to sustain himself with honor before the people.

But we are now referred to Romans, 14th chapter, 15th verse, which reads: "But if thy brother be grieved with, thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." Well, friends, is not this a clincher? Does it not prove beyond a doubt, that saints of God are finally lost ? We wonder what will come next. We now say, and so will this audience, that this text does not in any way touch the doctrine of the proposition. We are here simply to understand, that we are not so to act as to throw a stumbling block in our brother's way, by which his happiness and usefulness in the church of God is destroyed. There is nothing said here about saints of God being finally lost. No, nor will he find it in all the book of God.

But my friend is off again into Rush county, Indiana, debating with Bro. Johnson. We advise our friend to stay at Mt. Vernon a few hours longer. He can get more help here to prove his theory, than he can get from Bro. Johnson. We know him too well to believe that he would aid Mr. Franklin to defend a doctrine that is not found in the Bible, and is fraught with such awful consequences to the hopes of the Christian., We hope we shall hereafter hear more about the proposition, and less about his debates elsewhere, for surely they can do him no good on this occasion. But we have another shameful burlesque upon us and our doctrine, instead of Bible truth., Well, what is it? Why, the gentleman says we have nothing to do but to feed a few poor starving sheep. Well, suppose this to be true: does this prove that the

saints of the Most High God will be finally lost? Oh, what masterly logic is displayed here! Perhaps we had better surrender; such heavy discharges as this may bring us to ground. But we will try to stand long enough to inform the gentleman that he is very much mistaken with regard to what we have to do, for we would have him know what a good shepherd will be as intent to keep off the *dogs and wolves*, as to feed the sheep. Both are absolutely necessary for the safety and well being of the flock.

We are next referred to the fifth chapter of James, 19th and 20th verses. Here the Apostle was exhorting his brethren to the discharge of their duty, and telling them what consequences will follow, but not one word about finally lost, in the whole connection. But the gentleman wishes to know if we have not kept ourselves in the grace of God by our good works. We answer, most emphatically, No; that if we were left to be our own keeper, we should have made shipwreck long since; but, blessed be the Lord! His children are *kept by his power*, through faith, unto salvation; and if kept by his power, *we are sure they are safe*.

We are next referred to Hebrews, twelfth chapter, fourteenth verse. Here, also the Apostle is urging upon his brethren the great propriety and absolute necessity of good works, and showing them the blessed consequences that follow, but says nothing about *saints of God apostizing and finally being lost*. We have already said, that we did not verily believe that saints could, and many of them did, fail of the grace or favor of God by a willful neglect of their duty neglect of their duty, and drew down upon them the chastening rod of their Heavenly Father; But this by no means argues that their Heavenly Father will punish them eternally in hell. No; but proves the fact that they shall be severely chastised for their errors and wrongs, which chastisement will lead the child to repentance, and will work the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby. But the gentleman says we remind him of an old proverb, which says, "You can and you can't, you shall and you shan't you will be damned if you do, and you will be damned if you don't." Now, we think this suits the gentleman's theory precisely; for

he says the sinner can if he will, and cannot if he don't will. Now, we teach that if Almighty God does this work, without asking permission either of the devil or sinner, so that the sinner's will is not consulted in the matter. We also teach that saints *cannot fall from grace*, because God is their keeper. My friend says they can; but they can't, if they will do their duty. Hence, you see that the proverb suits him and not us. But the gentleman is back again after Esau. What has this to do with falling from grace? Was he ever a child of God? Was he ever born again? Was he a saint? No, verily. Jehovah himself hated him. If the gentleman intends to argue that such characters as Esau finally perish, we shall have no further debate; for we both believe it. But let him first prove that Esau was a saint. But this he will not try to do. What will he will next introduce to prove that saints are finally lost? In all that he has yet offered as testimony, there has not one word about apostasy, or saints being finally lost? We now tell you, dear friends, that we will never find one word of this doctrine in our Bible. What he could do, if he had his eight translations here, and they were admitted as evidence, we cannot tell; but sure it is, our present or common will never sustain him in the doctrine that he is now contending for.

But our minds are directed in the next place to Acts, first chapter, 24th, 25th verses. You, my audience, can read them at your leisure. The Apostle is here speaking of Judas and his fall, but not one word about his falling from grace. It has yet to be proven, that Judas was ever a saint, and this we will know will not be done even by the learned Mr. Franklin. There is, however, one thing proven in this connection, and that is, that Judas had a place, and to that place he must go.

We are next invited to the 17th chapter of John. We now say, in that whole chapter there is not one word said about apostatizing, or finally be lost; and as such, we shall not take time to refer to it. We should have great use for this chapter in this discussion of a different proposition.

Our attention is next called to Romans xi: 19, 20,21. We will not reply to this connection, for there is not one word said in this whole chapter about falling from grace,



or apostasy. Or being finally lost. If the gentleman will acknowledge that he cannot prove his proposition, and wishes to abandon it and will discuss some other subject, we will attend to his wishes; but we do not intend to reply to so many irrelevant passages for it would consume all our time. We understand our friend; he is awfully afraid that we shall get some time to open our battery upon him before we close. Well he may be afraid, for we intend to do it; and, when it is done, he will be sure to feel it, and ought to acknowledge its power. We wonder why the gentleman has not introduced the language of Job. "The oxen were plowing in the field." The audience, perhaps, remember the quotation. This text would come as near proving the doctrine of falling from grace, as any that he has yet introduced. Well, it is the he can do, and as such he should not be blamed for it.

We now come to Galatians, fifth chapter and fourth verse, which reads, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace." Now such texts as these we are willing to reply to. This has some appearance at first view, of sustaining the gentleman's theory. We will therefore attend to it in the best manner we can. In the first place, then, we say that there had been Judaizing teachers among the the churches of Galatia, who had taught the Christians to believe that they must be justified by the deeds of the law, according to the former custom of the Jews under the legal dispensation, and by this kind of teaching had banished the Galatian brethren, which is evident from the language of the Apostle, recorded in the third chapter, where he says, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, "and again, "Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" And in the third chapter he tells them that he that is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law. He tells them, moreover, that if they are circumcised, Christ shall profit them nothing. He exhorts them to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage; and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage; and then, in the further discussion of this subject, says: Christ is become of no effect unto you, *whosoever of you are justified by the deeds of the law, ye are fallen from*

*grace*. Now, the sum total of the Apostle's argument is this: all those who taught and believed the doctrine of salvation from works, or the deeds of the law, which is precisely the same thing, in this teaching and believing, they set at nought the merits and blood of Christ, and said "Thereby we do not depend upon Jesus Christ for salvation, but upon our own works in observing the commandments in the law, by which we expect to obtain eternal salvation." Hence those who are justified by the deeds of the law are fallen from grace, but no man will, who is justified by the deeds of the law. We answer, None; for Saith an Apostle, by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight. Hence, if no flesh is justified by the deeds of the law, and none fall from grace but such as are justified by the deeds of the law, who then is left to fall from grace? Why, just nobody. Well this is what we believe; and for what we are here contending, we would now ask, What has the gentleman made by reference to the fifth of Galatians? Why, he has made as much by that reference as he has by any other; and that is, nothing—nor will he make anything in favor of his proposition by reference to the whole Bible.

But we are next invited to Hebrews vi, fifth and sixth verses. We shall commence with the fourth verse: "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened and have tasted of the Heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the son of God afresh and put him to an open shame." Well, we are glad the gentleman has given us something to do. We will attend to all such Scriptures as these; but when he gets after oxen plowing in the field, we will not follow him, but, as the boys say, "just let him rip." Well, what do we learn from the fifth of Galatians. The very best mode of expounding the holy word of God is to take it in its connection. We wish you, therefore, to read the twelfth verse of the preceding chapter, and you will there find that the Apostle was laboring to correct an error which those He-

brew brethren had embraced with regard to what Christ had accomplished by his sufferings and death. Hence, he tells them that for the time they ought to be teachers; they had need that one teach them again, which be the first principles of the oracles of God. He also tells them that they had need of milk, and not of strong meat. Now, in the sixth chapter he tells them that, "Leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not *laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith towards God*, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands," &c. Now, here the whole mystery is explained. Those brethren being accustomed to rely upon Jewish ceremonies under the law, still seemed loath to give them up, while the inspired Apostle is engaged in expounding to them the way of the Lord more perfectly, and therefore tells them that all that they attempt to do, in point of their own salvation, is a denial of the efficacy of the blood of Christ: that Christ was the great substance to which all those shadows pointed: that he, the substance, had now come. Hence, every effort made under the law, was crucifying the son of God afresh, and putting him to an open shame. Hence, if it was possible for you to fall away, it would be impossible to renew you again to repentance. And why? Because Christ has already come and suffered, thereby fulfilling all the types and shadows, and finishing the great work of man's salvation; and if you now reject him, you are gone forever, for he will die no more for sinners. Hence the language, "*if these shall fall away.*" The very language itself conveys the idea of the utter impossibility of their falling, while there is not one word here about the saints of God apostatizing and being finally lost; so you see, my friends, there is nothing in the sixth of Hebrews to sustain the doctrine taught by the gentleman.

But again, we are referred to Hebrews x, 22. Here, in this chapter, the Apostle is warning his brethren against the awful consequences of sin, and of the just judgments of Almighty God against those who sin willfully, and of the fearfulness of falling into the hands of the living God, just as every faithful servant of God should do. But, mark it, he does not tell them that their Heavenly Father

will send them to hell, and that they shall finally be lost. Nay, verily, the Apostle never taught such a doctrine as this; he knew better; for he, as well as his brother John, would testify that, *if any man sin, we have an advocate with, the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous*. But this should not, by any means, encourage men to sin, for all saints should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; but, for the encouragement of such as are overcome by sin, it is said they have an advocate with the Father.

But my friend is gone again, and where to we cannot tell; he is now debating again with Elder Matthews. We would be glad if our friend would continue at Mt. Vernon until evening, and remember that he is not now debating with Elder Matthews, and that he can get no help from that quarter. We wish him to attend closely to the proposition now before us, but we rather guess he is about out of ammunition. We know all his strong points (as he supposes) are swept away, and in the whole of them not one word is said about apostatizing, or the saints of God being lost. We wish this fact to be remembered: that in all he has said, he has not attempted to show one text that proves the doctrine of his proposition.

But he is off again upon the second proposition. We suppose he is not satisfied with his effort upon that subject. Well, we do not wonder at it, for he made a very bad show in sustaining his system of works. He now tells us that he believes in salvation by grace as much as we do. Well, suppose he does; will this prove that the saints of God are finally lost? We suppose it will come as near it as anything he has introduced. We would just remark, however, that Elder Franklin's grace is too full of *if s and buts* to suit us, and so full that grace is entirely destroyed.

We have now replied to all the gentleman's arguments that we thought worthy of note. We have also answered all the Scripture that had any bearing upon the subject matter in debate; and we shall devote the remainder of our time to negative arguments and Scriptures, as we may have opportunity. We hope the friends have not forgotten the arguments introduced when we first got up.

We now repeat, that the child of God is born of God, and necessarily partakes of the nature and substance of God his father, and therefore the thing born of God is holy as "the Father of whom it is born. Hence, John says, "He that is born of God cannot sin, because his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God." "We here remark, that those born of God are saints of God, *and they cannot sin*; consequently, they cannot fall from grace. We hope our friend will attend to this point in his next speech.

We affirm, in the next place, that the child of God partakes of the nature and substance of God, and therefore God cannot punish him eternally without punishing his own nature and substance.

We affirm, in the next place, that the disobedience of the child does not destroy the relationship existing between parents and children; and, should the child be guilty of a capital offence against the laws of the State, and suffer the most ignominious death, yet still the relationship remains the same. Now, if our views are correct, what is the consequence, if Mr. Franklin's theory be true. Simply this: here is one of the children of God possessing the nature and substance of its Father, going down to the regions of darkness to suffer the vengeance of eternal fire. Now, what must be the feelings of the Father under such circumstances? Could the Father be happy? Most assuredly he could not. Now hear the Apostle declare, when speaking of the family of God under the figure of a human body, that "*If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it*. Now, if this be true, and surely it is, what follows? Why, if the saints compose the body of Christ, (and this will not be denied) and one of those saints suffer eternally, then all the saints suffer with it: and this is not all, for Jesus is declared to be the head of the body, consequently a member of the body, and he must suffer, too. O, my God! can such a doctrine be true? Is this what is taught in thy blessed word? No, blessed be the name of the Lord! there is not one word of truth in it. Such a system as this dishonors God, slanders the Bible, destroys the peace of Christians *if any believe it*, and insults common *sense*. And this is not still all. It represents

Jehovah as changeable, or he must love his children in torment.

We now intend to prove by the Bible, in positive terms, that this doctrine of falling from grace is basely false. Yes, the gentleman may now prepare himself for such a discharge from our artillery, that will make the deception of his delusive system manifest to all present. Our first proof-text will be found in the Prophecy of Isaiah, xxxv, 10, which reads: "And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Now, if my friend can tell when *everlasting joy* is to be set on end, he can then find a time when the redeemed may be punished, but not till then. Also, chap. xlv, 17th verse: "But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end." The last verse of the same chapter reads, "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." Here, then, is the whole family of God that is to realize safety and happiness, *world without end*. This is just long enough. Read the seventeenth verse of the fifty-fourth chapter, where the prophet says, "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou that condemn." Now, if no weapon is to prosper, and the saints are to condemn every tongue that rises up against them, are they not safe? Yes, beyond the power of the devil himself.

We now refer you to Jeremiah, chap. xxxi, 31—34, inclusive, which we wish you to read at your leisure. The thirty-fourth verse ends thus: "for I will forgive their iniquity, *and I will remember their sin no more*." We now ask this audience, if it can be true that God will eternally punish a people *whose sins He has declared He will remember no more*? Every candid mind in this audience must say. Surely he will not.

But we will now invite your attention to the gospel by John, chap iii, 36th verse, which reads thus: "He that believeth on the son *hath everlasting life*." Now, we see, that the believer in Jesus is in the possession of everlast-

ing life, and we know that everlasting life cannot die; neither can those possessed of it suffer eternal punishment. But we intend to show you, by the Bible, that Elder Franklin has to prove *Jesus himself a liar*, before he can sustain his proposition; and this we know he can never do.

We now refer you to John v, 24th and 25th verses. Hear them: "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, *and shall not come into condemnation*, but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is when the dead shall hear the voice of the son of God, and they that hear shall live." We ask you, my audience, what language could be plainer? What could the Savior have said more to have confirmed the disciples in the great truth, that believers in Jesus were sure of heaven? He does not only say that they have everlasting life, but positively declares *they shall not come into condemnation*, and then gives the reason: *because they have passed from, death unto life..* "But," says Mr. Franklin, "they may come into condemnation, and be finally lost." Now, we ask this audience, could one man contradict another more positively than does my friend contradict the Savior? You know they could not. Well, who do you think knew best? or who shall we believe? We are not ashamed nor afraid to say, that Jesus knew best: that he told the truth; and we are disposed to believe him. Well, the very same idea is confirmed in the twenty-fifth verse. He there says, the dead shall hear his voice, *and that they shall live*. Well, how long shall they live? We answer, as long as Jesus lives, and that is long enough. We have now proven the gentleman's proposition positively false, by the language of the Savior; and, in doing this, we have shown you that Elder Franklin is not ashamed to contradict him who spake as never man spake.

But we are not done yet. Turn to John, vi, 47, where the Savior more abundantly confirms what he said in the fifth chapter. He here says, "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life." Here this important truth is confirmed by a double "verily."

It is true, and it cannot be otherwise. Hence, my friend must show that everlasting life has an end, or he cannot show that any of the saints of God will be finally lost.

But this soul-cheering doctrine is more powerfully confirmed by the blessed Savior, in John, x, 57, 28, 29, where he says, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life; and they *shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them, out of my hand.* My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my father are one." O, my friends! is not this enough? The blessed Jesus here says, most positively, that his children *shall never perish;*"for," says he, "none is able to pluck them out of my hand." Moreover, he says, that his Father is greater than all, and none is able to take them away from the Father, and then concludes by saying, "I and my Father are one." Hence, while Jesus lives, they cannot die. Nay, more: while the Eternal God himself lives, the devil, with all his legions of wicked spirits, never can eternally punish the members of Christ's body, the objects of his unchanging love.

We will now consult the Apostle Peter, and see what he has to say upon this subject. In his first letter, first chapter, 4th and 5th verses, where the Apostle is addressing the strangers who were scattered abroad, after telling them in the third verse what had been accomplished by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, from the dead, which was the begetting them again to a lively hope, he adds to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, &c. Now, here is an incorruptible inheritance for an incorruptible people, which inheritance is reserved in heaven for them, and they are kept by the power of God. Hence, until there can be some power introduced that is greater than the power of God, the saints are safe; and hence my friend's proposition is proven false by the Apostle Peter. But read the twenty-third verse, same chapter, which says, "These people were born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which



liveth and abideth forever." We will here take a position that we dare our friend to deny, and that is, *that which is incorruptible never can be corrupted*; consequently, those born of this incorruptible seed never can become corrupted, and as such they never can suffer in a future world, for our God will only execute his judgments, and manifest his wrath and indignation against sin, and upon such as are not conformed to the image of Jesus, or have not been born again of incorruptible seed.

But my time is nearly out, and let me say before I sit down, that you will see that Elder Franklin will not attempt to reply to one of the many texts which we have now introduced, for the simple reason that he cannot reply to them successfully; and tins should convince all present that his theory is wrong, and that the doctrine of final apostacy is not taught in the sacred Scriptures, but has its origin in a very different source.

Time expired.

## **MR. FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS.**

### **FOURTH PROPOSITION.**

---

MR. PRESIDENT:

I presume that no person in this audience thinks that the speech you have just listened to is anything like a reply to my argument. If Mr, Hume, in a single instance, has fairly stated an argument of mine—formed a fair issue with it, and attempted to meet the argument in a rational manner—I have been unable to see it. He either is wholly incompetent to state an argument in an intelligible form, and attempt, in any rational way, to set it aside, or else he does not desire to do it. I shall not try to determine which. He professed to review my speech, and show that the proofs were not conclusive; but is there a man in the house who can tell how he did this? Several of my most explicit and pointed proofs he never referred to at all; and others he merely mentioned, and said that they did not prove my point, without giving any reason whatever. But I shall not let him escape so easily as this. I shall call attention to some things in his speech, in such a manner as he and others will remember.

Speaking of the doctrine of my proposition, in the first of his speech, he said, "If this doctrine be true, very much depends upon a correct knowledge of what we have to do." This is very true, but it implies that, if this doctrine is not true, or if his doctrine is true, very little depends upon a correct knowledge of

what we have to do. This may account for the gentleman's disrelish for learning, and the many innuendoes he has thrown out in regard to it. But little depends upon a correct knowledge of what we have to do, if his doctrine is true. Wording to his own concession; and, in reality, nothing depends upon a correct knowledge of what we have to do, if he is right. It is an admirable system for ignorance.

Again, he says, "If our happiness in a future world depends upon our course of conduct in the present world, we should by all means know it." This language smacks very much of Universalism. Who supposed that the gentleman would deny that our happiness in the coming world would depend upon our conduct in this life? This, it appears, he now openly denies. From this time forward, it is to be understood, that Mr. Hume does not believe that a man's happiness in the world to come depends upon his conduct in this life. According to this, sinful conduct cannot separate between a man and happiness in the next life. I shall renew my accusation, that he is the apologist for sinners; for he not only says, they cannot help sinning, but denies that their sinful conduct can destroy their happiness in the world to come. Every Universalist in the land will give him the right hand of fellowship, and tell him. You are right, Bro. Hume; our happiness in the world to come does not depend upon our conduct in this life. What, then, did the Lord mean, when he said to those who had not fed and clothed the poor, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal? What is it that makes a righteous man but his conduct? I assert boldly, and defy him or any man to disprove it, that the reason assigned in the Bible for any man's entrance into hell or heaven, is found in his conduct. The love and grace of God are the same to all men before they come to Him but the disobedience of some keeps them away, and the obedience of others brings them to Him; and on account of the unrighteousness of some, he will say, "Depart, ye cursed"; and on account of the righteousness of others, he will say, "Come, you blessed." With Mr. Hume, the characters of men weigh nothing in the estimation of the Almighty. Because he chooses men, they are saved; and because he does not choose other men, they are not saved, he finds the only cause why men are saved or lost, not in their conduct—in anything they have done

or have not; done—but in the design of God. At one blow, he thus annihilates every argument drawn from a glorious heaven or the punishments of hell, bearing upon the conduct of men in this life. This is an alternative that we had no thought of driving him into.

The gentleman informs us that the shepherd has something to do besides "to feed the sheep," viz: to "keep off dogs and wolves." But all this is a mere show of something to do, according to his doctrine; for no "dogs and wolves" can catch or kill the sheep, for they cannot die. He must love work, for he works for nothing and finds himself. His work can neither save the sheep nor destroy the "dogs and wolves." The sheep are all safe, whether he watches them or not, and the "dogs and wolves" are sure of their bait, so that his office, as a shepherd, is a fifth wheel. He even despises the commandment of God, "Keep yourselves in the love of God," Jude xxi, and says, "If we were left to be our own keepers, we should have made shipwreck."

In one part of the speech you have just heard, the gentleman admits that Christians "may fail of the grace of God," "fall into many errors and wrongs," so as to call down the chastening rod upon them; and in another part of it, he tries to prove that they cannot sin. I should like to know how he puts these two doctrines together. If a man so conducts himself as to fail of the grace of God, fall into many errors and wrongs, so as to call down the chastizing hand of the Lord upon him, I should think he committed sin. But still Mr. Hume thinks he has proved that the Christian cannot sin. I am aware that the common version says, that "He that is born of God cannot sin," but I know that the import of the passage is, that he cannot consistently, or in accordance with his profession. Such must be the import of the passage, as it cannot be harmonized with other parts of the Bible, and of the same letter, any other way. Mr. Hume himself has quoted the words, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father," which is a provision for Christiana who might sin. In the same letter, he instructs the brethren how to proceed with a brother who shall "sin not unto death," and states that there "is a sin unto death," which

must have been committed by one who was alive, and which causes death. In the same book the Apostle says, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves." Elder Hume tells us that, he is born of God, and that those born of God cannot sin. He, therefore, claims to have no sin, thereby deceiving himself. Now, the fact that the Lord tells Christians to confess their sins, and that he is faithful to forgive them; that if they say they have no sin they deceive themselves; and the fact that, in the book of God, numerous instances are mentioned where they did sin, all go to show that it is useless for any man to plead that it is impossible for Christians to sin. There is, then, a very easy way to reconcile the passage, "cannot sin because he is born of God," simply by applying the same common sense to it that we do to the same words, "can not," every day, in common conversation. Mr. Hume asks me if I will grant a certain position. I state that I can not. Who understands me to mean that it is impossible? No man of sense: but I cannot consistently, and, therefore, will not. "God cannot lie"; that is, cannot consistently, and, therefore, will not. "Can not" is used for "will not," many times in the Bible, and thousands of times out of it—that is, I will not, because I can not, consistently.

He attempts a forced construction of another passage, that is no better: "They shall never come into condemnation." Now, to isolate this expression, and attempt to make an absolute and unconditional declaration of it, is as complete a perversion of its whole intention as could be conceived. It would be as blind and stupid a perversion as to take the promise to the Israelites to enter Canaan, where it is found without the statement of the condition, and make it absolute and unconditional. I can produce the passage where they are promised to enter Canaan, and no condition is mentioned. I can also find where the destruction of Nineveh is threatened, and no condition mentioned. But still Nineveh was not destroyed, for the good reason, that the threatening was conditional, and the inhabitants complied with the condition—repented. Many of the Israelites, notwithstanding the promise, did not enter Canaan, because they failed to comply with the

condition—to believe in God. Paul says they through unbelief. In the same way, all such passages as, "None can pluck them out of his hand," "He is able to hold them up," and ".They shall never come into condemnation," are suspended upon a contingency. The condition implied all the time in such expressions is, if they continue faithful; follow Ids instructions and adhere to him; or, as John expresses it, "!' if ye continue in the son and in the Father." Every condition in the Bible is an illustration of this point. The Lord keeps us by his power, but it is "through faith"; and he admonishes us to fear lest a promise being left us of entering into his nest, any of us should seem to come short of it. Even Paul, a called Apostle, had to keep his body in subjection, lest he should become a castaway. Judas Iscariot, one of those given to Christ, called to the apostolic office, "by transgression fell," and became a castaway. Mr. Hume need not talk of his going "to his own place," for he was one that was given to Christ—one that Calvinists have always called "elect."

Mr. Hume dreads the case of Esau. He cannot tell us anything about his losing his birthright. I wanted a little light here very much, but he would not afford us any. Esau lost his birthright. I want to know if any but Christians or saints ever had a birthright. He will not tell us. According to his doctrine, none but saints ever had a birthright. Esau had one and lost it. Yet he says he never was a saint. How came he by a birthright then?

I could not get the gentleman to say a word about 2 Peter, ii: 1. I want him, if he pleases, to tell us what he thinks of the "false teachers among you, who privily bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." Those the "Lord bought" are his, are they not? When they "bring in damnable heresies," and "deny the Lord that bought them," they sin. Therefore, those the Lord bought can sin; and when they "bring upon themselves swift destruction" by denying the Lord that bought them, they finally fall away, or apostatize, and are lost. Can the gentleman understand this? Why did he

slide over this passage? They bring this destruction upon themselves, by their conduct, in denying the Lord that bought them. The Lord loved them, died for them, bought them; but they denied him, and brought swift destruction upon themselves, and of course were lost. I shall hold him to this passage, with the language of Paul: "Destroy not with thy meat him for whom Christ died." This shows that those for whom Christ died can be destroyed. He is the fourth Calvinist I have tried in debate on these passages, but find them all fail to make even a show of argument.

What has the gentleman done with the "trees twice dead and plucked up by the roots," mentioned by Jude? These trees had once been living, growing trees, or represent living, growing members in the church. What had become of them? They had died; nay, more, they had become twice dead; yes, worse still, they were plucked up by the roots. These trees represent what had been saints, but have now died, and nothing now remains for them but the blackness of darkness forever. What has he done with those who have their names blotted out of the book of life, and their part taken out of the holy city? None but saints ever had a part in the book of life and in the holy city, and the Lord speaks of certain characters having their names blotted out of the book of life, and their part taken out of the holy city. Will not those whose names are blotted out of the book of life, and whose part is taken away out of the holy city, be finally lost? Is not this passage, then, unanswerable proof that a saint can apostatize from the Christian faith and be finally lost? What offset has Mr. Hume made to all this? I say, that he has made none that deserves the name.

What argument has he offered on 2 Peter i. 1-11? Did 1 not show that eternal salvation is there suspended, upon continuing and abounding in the seven Christian graces there mentioned—virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity? Has he offset my position? He has not, and no man can. Having enumerated these seven items, the Apostle proceeds to reason from them. He says, "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence, to make your calling

and election sure." He did not tell them, like Mr. Hume, that their calling and election were already sure, but commanded them to make them sure. But hear the Apostle again: "For if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." Only think what hangs upon doing these things. "If ye do these things, ye shall never fall." But what is the opposite? If ye do not these things, ye shall fall. But the Apostle proceeds: "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom." That is, by doing these things, an entrance shall be ministered unto you, but if ye do not these things the entrance shall not be ministered unto you. The result will be, that he who fails to do these things, will not make his calling and election sure; will fall; fail of an entrance in the everlasting kingdom, and be finally lost. Mr. Hume made no offset to all this, and no man ever can.

But what did he do with Heb. vi. 3-8? Here the Apostle speaks of those who "shall fall away," and says, "It is impossible to renew them again to repentance." It is out of his power, or that of any man occupying his position, to escape from the argument drawn from this passage. The Apostle is speaking of saints—"those who were once enlightened, have tasted of the heavenly gift, were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted of the powers of the world to come." These were saints, beyond dispute. Well, what does he say about them? He says, in the strongest and most unequivocal terms, that if they shall fall away, it is impossible to renew them again to repentance. If this does not teach that saints can fall away, and that so far that it is impossible to renew them again, I cannot understand the force of language. And certainly, those so fallen as for it to be impossible to renew them again unto repentance, must be finally lost. No man can avoid the conclusion. But we connected this with Heb. x. 22-29. At verse 23, he exhorts the disciples to hold fast the profession of their faith, which shows that they had the true profession, and consequently were saints, and that they could lose their profession. And then, at verse 26, he says, "If we sin willfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." Now recollect, he is speaking



of those who have the true profession—who have received the knowledge of the truth, and are consequently saints —and he not only speaks of their sinning, but sinning willfully; and he not only declares, in the most unequivocal language, that there is no more sacrifice for the sins of such, but that nothing remains for them "but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." If such have not apostatized from the Christian faith and will not be finally lost, we cannot understand anything of the meaning of language. That we have no response to all this, that at all meets the case, every man here knows.

What has the gentleman done with the "natural branches that were broken off?" Rom. xi. 19-21? The branches here spoken of were people, and in grace, but broken off, through unbelief, from the grace of God. Some that were once elect, were broken off and separated from the original stalk, and no longer partook of its substance. They had fallen from grace. Others, that were not elect, were grafted in, contrary to nature, and made elect. Here the Apostle admonishes them to take heed, for, if he spared not the natural branches, he may not spare you. Let me admonish Mr. Hume, in the language of Paul, "Be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee." From all that Mr. Hume said, I am satisfied that he has not thought upon this passage, and is wholly unable to meet the argument.

What an effort he made on those of whom Paul affirmed, "Christ is become of no effect unto you; whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace"! Gal. v. 4. There are persons to whom Christ had been effectual, but to whom, on account of their apostasy in going back under the law, he had become of no effect, and who had fallen from grace. If a person to whom Christ had become of no effect, and who had fallen from grace, is not finally lost, he must be saved without Christ and without the grace of God.

Time expired.

## **MR. HUME'S SECOND SPEECH.**

### **ON THE FOURTH PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS—LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

In the opening of the gentleman's last speech, he gave us another lengthy dissertation upon the subject of good works; and, as such a course is so well calculated to prove the doctrine of final apostasy, we will have to indulge him in it, while we believe this audience understands the proposition now before us, too well, to be misled in this way. It is passingly strange, that any man will undertake to prove, that the saints of the most high God can be finally lost; and, become so deranged, that he forgets the proposition entirely, and give his auditors a sermon on the subject of good works. But, such is the dilemma into which Mr. Franklin has fallen. We have several times during this discussion, given our views upon the cause, nature, and design of good works, and, we believe that we have been understood by the audience; and, we now repeat, that we are a strong advocate for the doctrine of good works, as taught in the Bible; but the heterogeneous mass of bombast and trash introduced by the gentleman, in his last speech, as good works, we wholly reject as being without authority in the written word of the Lord; and, we now challenge the gentleman, with all those who are identified with him, to produce one text in all the Bible, to sustain his course upon the subject. The organization of Missionary Boards, Bible Societies, Sunday School Unions, Temperance Societies, and Tract Societies, are all unknown in the Scriptures of eternal truth; they are all the works of men, and, as such, we reject the whole of them, as being connected with the subject of

good works, as taught in the Bible. Those different organizations may have been designed for good in their origin; but surely they have been made, in many instances, the engines of cruel oppression, even upon the widow and orphan, and are also the means of sustaining a set of lazy, idle demagogues, who are wholly unworthy of public confidence, and should be treated with perfect contempt wherever they are found. These things we object to, because they are not to be found in the Bible; and, further, because their ungodly abettors are ever seeking after legislative enactment, to aid them in their wicked crusade against all those who dare raise their voice against them; who are determined to be free, and will not suffer those greedy dogs to keep their conscience for them. Perhaps the learned gentleman, will be willing to drop this subject now, and let us alone. If he should not, he shall hear from us again, in such a manner as we shall deem consistent with truth. We hope the audience have not forgotten the proposition.

The gentleman has undertaken to prove, that any saint in the Church of God can apostatize and be finally lost. In all that he has said, he has not yet introduced one text, that says anything about apostasy, or being finally lost; and, we are sure he will not. We told you in the close of our last speech, that he would not attempt to reply to the plain, pointed Scripture proofs, introduced by us, to prove the negative of his proposition. Well, we prophesied correctly. This should be conclusive evidence, that he cannot answer them to the satisfaction of the audience; and, as such, he passed them in silence. And notwithstanding all this, the gentleman had the assurance to tell the audience that we were entirely defeated. Now, had he said that we were deceived with regard to his ability to discuss the doctrine of the proposition, he would have told the truth, as it is. But, as to our being defeated, we will submit that to the decision of the audience, and not to Mr. Franklin; for, had his word been taken as evidence during this discussion, he would have proven us down here in the swamps of Indiana, a motley set of beings, sure enough. But we are governed by the Bible in this debate, and not by the diction of Elder Franklin.

But he, in the next place, (in order to arouse the sympathies of the people in his favor), tells you that he cannot talk like us. Well, what suppose ye, my audience, can be the reason that our learned and talented friend cannot talk as we can? Is it because his acquired abilities are inferior to ours? Is it because his age and experience are inferior to ours? If we have understood him correctly, it is neither. Well, what, then, can be the reason? It is simply because we are working in the light, and speaking the truth made manifest by the light; consequently it is easy to speak, for God aids men in proclaiming the truth; while my friend is all the while working in darkness, which darkness blinds his mind, and conceals the truth; hence it is difficult for him to get along. And no wonder; for should we attempt to advocate such a system of error and delusion, we could not talk at all.

But my friend wished to know if we would stick to our text. We answer, Yes, sir, we will; and stick closely to it too; for our text-books the Bible, and this is the only book that he seems afraid of; and well he may be afraid of it, for this old Jerusalem blade has two sharp edges, and cuts both ways, and slays Armenianism wherever it is found, and with it we expect to slay Goliath, and lay him dead at our feet.

But he is back to the fifth of Galatians. "We have already replied to this connection at some length, and we did not intend to notice it again, for we are not willing to waste ammunition at game already taken.

He in the next place has prophesied our entire defeat upon this proposition. Well, is not this strong proof that the saints of God will finally be lost? Whether it is or not, we leave the audience to judge; while we would remark that we believe our friend is a false prophet, at least in this particular.

But we are again referred to the great danger of saints falling grace. Now, we have already given our views about, saints backsliding, or falling from their steadfastness in the faith, which produces great departures in practice,, and very justly brings upon them the chastenings of the Lord; but all this does not prove apostacy, or that saints will be finally lost. Nay, verily; parents do not disown

their children because they disobey them, but apply the means of correction, and thereby bring the child to a sense of its duty and obligation to its parents. So with our Heavenly Father. But he hates putting away. The gentleman thinks we are a very strange kind of shepherd to bring our little flock into the midst of a gang of prowling wolves. Now, we were not aware that we had done so, until Elder Franklin was pleased to inform us; for sure it is, we made no such allusion. We really think the audience is under great obligations to the gentleman for the very flattering compliment he has paid them. Our remarks upon this subject were simply these: that it was as much the duty of a shepherd to keep off the dogs and wolves as it was to feed the sheep, for both were necessary to the safety and well-being of the flock, and every one here knows this to be true. But my friend is lost again, and tells the audience that we have made sport of and sneered at the doctrine of good works. Now we leave the audience to determine whether this charge is true or false, while we shall proceed with the argument.

The gentleman next tells us that faith is the act of the creature—that all men can believe, and it is their duty to do so. Well, if all this was true, would it prove that the saints of God are finally lost? You know it would not. But the Apostle says that faith is the fruit of the spirit, and that saints believe because of the working of the mighty power of God, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. The same doctrine is strongly confirmed in Ephesians, second chapter, 8th and 9th verses: "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." Now, you see, my audience, that the Apostle and Elder Franklin are at variance upon this subject, and we choose to believe the Apostle.

But here my friend again says he believes in the doctrine of salvation by grace as much as we do. Well, if he does, why does he not preach it? Truly he has a very strange method of preaching salvation by grace; for he has been crying "Works! works! works!" from the beginning of this discussion until now, and after all

says he has only been jesting, for he believes in salvation by grace as much as we do. We will tell you, friends, that Mr. Franklin's grace has so many "ifs" and "buts" in it, that they knock all the grace out of it, and he is still found to be hard at work, and work he will, until grace teaches him better.

He wishes very much to know whether Christians do not sometimes commit sin? We answer, that in every Christian there are two natures—the one spiritual, the other natural; the one heavenly, the other earthly;—the one loves and adores God, the other loves and practices sin. This unconverted nature does sin, for sin is its element, and this made the Apostle say, "O, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me," &c. Every child of God upon earth realizes this warfare in a greater or less degree, and they, and they only, understand it, while hypocrites and false prophets know nothing about it.

But the gentleman told us in his last speech, that he knew nothing about a religion that caused so much moaning and distress, and especially such as was found in the thicket. Well, we will not insult the gentleman by disputing his word upon this subject, for we verily believe he has told the truth. But when he says no other person knows anything about any such religion, we must, in all good conscience, contradict him, for we believe there are multiplied thousands who know better. Surely he is to be pitied. But he also told us that he knew nothing about this doctrine of contention in the bosom of Christians. The whole man must be dedicated to God, or he was no Christian. Well, we have no doubt he tells the truth when he says he knows nothing about the warfare; but when he says that others do not, we are again bound to contradict him; and we even go further, and remark that there is not a child of God in all the wide world but what realizes the truth of the language of the Apostle, when he says, "When I would do good, evil is present with me."

But the gentleman has found out, as he says, that we are the advocate of the accursed practice of adultery and fornication, which thing he hates, and God himself hates it. That God himself hates it, we verily believe to be

true. We wish we were as well assured that Mr. Franklin hates it. There is one thing, however, that we do know, and that is, that the conduct of Mr. Franklin and this people will not argue more strongly that they hate such base prostitution, than our conduct and that of our people goes to prove that we hate it. And we now say, without wishing to give offense to any, that our people can boast of as much virtue in this particular as any other denomination in all the world; and if it were necessary, we could prove, by persons now in this audience, that this is true, so far as the denominations round about here are concerned at least. And we now say, further, that there is no people under the whole heaven who can boast more female virtue than the Regular Baptists, and we challenge comparison with all the world.

Now, in conclusion upon this subject, we say that the charge is basely and slanderously false, and could not possibly have originated in purity of motive.

We were next directed to the language of the Savior— "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." Here the gentleman said it was as plain as the sun at noon-day, that if they did not continue in his words, that they should be finally lost. We wish the audience to remember, that this is Mr. Franklin's Scripture, and not found in the Bible. Remember that our Heavenly Father says, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." But my friend would fain make you believe that your Father has not told the truth, for he will forsake you if you do not hold out faithful. We are told in Second Peter, first chapter, 4th verse, that saints are made partakers of the divine nature. Now, there is no divine nature but God alone; hence they are partakers, as we have already shown you, of the nature and substance of God consequently they cannot fall from their own nature and substance, or from the divine nature of which they are made partakers, and hence the doctrine of falling from grace is not true. But we are referred to Galatians, fifth chapter, 19th and 20th verses, in which there is not one word said about grace in any way, much less about saints being finally lost. But my friend has surely forgotten the proposition, for in his whole last speech he has never

come into the neighborhood of it. Behold him, if you please, yonder in the 18th of Ezekiel, as though he could find a resting place there. We now remark, and we challenge contradiction from any man, Mr. Franklin not excepted, that in this whole chapter there is not a single promise of heaven, or a threat of hell; hence you see that this, like all the rest he has introduced, has nothing to do with the subject before us.

My friend is determined to be of the works of the law in despite of all we can say. But the people of God are not under the law, but under grace; hence the language of the Apostle—" Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;" hence we and Mr. Franklin are not of the same family, and of course look to different sources for our inheritance.

We were next referred to the case of the rich man and, Lazarus. Now, we ask, in the name of all that is sacred, what has this to do with the proposition? Is anything here that proves that the saints of God may be finally lost? No, not one word; and as such, we shall make no reply.

We have now answered all the gentleman's arguments, and shall proceed to open our battery again, after reminding you that our friend has failed to introduce one text that speaks of final apostacy, or the saints of God being finally lost; neither has he made any reply to the numerous passages introduced by us. He has but two more half-hour speeches, and you will see that he will continue to fail to reply to those positive proofs introduced by us.

We will now invite your attention to the language of 'the Apostle, recorded in the third chapter of Colossians, third and fourth verses, which reads—" For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Now if there was no other text in all the book of God to prove the final preservation of the saints but the one just quoted, it would be sufficient to satisfy 'every child of-God who is willing to believe the Apostle. It is evident from this text, that before the devil can get one of the saints of God, he must be admitted into heaven itself, and not only so, he must by some means get into



the Godhead where Christ is, before he can reach the life of one of God's dear children.

But, revolting to the mind of the Christian as this idea may be, there is still another more contemptible than this, and that is, the devil must dethrone Deity, overpower and captivate the glorious Lamb of God, and drag him down to everlasting burnings, or he will never get one of the saints of the Most High God! And this is still not all; but if the gentleman's theory be true, then the Apostle is found to be a liar; for, says the Apostle, Christ is our life; hence, to get the life of the saint is to get Christ. The Apostle adds, "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Now mark, he does not teach, like Elder Franklin, that if you will continue to perform good works, and hold out faithful to the end, then you shall appear with him. No, verily! But he argues on the ground that Christ is our life; consequently, when he who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory. To this my friend will make no reply.

But read, if you please, in the eighth chapter of Romans, 38th and 39th verses. O, will you listen to the exalted views here given by inspiration! The Apostle says: "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all the powers that are within me praise his holy name for such glorious consolation as is presented in his blessed word! Here the inspired writer has searched heaven, ransacked hell, and diligently examined all powers, all heights, all depths, and all creatures, and tells us in plain words that none of them, nor all of them combined, shall be able to separate our Father's children from his love. Dear brethren, sisters, and friends, all the devils in hell, combined with wicked men upon earth, can never harm you beyond what will be for the glory of God our Father, and for your good; for our blessed Jesus has conquered death, hell, and the grave, and with these, all the enemies of his dear children, and has arisen trium-

phantly, and ascended gloriously, and is now seated at the right hand of the majesty in the heavens, where he is making intercession for all his dear children.

O, dear friends, will you contemplate the soul-cheering idea, that this Jesus is your Redeemer, that he is your life, and that he, with all his dear saints, will live when death itself is dead! Yes, dear brethren and sisters, be of good comfort, for now is your salvation nearer than when you first believed; and notwithstanding you have had many sore trials to endure, many afflictions to encounter, both of body and mind, yet your blessed Jesus careth for you, and will give you grace to overcome them all. Then bear hardness as good soldiers. What if they do speak evil of you, and call us the filth and offscouring of all things—this can never harm us, for they called the dear Savior the same. Yes, they even called him Beelzebub! Then we should rejoice at these things, only let us not give any ground for the enemy to speak reproachfully of us. Let us love as Christians ought to love, and live as Christians ought to live, and all will be well. Let us remember that by and by our dear Jesus—our life—will come again, and in the midst of the wreck of nature find the crush of world, the redeemed family will ascend 'up to that kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, there to enjoy the smiles of our dear Redeemer, world without end.

Time expired.

## MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS.

### FOURTH PROPOSITION.

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS—LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I have had considerable experience in discussion, and have heard many speeches that savored but little of the grace of Christianity; but never in my life did I listen to a speech of a half hour's length that had so little in it to commend it to an intelligent religious community, as the one you have just heard. Mr. Hume puts me in mind of the sign over a shop door, where turning is done, screws and twisted columns are made. The sign reads as follows: "All kinds of turning, heating, and screwing done here." I could but think, while listening to Mr. Hume, that all kinds of twisting, turning, and screwing are done here. But I do not speak of his speech merely in regard to its total destitution of all argument, but its entire destitution of all that is kind, lowly, courteous, and gentlemanly. That it abounded with the lowest slang, the most rough, uncouth, and unpolished insinuation, I need not inform any man in this audience. But I cannot and shall not attempt to descend to the unworthy slang and insinuation of his speech. My reputation is beyond the power of his tongue to injure, and if it were not, this is not the place for low insinuation. I shall notice his speech so far as it bears upon the question, and no further.

I am unable to say how many times he has told the audience that I have not brought one passage to prove my position. This will look well in a printed book, especially when any one can refer to his first speech, and find where he attempted to reply to several arguments from most unequivocal proofs. But in this, he took good care to

avoid several of my most clear and pointed proofs. In my second speech, I called his attention to these, but failed to induce him to take the most distant notice of them. Especially did I try to get his attention to those of whom Peter speaks, who "deny the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." But I failed to induce him to mention them. I ask any, or all present, if those the Lord bought are not saints? And I ask if such deny the Lord that bought them, and bring upon, themselves swift destruction, if it is not apostatizing, and being finally lost? But still, he is inflating himself with the vain conceit that he is in the light, and gives this as the reason of his extraordinary liberty of speech. What has he said in reference to those whose names shall be blotted out of the book of life, and whose part shall be taken away out of the holy city? Has he given the least attention to them? Not a syllable has he, uttered about this important case. What response has he made to the "trees twice dead, and plucked up by the roots?" Why can he not be induced to notice these passages at all, in place of his continued assertions that I have produced no proof?

Mr. Hume speaks of negative proof! Let us, then, "look at his negative proof for a few moments. He mentions Col. iii. 3: "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." But he forgot to read you the preceding words from this passage; he overlooked the fact that this life hid in God is introduced with an "if." Let us read it together. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections on things above, and not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." This passage makes a man's privilege to seek those things above rest upon a contingency. "IF ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above." This implies, that if ye are not risen with him—not converted—you are not entitled to the privilege of seeking. But what are they to seek? "Those things which are above." What are they? The main matter is the life that is hid with Christ in God. This passage, then, requires, us, to seek the life that is hid with Christ in God. What does the Lord say of those who seek? He says they shall find. But this, to a man who feels the force of language, says, those who do not seek, shall not find. The gentleman's proof-text, then, requires us to *seek*

*the life* hid with Christ in God, and implies that those who do not, shall not find it.

Mr. Hume quotes the words, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee," and the declaration of Paul, that "neither height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate between us and the love of God," without giving the least attention to the exposition I gave of such passages. In all such cases, a condition must be understood, and that condition is, that we continue faithful to him. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. xxii. 14. Here it is manifest, that the promised blessing hangs upon doing the commandments, and cannot rationally be claimed by any one who does not keep his commandments. "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Rev. ii. 10. Here the crown of life is promised upon condition of faithfulness till death. Of course this promise is not to, and cannot be claimed by, any one who is not 'faithful unto death. Again: "If that which you have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye shall continue in the Son and in the Father." 1 John ii. 24. I wish the gentleman to open his eyes; and look at this passage, for I believe he denied in his last speech that there was any such passage in the Bible. What is it that the Lord here hangs upon an "if"? It is continuing in the Son and in the Father. What is that "if," or contingency? It is, that "the things you have heard from the beginning remain in you." Those to whom the Apostle spoke this, could not have remained in the things they had heard from the beginning, unless they had been in them, and he would not have spoken of remaining in them, if there had been no possibility of getting out of what they had heard. He would not have promised persons that they should continue in the Son and in the Father, *if they remained in what they had heard*, if there was no possibility

of getting out of the Son and the Father. But Mr. Hume tries to prove that all who were in the Son and the Father shall continue in them, whether they will remain in what they have heard or not. The "buts" and "ifs" of which he complained, are in the Bible.

The gentleman complained that I did not come into the neighborhood of the proposition in my last speech. If I did not, it was because I had to leave the neighborhood of the proposition that I might get to him, and refute some of his ridiculous positions. I am bound to leave the proposition occasionally, or leave him altogether, for he has given it but little attention. He has too much trouble in. Mixing up two natures for man—one that cannot sin, and one that can and does sin. He involved himself in this ridiculous absurdity and contradiction, by first trying to prove that saints cannot sin; and then, when I introduced those who "fail of the grace of God," those "who fall away;" "turn away from the holy commandment;" "deny the Lord that bought them;" "trees twice dead and plucked up by the roots," &c., &c., he speaks of their doing great wrongs, having errors, &c., for which the Lord sends severe chastisement upon them. But when I press him with the egregious sins committed by those manifestly Christians once, he explains the whole by telling us that man has two natures! It is no difference to me how many natures man has, nor would it extricate him from the absurdity into which he has fallen, if he could show that he has a dozen natures. He argued that man, born of God, could not sin, and then had to admit that man did sin! The question was not about the nature that led man to sin, but whether the converted man could sin. He denied that he could, and we compelled him to admit that he did, especially such as deny the Lord who bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.

Mr. Hume calls the Scriptures we introduced in our last speech "a heterogeneous mass of bombast and trash," and openly declares that he "wholly rejects" them. We have been perfectly aware of this all the time, but we did not expect him to acknowledge it. He has had his trouble about good works, and must continue to have until he abandons his untenable position.

But I must once more call his attention to the word of the Lord, on the subject of righteous men and good works. Can a righteous man turn away from his righteousness? Let us hear the Bible: "But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sins that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." Ez. xviii. 24. Here, I would advise the gentleman, is an end of all caviling. Here is the language of the Almighty, talking about a righteous man turning away from his righteousness, and doing "according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth;" and his sentence upon him is, that "in his sins that he hath sinned, he shall die." A righteous man is a saint, and a saint or a righteous man turning away from his righteousness, and doing according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, is a saint falling from grace, or, in the language of my proposition, "apostatizing from the Christian faith;" and dying in his sins that he has sinned, is being "finally lost," and I defy him or any other man to escape the conclusion.

To show that the destinies, not only of men but of nations, hang upon their conduct, I will read from another prophet: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." Jer. xviii. 9, 10. See here what hangs upon doing evil in the sight of the Lord. It has been the cause of the downfall of nations and kingdoms.

Mr. Hume is down with great fury upon Bible and Missionary Societies, as well as Sunday Schools. I knew that, as a matter of course, he would be against all these; yet we must consider him friendly to good works! A cold friendship this! But of course a preacher who can do nothing but feed the sheep, and fight the "dogs and wolves," could not be expected to extend his benevolence outside of his little flock. He is not under the commission that the Lord gave to preach the gospel, for he commanded

it to be preached to "every creature." It is useless for those out of his field to hear him preach, for he is simply feeding the sheep and fighting off the dogs and wolves!" If men of the world go to his meetings, it must be simply to see him feed the sheep, and keep off the dogs and wolves, for he admits that his preaching can do them no good. It would be no use to send him as a missionary to the heathen, for he admits that he can do them no good by preaching to them. He would not send them the Bible, for he thinks it would be as useless as his preaching. He would not teach children in the Sunday School, for his teaching could do them no good, as they are not sheep. He considers them sinners. This is a pretty system for any man to advocate in the middle of the nineteenth century! A splendid system this, that can do nothing for the unconverted of our country, for the Pagan world, nor for our children! A beautiful system this, that does not even encourage fathers and mothers to bring their children up in the nurture and instructions of the Lord, but denies that Christianity can be taught to children, or anybody else out of the church! A valuable system this, to set up its claims in your midst, friends, that simply directs the lambs to be fed, and the dogs and wolves to be kept off! It not only does not claim to be of any use to those without, but denies that it can do them any good 1 If it has any merits, it must be that it is the most circumscribed, narrow, contracted and selfish scheme ever set on foot!

Those under the influence of this system think that they are the special few that God loved, that Christ died for, that were included in the atonement, that will all be converted; cannot sin, cannot apostatize from the Christian faith, cannot be lost, but will all be saved; and all the balance of the race were left out of the intention of God, out of the promise, out of the predictions of the prophets, out of the covenant, out of the atonement, out of the grace of God, out of the church, and will be left out of heaven! This little special few—the elect—can do the balance of mankind no good, except to keep them off as dogs and wolves! This is the fruit of the extraordinary light of which Mr. Hume boasts! There is but precious, little



grace in his system, so that if he should fall from it, he would not fall far. It contains no grace for any but those within. It light is all fur those within. This latter fact may account for his seeing such great light in his last speech, which was all invisible to the rest of us.

From the manner in which Mr. Hume worked in his last speech, one would have thought that he considered that his fate hung upon his human efforts. If the test to which he submitted his lungs, and profuse perspiration are to be allowed as witnesses in the case, he felt that much depended upon works, for he certainly worked if ever a poor mortal did; and what was worse, he found that his work was unavailing. I never saw as great an inconsistency, as to see Mr. Hume working with every power he possesses to prove that works amount to nothing! He contends that his preaching can do men outside of the church no good; and yet I never saw a man labor so hard with men outside, seeming to be trying to convince them! "What consummate nonsense! If I believed as he does, that all the elect are safe—cannot be lost, and that the non-elect cannot be saved, I would be very clear of debating. Does he not know that the non-elect cannot be convinced, and that the elect cannot fall? Where is the use of his debating? The number to be saved is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either added to nor diminished. I defy him to show, according to his doctrine, that his debating or preaching can do any good for one soul of Adam's race. We can plead with men, because, with the Apostle, we believe we can "convert a sinner from the error of his way, and save a soul from death."

That Mr. Hume may have something definite before his mind, and make some reply, if indeed he can make any, I will give him a few points in my remaining two or three minutes. I argue in this discussion, that any saint can apostatize and be lost. To show this, I have shown that Esau had a birthright, and lost it, which it is insisted no saint can do. Judas was one of those given to Christ, and by transgression, fell and was lost. Paul had to keep his body in subjection lest he should be a castaway. In the letter to the Romans, Paul speaks of the natural branches, "who were the elect, being broken off, and others—the

wild olive—grafted in contrary to nature, and made elect. Peter speaks of some whom the Lord bought, denying the Lord, and bringing upon themselves swift destruction. Here are elect persons lost, because those whom the Lord bought are elect, if there is any elect. Jude speaks of trees twice dead and plucked up by the roots. These trees represent people, who had been alive in the church, but had become twice dead. These had fallen from grace. Paul, in his letter to the Galatians, speaks of men who were disciples, and tells them that owing to certain acts of disloyalty, Christ would profit them nothing, and they would fall from grace. Besides these, we read of others "turning away from the commandment," "falling away," "departing from the living God," "turning back," "sinning wilfully," "destroying a brother," for whom "there is no more sacrifice for sin," who could not be "renewed again to repentance," for whom nothing remained but the "blackness of darkness forever," whose "names are blotted out of the book of life, and their part taken away out of the holy city." If these Scriptures do not teach that any saint can apostatize and be lost, I know not what language could prove it. "Let him who standeth take heed lest he fall," said the inspired Paul. Be not high-minded, Mr. Hume, for if Paul had to keep his body in subjection, lest he should be a castaway, you had better take heed.

Time expired.

## **MR. HUME'S THIRD SPEECH, ON THE LAST PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN"—

"We are now approaching the close of our discussion; and, as we very much desire your instruction and edification, we hope that you will endeavor to bear in mind all the arguments on both sides, as well as all the Scripture proofs introduced by the contending parties; and, after a careful examination, you will no doubt decide according to the best understanding you have. You should, however, remember that, where there is positive testimony and inferential testimony both introduced, the preference should always be given to the point sustained by positive proof; for surely it is much safer to rely upon positive evidence than upon inferential, in any matter, and especially upon the important subject of the Christian religion. Much of the testimony introduced by us has been of the positive character, and particularly such as has been introduced during the discussion of the present proposition, while my friend Mr. Franklin has had to rely entirely upon inference for proof, so far as he has attempted to introduce any. Whether we have been able to satisfy your minds with regard to the true meaning of the passages which he has introduced, is not for me to determine. But Mr. Franklin has surely failed to satisfy you that the passages introduced by us did not mean what we have said they did; for he has not noticed them at all; and, if you watched him as closely as we did during his last speech, you discovered that he did not introduce one new text. This really looks like the gentleman was out of ammunition, sure enough. Well, we have plenty on hand yet, and to the point, which you shall hear before we sit down. The whole of Mr. Franklin's last speech was

a repetition of what he had said on the second day, and we are not disposed to follow him there. We will, however, attend to the few things said by the gentleman, aimed as arguments in his last speech, not one of which has anything to do with the proposition. He was pleased to tell us that if we failed to do our whole duty, even to the end, we would finally be lost. If this be true, we are sure there will be none saved, for that man does not live who does precisely right in all things. But we know the doctrine taught by the gentleman upon this subject is not true, for there is no earthly parent who will punish his children severely for the first offence; neither is there any parent who would punish his children eternally for any offence whatever, and, more especially, if he had the power to influence his children to pursue a better course; while it must be confessed that our Heavenly Father feels a much stronger attachment to, and affection for, his dear children, than earthly parents do. And not only so, but He has the power to influence them to a better course, and cause them to love, honor, and adore Him, and, as such, He will not punish them further than will be for their good; and ultimately, in the end of all their sufferings, He will bring them to the enjoyment of that rest that remains for the people of God. Moreover, we have proven that the saints of God are the partakers of divine nature: that there is no divine nature but God above, and divine nature cannot suffer; and as such, those who are possessed of it cannot possibly be finally lost, unless it can be proven that divine nature goes to hell, which we are sure will never be done. The audience will doubtless remember that we requested the gentleman, very politely, to give us his views upon the passage in Jeremiah which says, "I will forgive their iniquities, and I will remember their sins no more." We desired him to tell us if saints would be finally lost, whose sins God himself says he will remember no more. But my friend did not think proper, in his wisdom, to comply with our request, but passed over it as though he thought there was death in it, sure enough, there is death in it to the doctrine of falling from grace. He knew better than

to touch this text, for it is too plain to be misunderstood, and that with all his ingenuity in mystifying and garbling up the truth, he could not conceal the plain simple truth taught in this text; hence, his entire silence upon the subject. There are two things the audience should remember: first, that Elder Franklin has not introduced one text this day that says anything about apostacy, or the saints of God being finally lost; secondly, he has not attempted to reply to one of the many pointed Scripture proofs which we have introduced. Now, if these things fail to convince the people that he is wrong, we know not what would convince them.

But as the gentleman is out of argument and Scripture proof, both, he has ventured another shameful burlesque upon us and our doctrine, by saying that we teach our children immorality, and encourage them in their wickedness, by keeping them away from Sabbath schools, and thereby refusing to teach them religion. Now, we think if the gentleman was as well acquainted with what has transpired in this town, both among teachers of Sabbath schools and the scholars taught by them, as we are, it might possibly change his opinion somewhat; but true delicacy forbids our descending into particulars. The facts are all known here. We speak as to wise men; judge ye what we say. This much, however, we will say: that the morals of the children of Regular Baptists in this country, will compare very favorably with the moral conduct of those who teach as well as those who are taught in Sabbath schools; and as such, the gentleman has nothing to boast of (if he only knew it) over the Regular Baptist. Here we endeavor to instruct our children in the great principles of morality, honesty, and truth. We also teach them to read the Holy Bible; to go to meeting, and behave themselves while there, and pay attention to all they hear. But all this is not religion. Neither do we attempt to teach them religion, for we are too well acquainted with our weakness to engage in such an important work; for we maintain that nothing short of the power of Almighty God can teach any man a true knowledge of the Christian religion, and as such, we

take our children to the Lord, and humbly implore his divine mercy upon them. Here we are willing to leave them, knowing that our God is too wise to err, and too good' to be unkind. But, if we were ever disposed to make an effort to have them taught the great principles of the Christian religion, the Sabbath school is the last place to which we should send them, for they are generally under the influence and control of strong religious partisans, fiery zealots, and hot-headed bigots, whose zeal is not according to knowledge, and, as such, are unfit to instruct the youthful mind properly upon any subject. We now say (and we challenge contradiction from any man), that the children of Regular Baptists, upon the whole, are as moral, as honest, as truthful, and as well behaved, as the children of those who are engaged in the whole modern machinery, falsely called benevolent, while the gentleman himself, in all that he has said about the conduct of the Regular Baptists, has only manifested his entire ignorance of their true character

But we now ask, what has all this to do with the doctrine of falling from grace? Every one here must see that the gentleman is determined to evade the real point at issue: that he is unwilling to meet the issue fairly, and hence his continual playing off upon some other subject—anything that he thinks will divert the attention of the audience from the subject of debate today. But we have endeavored to keep the proposition before the people, and we hope they will not forget it. We have shown, by a number of plain pointed Scripture proofs, that the proposition is false in itself, and although the gentleman did not in his last speech introduce one new text; neither will he. We have several more, which we intend to introduce; and, if my friend will not reply to them, the audience will perhaps recollect them, and thereby be convinced, as we are, that Mr. Franklin never can prove the doctrine of falling from grace by the Scriptures of eternal truth, but that this God-dishonoring doctrine has originated in the distracted brain of some religious fanatic in ages gone by, and like that of infant sprinkling, has

found its advocates in every age, from its introduction down to the present time.

But, as further proof that this doctrine is false, we invite your attention to Hebrews viii. 10th, 11th, and 12th verses, which read as follows: "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying. Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I, remember no more. Here the Apostle has brought several things to view that are worthy of our consideration. He tells us, in plain terms, what Jehovah himself will do for his people. He will, in the first place, put his laws in their minds and write them in their hearts; he will be their God and they shall be his people. This is what he will do. Well, he tells us what his people shall not do; and, in pointing this out, we fear our friend and all that; are identified with him, will be left entirely out of this covenant, for, says the Apostle, "They shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying "Know the Lord." We now ask our friend. What are you doing with your Sabbath schools, tract societies, &c.? Are you not engaged in trying to teach a knowledge of God and religion? This you dare not deny. Hence, by your own conduct, you prove conclusively that you are not the people who are embraced in this new covenant, for they shall not teach, while you are engaged in trying to teach.

But once more: Jehovah says, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness." These are not the brethren of Elder Franklin, for he has told us, time and again, that we must work, and must work righteousness, too, and continue working to the end, or we should be finally lost. Hence, in this case, Jehovah would have to be merciful to their righteousness; but,

in this new covenant, he is merciful to their unrighteousness. Hence you see, my audience, that Elder Franklin has no interest here, but must look for salvation to a different covenant entirely.

But this is not all. Hear the Apostle further. He says: "and their sins and their Iniquities will I remember no more." Here is a death-blow to the gentleman's whole theory: for if God himself will not remember their sins any more, sure it is that He will not punish them eternally. Nay, verily; for, if sins are not remembered, most assuredly they are pardoned, buried, forgotten, and, as such, all the members of this covenant will be brought to the paradise of God, while those of the covenant of works, or the children of the bondwomen, shall be cast out, for, saith the Apostle, "The son of the bond woman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman." But, before Mr. Franklin can eternally punish any of the children of the free woman, he will have to dethrone God their Father, and conquer Jesus their elder brother, destroy the efficacy of his blood, tread it under foot, and prove the Bible to be a lie—none of which will he ever be able to do.

But once more, Hebrews xii: 5, 6: "For He hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee, so that we may boldly say, The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me." Yes, dear friends, here is the consolation: the Lord has said, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee"; therefore we can boldly, or with confidence, say, The Lord is my helper, and if he be for me who can be against me? I will not fear all the combined powers of the enemy, for I have the promise of my dear and Heavenly Father, that He will never. A blessed word! consoling declaration, never forsake thee! Well, how long is never? Why, it is without end—eternal or everlasting duration. "Well," says the child of God, "that is long enough. I shall need his aid no longer than eternity shall last, and I have the promise to that end, and I am satisfied. Yes, I can boldly face the world, the flesh, and Satan, which are all the enemies I have, and tell them I do not fear them all, for the Lord is my helper, and he has said, 'I will never leave thee nor forsake thee,' and I believe his word. O, what sweet peace, joy, and comfort this blessed promise affords to our Father's family in this



world of affliction, disappointment, and sorrow. Yes, they can with confidence and assurance, run to the name of the Lord, as a strong tower, and there feel their safety. And, as further evidence of the eternal safety and security of the saints of the Most High God, read, if you please, in the gospel by John, xiv. 19: "Yet a little while and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me. Because I live, ye shall live also." Here is further evidence of the positions assumed in our last speech, founded upon the language of the Apostle, recorded in the third of Colossians, "When Christ who is our life, shall appear," etc. Now, it is evident, from the language of the Savior here, that the eternal safety of all the saints of God is suspended upon the single fact that Jesus is their life. Such is the nature of the union existing between Christ and his people, as we told you in our last speech, that, if they die, he dies; if they suffer, he suffers; if he lives, they live also; and, if he dies, and reigns eternally in glory, they will eternally reign with him. Now, remember that Jesus does not talk like Mr. Franklin upon this subject, and tell his disciples what the gentleman has often told us, That because you have been very diligent in maintaining good works, and have been faithful even to the end, you shall live; No. But he says in plain terms, not to be misunderstood, that the reason why they live is because he lives; hence, it is evident that the gentleman's whole theory upon the subject of falling from grace, is unfounded in the Bible, and you see, moreover, that he has not introduced one text that says a word about the saints of God being finally lost. We have no doubt but he has done his best, and yet, after all, like every other man who undertakes to prove a false theory from the Bible, he has most signally failed. We hope this may teach him better than to ever undertake to prove the doctrine of falling from grace, again. We tell you, dear friends, what is true; and that is, there are many who fall from works for the want of grace, but we hope our friend will not be found among that number.

But we are not quite done yet. One more discharge from our artillery we think will be quite sufficient to silence every one here who yet believes that the saints of God may be finally lost. We tell you now, my audience, that if there yet remains a particle of the mud-walled cottage in which my friend has been trying to conceal himself, that is not blown away the discharge that is now

about to be let loose upon it will sweep it to the very earth, so that a single vestige of it will not be seen, and we think the gentleman will be ashamed to acknowledge that he ever dwelt there. No; remember that Mr. Franklin says, that any saint in the church of God may apostatize and be finally lost. Now, we intend to prove, by one of the ancient servants of God, that this doctrine is basely false, or otherwise Mr. Franklin will prove that what the servant of God has said is basely false.

We will now give you the name and language of the servant, and then you can believe which you please. Turn, then, to the seventeenth chapter of Job, and read the ninth verse, where Job declares, "The righteous shall hold on their way." Come, friend Franklin, what have you to say now? All you willing to give this servant of God the lie? This you must do, or give up your doctrine of falling from grace. We hope you will prefer the latter, as the former would present you in a very unfavorable light before the people here.

Now, friends, do not forget the language of Job, "*The righteous shall hold on their way.*" Mr. Franklin says they may not hold on their way, but may be finally lost. You now have the testimony of both Job and Mr. Franklin— believe which you please. We now appeal to every unprejudiced mind here, if we have not fully sustained the negative of the present proposition, and proven, beyond a doubt, that the whole family of God will finally be brought off, more than conquerors, through him that loved them and gave himself for them? Not, however, because of anything inherently holy in them. No, verily; but because that Jesus Christ is their life, and, as such, while he lives they will live also. He is their righteousness, also, and, being found clothed in his righteousness, they will be justified in the sight of God their Father. He is also their wisdom; hence, he directs all their ways in truth, and by him they are instructed in all things necessary for them to know. He is their sanctification, too; hence, their holiness is derived from him; and, adored be his holy name, he is their redemption from the claim of the law and from all iniquity; and, having redeemed them from all iniquity, they never shall come into con-

demnation, for they are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. Yes, they are born of incorruptible seed; consequently, they cannot become corrupted. And, being kept by the power of God, Job might well say, The righteous shall keep on their way. Yes, dearly beloved brethren and friends, we tell you, that hell may roar and vent her spite, but Christ will save his heart's delight; and when the earth is deluged in fiery wrath; when the elements melt with fervent heat; when the last loud trump shall re-echo through the vaulted dead; and when the nations shall be summoned to the bar of God;—then shall the redeemed family (every one of them) hear the welcome news proclaimed by him who is their life, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you. Yes, for you (and none others) from the foundation of the world. There, dear friends, the wicked will cease to trouble, and the weary will be forever at rest. May you and I be among that happy number.

Time expired.

## **MR. FRANKLIN'S CLOSING ADDRESS.**

### **FOURTH PROPOSITION**

---

MR. PRESIDENT:

I arise to make my closing address. I shall make a few remarks upon the speech you have just heard, and then state my argument and leave it with you. Much of the gentleman's speech might have been mistaken for a Universalian speech. His argument, that God loves his children as ardently as an earthly parent does his—and no earthly parent would allow his child to suffer, if he could avoid it—is real old bald-faced Universalism. The Universalian would differ with him about the number and who are the children, one contending for only apart, and the other for the whole human family. But they agree in this: that all the children will be saved. They agree, further than this, that nothing that a man can do in this life can affect his condition in the eternal state. But Mr. Hume does not understand enough of logic and argument to see that this is all begging the question. The very question in dispute is, whether a child of God can forfeit his claims, as a child, and lose his inheritance and be lost. His argument from the divine nature is of the same kind. It amounts to this: Saints are partakers of the divine nature, and, therefore, cannot be punished without punishing the divine nature. But this begs the question again. The question in dispute is, whether a saint can lose the divine nature? I affirm, and have conclusively proved., that a child of God can forfeit his claim as a child, lose the divine nature, and be lost.

Mr. Hume argues that, because the Lord says of those

in the new covenant, he "will remember their sins and iniquities no more," they cannot fall from grace. But there is no proof of any such proposition in those words. This language refers to their "old sins," as Peter calls them, committed before their conversion, which we all know are remembered no more. But this does not prove that the Lord will not notice the sins committed after they are pardoned, as I have abundantly shown can be committed.

Mr. Hume's assertions are certainly cheap! He tells us again, that I had neither introduced a proof of my proposition nor noticed one of his proofs. This will have a sad aspect to those who read this debate. He is now the respondent, and I ask any candid man what he has done towards replying to my arguments? Have I not tried to get his attention to important passages, and utterly failed? It is shocking that a man should make such frequent and unguarded statements!

The gentleman says, they do teach the children to read the Bible in his church. If they do, he is very careful to tell them that they cannot understand, believe it, or repent of the sins pointed out in it! What good, then, does their reading it do? That you may see his views of training children, as well as his profession of the Bible, I call attention to one of his quotations. He quotes the words, "shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother," to prove that it is wrong to teach children in the Sunday school. In view of the fact that there would be none in the new covenant who should not know the Lord, it was said, "They shall not teach any man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord;" but surely this does not teach any intelligent man, who has children not in the covenant, should not teach them to know the Lord; for I have expressly shown that the Apostle commands parents to bring up their children in the nurture and instructions of the Lord. A shocking religion this, that ridicules imparting religious instruction to children!

Mr. Hume says, "The Lord does not say, because you have done good works you shall live." Well, with" all due deference to the gentleman, I say that he does sub-

stantially say this. He says, they who do his will shall enter into his kingdom, and, in the resurrection, "they who have done good shall come forth to a resurrection of life." When the young man asked the Lord what good thing he should do to inherit eternal life, he told him of the commandments of God. The young man responded, "All these things I have observed from my youth." The Lord said, "One thing thou lackest; Go sell that thou hast and give to the poor and follow me, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." It is as certain as that the Bible is a revelation from God, that eternal life depends upon the conduct of men in this life. Hence Paul said to Timothy, "Charge them that are rich in this world that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." Mr. Hume knows nothing about this method of laying hold on eternal life.

But it was awfully terrifying to see the gentleman when preparing, as he expressed it, to let loose his mighty artillery upon me. When I considered the circumference his mighty arms could sweep over, the streaming perspiration, sonorous voice, and foaming mouth, you may guess something of the terror that hung over me, when the gentleman was about to open his artillery upon my devoted head; but it came out like Dr. Rice's man, who ran forty rods to jump a high fence, and when he reached the fence, he had to sit down and rest before he jumped. It turned out so with Mr. Hume; he made such an ado about his great gun, that it sounded to us as one of the most ordinary kind;—it turned out to be nothing more than the words of Job, viz.: "The righteous shall hold on their way." Why did the Lord speak of the patience of Job, if he could not fall? Why did the Lord say of Job, "There are none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil." But Mr. Hume believes the language of the devil concerning Job. He said, "God made a hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on

every side." But the Lord showed him that he could put all that Job had in his hands, and leave him to himself. He did so, thus showing the excellence of the man who would maintain his position and standing, when everything was so unfavorable. The declaration of Job, that the righteous should hold on his way, did not relate to the righteous in general, but to himself as a righteous man, or his intention and determination to continue his course, and had no bearing upon our question.

But I now ask, to what argument of mine has Mr. Hume made anything in the shape of a fair and honorable reply? I say, not one; and the only promise that I can now recollect that he has made and kept, in this debate, was his promise in his speech just heard, not to notice my arguments. This promise he kept faithfully. Never in my life did I debate with any man who attempted to respond, said as little to the point, as the gentleman in the speech you have just heard.

I must now spend a few minutes in reviewing the argument, and then leave it with this large and intelligent audience that has listened to us so patiently during four-days' discussion, to decide for themselves where the argument lies. All I desire is, that truth may triumph. It is a matter of no consequence to gain a victory over Mr. Hume; but for truth to gain a victory is always important. This is all I desire on this occasion. I can only review a few of the main points in the argument in the short time now remaining.

We have seen that Esau lost his birth right; Jacob gained one. According to Calvinists, none but elect persons, ever had a birthright, and those who once had a birthright can never lose it. Esau once had one, and must have been one of the elect; but he lost it, and must then have become one of the non-elect. But Jacob once had no birthright, and consequently was one of the non-elect; but gained a birthright, and, therefore, became one of the elect.

The natural branches, the Jews, being broken off, and the wild olive, the Gentiles, being grafted in contrary to nature, establishes the same doctrine, viz.: that some of the elect were lost, and that those who were not elect be

came elect; and the fact that Paul told them that "if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee," proves that there is danger of any saint in the kingdom of God not being spared, if he does not take heed to his ways.

The fact that the holy Apostle Paul labored to keep his body in subjection, lest having preached the gospel to others he might be a castaway, shows that he could be lost, and if he could be lost, any saint in the kingdom of God could be lost. The fact that Judas Iscariot, one called to the apostolic office, who was with the apostles, and a bosom companion of the Lord for more than three years, by transgression fell, and was lost, proves that any saint in the kingdom of God may fall by transgression, and be lost. The fact that Paul speaks of destroying a brother for whom Christ died, proves that a saint can be lost; for none but a saint could be a brother for whom Christ died, and being destroyed is being lost. The fact that Peter speaks of men "bringing in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction! proves that saints may apostatize from the Christian faith, and be finally lost. Up to this moment, I have been unable to induce Mr. Hume even to attempt a reply to the argument drawn from this passage. Here are those the Lord bought. They deny the Lord who bought them. This brings upon them swift destruction. The Lord did his work towards saving them—he bought them. They were lost. Why? Because of their own actions; they denied the Lord who bought them, and brought upon themselves swift destruction. This passage proves that the actions of men may be the means of destruction to those the Lord bought, and that those he bought may be lost, in defiance of all refutation.

I have shown that the Apostle Peter suspends our entrance into heaven upon adding to our faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, and continuing in them; for the Apostle says, "If ye do these things ye shall never fall, for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly in the everlasting kingdom." In the same connection, referring to the same things, he exhorts the disciples to "*make their*



*calling and election sure,"* which shows that their own conduct had something to do in making their own calling and election sure, keeping them from falling, and gaining for them an entrance into the everlasting kingdom of heaven itself. I have shown that a man may have "his name blotted out of the book of life, and his part taken away out of the holy city," which is an eternal refutation of Mr. Hume's position. None but saints ever had their names written in the book of life, and a part in the holy city, and these can have their names blotted out of the book of life, and their part taken away out of the holy city. This proves that a saint can be lost by his disobedience to the Lord. I have shown that some who have been saints, are compared to trees twice dead and plucked up by the roots, which shows beyond all controversy that they had once been living saints, but had apostatized and become dead, and consequently must be lost. I have shown that Paul speaks of a condition in which saints may place themselves, in which "Christ shall profit them nothing," and in which they "are fallen from grace." Could language be more explicit? Paul speaks of men failing of the grace of God, and dispossessing themselves of that "holiness without which no man can see the Lord." No man could fail of the grace of God unless he was once in that grace, and if he fails of the grace of God, he must be saved without the grace of God, or not saved at all. Paul admonishes the saints to fear, lest, a promise being left them of entering into his rest, any of them should seem to come short of it. This shows that a promise of an entrance into rest is conditional, and that men may fail of an entrance into that rest by their own misconduct.

From Heb. vi, 4, 9, I have shown that those "once enlightened," who "have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit," "tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come," which, beyond all dispute, were saints, may "fall away," so that it shall be "impossible to renew them again to repentance; seeing that they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame," and that their "end is to be burned." These were saints, who could not be renewed to repentance again, because they

had fallen away," and their "end is to be burned," which is the apostacy of saints who will be finally lost. The end of men is their final condition, and if their "end is to be burned," they are finally lost. But I have shown, from the same epistle, that persons who were in the good profession, and exhorted by the Apostle to hold it fast—persons who had "come to the knowledge of the truth," who were saints, are told that "if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." If there remains no more sacrifice for sin for such, what does remain for them? The Apostle says "But a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries." This is being finally lost, for this is what the apostle declared remained for them, and speaks immediately of a "sorer punishment than death without mercy." But to put an end to all caviling, I have referred the gentleman to Ez., xviii. 24, where the Lord expressly speaks of the righteous turning away from his righteousness, and committing iniquity; doing according to all the abominations that the wicked doeth. Where God asks the question concerning such a man, "shall he live? Mr. Hume says, he shall. But the Lord says, "All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned in his trespass that he has trespassed, and in his sins that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." Here is a saint, turning away from his righteousness, sinking and dying in his sins. Such must be finally lost, or else men may die in their sins and be saved.

What reply has Mr. Hume to make to all this? Has he reviewed these passages and shown that I have misapplied them? You all know he has not, and that many of them he has not mentioned in any shape. It is the duty of a respondent to follow the affirmant, examine his proofs, and show that they are not to the point. But has he done this? His failure in all that pertains to the argument, has been the most complete of any that I have ever known in any case. He has made nothing that deserves the name of a reply; but still, I suppose he will go on in his closing speech, in the same braggadocio style, and say that he has maintained himself with a high and

an out-stretched hand; that I have not brought one proof, nor replied to one of his positive proofs! Such vapping amounts to nothing before an intelligent audience, and it will show miserably in a printed book. But he must take his own course.

In the very few minutes remaining, I will condense the argument to a point as near as possible. If there be no apostatizing from the Christian religion, what mean the following expressions: "Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into that rest, any of you should seem to come short of it;" "Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God;" "Make your calling and election sure;" "If you do these things you shall never fall;" If they shall fall away, it is impossible to renew them again to repentance;" "If God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee;" Esau for one morsel of meat sold his birthright;" "Judas, by transgression, and was "lost;" "His name shall be blotted out of the book of life, and his part taken away out of the holy city;" "If the righteous shall turn away from his righteousness, and do according to the abominations that the wicked man doeth, \* \* \* in his sins that he hath sinned, in them shall he die;" "Christ shall profit you nothing; ye are fallen from grace;" "they shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord who bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." Is it not as manifest as the light of day, that the Lord speaks of "sinning willfully after coming to the knowledge of the truth," and that for such there is no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries?

We then, in conclusion, as we solemnly believe in the spirit of the New Testament, exhort you to "make your calling and election sure"—to "look diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God," and "fear lest a promise being left us of entering into that rest, any one should seem to come short of it," and see that "none of you have an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God."

Gentlemen moderators, I tender you my sincere thanks for the respectful and dignified manner in which you have presided in this discussion. Ladies and gentlemen, accept of my thanks for your very respectful attention.

## **MR. HUME'S LAST SPEECH, ON THE LAST PROPOSITION.**

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS—LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

We have now arisen for the purpose of closing this discussion, which has been protracted for four days, during which time many of you have given us your undivided attention. You have now heard all the arguments and scripture proofs on both sides. We will not be allowed to introduce anything new in our present speech. We will, however, make a few remarks with regard to some things said by the gentleman during his last speech, and devote the rest of our time to recapitulation. We humbly hope that you will be enabled to decide upon these important matters in such a way as will be for the glory of God and your own advancement in religious knowledge.

The first thing said by the gentleman in his last speech that we have noted was, that such as reached the kingdom of glory upon our plan (if any did), would not be permitted to enjoy that degree or weight of glory that those will who are engaged all their lives in the performance of good works, and seeking after the well-being of the race. Now, all the answer we feel disposed to make to such a contemptible idea as this, is simply this: If we can be so happy as to reach the kingdom at all, and be admitted to the feet of my dear Redeemer, we ask no more; for sure it is, we feel that this is more than we have ever merited; and should we be so happy as to reach that holy place, it will be by grace alone, and if there will be a debtor to free grace admitted into the presence of Jesus, surely I shall be the very man. But my friend is still under the law, working for life,

and in the end he will find there is no life in the law— that he has worked all his lifetime in vain; for had there been a law given that could have given life, then, verily, righteousness would have been by the law. But if my friend is ever saved, he must be saved in some other way. But he tells us that he knows nothing about any religion, only what he has learned in the Bible, and by that book he knows that he is a Christian. Well, we can say truly that we are sorry for the gentleman, for most assuredly God's people know more than the written word has ever taught them, and yet what they have been taught by the spirit of God, does not contradict what is revealed in the written word, but confirms it. We would inform our friend, that the saints of God have the witness in themselves, to wit: the spirit of God bearing witness with our spirits that we are the children of God. Hence, he that is born of God hath the witness in himself, not in the "written word, out in himself, and he that hath not this witness is a stranger to the new birth, and knows not what it is to be born again, while he that has this witness in himself loves God supremely and his children sincerely, and love is the fulfilling of the law, &c.

But the gentleman says they must and they will have money. Well, we read in the Bible of some who said they could not dig, and were ashamed to beg, but modern money beggars have lost the shame of their ancient brethren. Indeed, we think some of our Modern would-be deceivers would make the devil ashamed, if he had any shame in him; but he and his servants are much alike— neither of them can be made ashamed by giving them money. But we also read of a certain set that taught for hire and divined for money. Well, who were they? They were such as build up Zion with blood and Jerusalem with iniquity. Micah, 3d chap. 10th and 11th verses. This is the character of those who anciently preached for money, and we believe it is their brethren who are now selling themselves to the highest bidder; for, say they, money we must have, and money we will have. And for what? What do those pious money-beggars give in exchange for money. If you will allow us to judge, we will say a mess of pharisaical works that sheep would starve

to death on. We think the people would be far better off without such preaching, and had better pay their money for something more substantial.

But the gentleman complained in his last speech because we had not replied to more of his quotations. In answer to this complaint, we say that we replied to every text introduced by him that in any way referred to the subject before us; the others I did not, because there was no necessity for it. And be it now remembered, that in all the Scriptures introduced by the gentleman, there is not one word said about apostacy, or the saints of God being finally lost; while we have introduced a number that declare positively, that they shall never perish; that they shall not come into condemnation. We hope the audience will not forget this important fact, that Mr. Franklin has not attempted a reply to one of those pointed proofs. We hope, also, that you will remember our argument founded upon the fact that those born of God partake of the nature and substance of God their Father, and as such, cannot possibly be finally lost, unless it could be proven that the Deity himself would have to suffer. To this argument we have had no reply. We wish this argument to be remembered, for to our mind it is conclusive, and proves beyond a doubt the utter impossibility of the children of God falling from grace, or being finally lost. But this is not all. Before this doctrine can be successfully proven, we must set aside the testimony of the prophets, of the apostles, and of Jesus Christ himself. This is clear to every unprejudiced mind, and cannot be successfully denied.

We now refer you to the enunciation of Jehovah by his servant Isaiah, which has already been introduced. Hear it: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise up against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn." Now let us read to suit Elder Franklin, "Some weapons that are formed against thee may prosper, and some tongues that rise up in judgment against thee may condemn thee." Now we ask, is it not a plain case, that Mr. Franklin contradicts the Prophet Isaiah? Well, Jeremiah says, or rather the Lord by him, "I will forgive their iniquities, and *I will remember*

*their sins no more.*" Mr. Franklin says God will remember their sins, and so remember them that he will wish them forever. Hence you see that the views of Elder Franklin are antagonistic to the express declaration of Jehovah himself. But this is not all. The Apostle says that the life of the saint is hid with Christ in God, and when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory. Mr. Franklin says if they do not work to the end, they shall not appear with him in glory, but will be finally lost. The Apostle says, moreover, that he is persuaded that "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Here the Apostle has searched heaven, earth, and hell, and all the powers and creatures that are in them, and says positively that they all shall not be able to separate us from the love of God. But hush, says Mr. Franklin; this is all wrong. If you do not hold out faithful, and work to the end, you shall go to hell, and suffer eternally. Hence you see how much respect my friend has for the holy truths delivered by the Apostle.

We now ask you to listen to the adorable Jesus himself, who declares emphatically, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." But hear him further: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him "that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." We now ask, could language be plainer or more pointed than that which is here expressed by the Lord of life and glory himself? And yet, notwithstanding all this, we have a learned gentleman here from the Queen City of the West, who has the unblushing effrontery to give our dear Redeemer the lie; for, says he, they may perish—they may come into condemnation—they may be finally lost, when Jesus says they shall never perish—they shall not come into condemnation. O, what comfort and consolation to the way-worn pilgrim here—that poor tempest-tossed child of Jesus, who, under a deep sense of his own unworthiness, is full of doubts and

fears, sorrows and sore trials—when he hears his blessed Savior say, "They shall never perish; they shall not come into condemnation." "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee; because I live, ye shall live also." These glorious and soul-cheering promises impart new life to the soul, and so invigorate the mind of the little saint, that he is enabled to rejoice with a joy that is unspeakable and altogether full of glory. Ah, says the dear child of the kingdom, "though I pass through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; though deep sorrows encompass me around at almost every step, yet no evil shall befall me, for I have the promise of my dear Jesus that he will never leave me nor forsake me, and to be with Jesus is to be safe and to be in heaven."

Now you know, my audience, that Elder Franklin has not introduced any such pointed testimony as this, but his whole effort has been founded upon inferential testimony, while his whole arguments have been so directed as to arouse the fears of all those who believe the doctrine he advocates. Hence, those persons perform their service under the influence of a slavish fear; and we learn in the Bible that fear hath torment, while he that feareth is not made perfect in law, for perfect love casteth out fear. The saints of the Lord love, serve, and obey him, because he first loved them. They are influenced to obedience from a principle of filial fear, which arises from affection, and makes the child afraid to disobey God its Father, or incurs divine displeasure. Hence, their fear is influenced by love, while those who are afraid their God will desert them in the trying hour; are all the while under the lash, and, like the slave, are afraid if they do not work, and work till death, that their Heavenly Father will send them to torment. Now, if you can but convince the child of God that he is a Christian: that his Heavenly Father does love him, and he has no fears that He will punish him— no, verily—he knows He is unchangeable, and what He loves once He loves to the end. He therefore has no fears that because he sometimes commits errors and wrongs, that his God will forsake him, and send him down to hell. He knows He will sorely chastise him when he violates His holy commandments, but he also knows that He chastises



in mercy, and that, in the end it will work for his own good, and the declarative glory of His great name. This is the influence under which the saints of the Most High are led to obey Him, and to endeavor to walk in all His ordinances and commands, blameless; and with boldness and confidence such persons can approach their Father, having His blessed promise that He will never leave nor forsake them.

We have not at any time, in all our lives, been able to see what comfort there was to a Christian, in believing the doctrine of falling from grace. Indeed, we do not believe that Christians can take comfort in it, for they are so sensible of their own weakness and inability, that they know most assuredly that if their eternal salvation depended upon their good performances, they would truly be forever lost. Hence, if they could be persuaded to believe in the doctrine of apostacy, they would be miserable just as long as they believed it; but properly taught saints know better, and their great consolation consists in believing that they are not their own keeper, but that they are kept by the power of Him whose ways are in the deep, who saith to the troubled ocean, "Be still," and there is a great calm. They remember that this Almighty Jehovah, in whom they trust, has said in his holy word, that he has appointed salvation for walls and for bulwarks round about Zion, and they believe this Zion to be the city of the living God, where he himself deigns to dwell. They remember also that He has said, that underneath, are the everlasting arms which uphold the weak and trembling child; and they also remember, that it is written that He feeds His flock like a shepherd, gathers the lambs within His arms, and carries them in His bosom; and that, being thus in the embrace of their dear Redeemer, they feel safe, and with the inspired Apostle can say boldly and yet meekly, "The Lord is my helper; I will not, fear what man can do unto me."

We hope, dear friends, that you will remember our argument, that no parent who loves his offspring will disinherit them simply because they have, in some instances, disobeyed him, and especially when the parent possesses the power to influence the child to a better, course, and

give him a disposition to love, reverence, and obey him. Well, all this is true with regard to our Heavenly Father. He will not disown his children because they sometimes disobey him, but he will, by the influence of his Holy Spirit, direct them in a better course, and influence them to love, serve, and obey him.

There is one more argument which we introduced, that we hope you will remember, and that is, we showed you in a former speech, that whatever might be the course of disobedience pursued by the child, it could by no means destroy the relationship between the parent and child; and that, should the child be guilty of a violation of the penal laws of the State, for which violation death was the penalty, nevertheless, the relationship remains the same, and, could the parent save his child under those circumstances, he would most assuredly do so. Well, if earthly parents thus love their children—their own offspring— how much more does our Heavenly Father love his children—his own offspring! Now, to neither of those arguments did our friend reply. And why did he not? The reason is obvious: there could be no sensible reply made to them, for they are unanswerable. We therefore remark, in conclusion, in our old fashioned style, that notwithstanding the saints of God are in this wilderness of sin, surrounded with temptation, sorrow, and pain, having many foes mighty and strong to contend against, yet in the end of all their sufferings, toils, and pains, they will be brought off more than conquerors, through him that loved them and gave himself for them. Hold up your heads, then, ye redeemed of the Lord, a few days longer; be faithful until death. Let the world say what they may, they cannot say worse of you than they that, said of your dear Redeemer, for they called him a glutton, a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners, and, worse than all, they called him a devil. Well, says Jesus, if they did these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? and if they called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more they of his household? The great matter with us, dear brethren and sisters, should be to give the enemy no just grounds to speak reproachfully of us, and then, if your names are cast out as evil, re-

joyce and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven. But let us live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace. Yes, dear friends, let us endeavor to let our light so shine before men, that they may see our good works, and glorify our Father which is in heaven; and by this means we will adorn the doctrine of God our Savior, in all things, and show forth the praises of Him who has called us from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. And let me say to you, that you will not have to suffer much longer until your dear Redeemer will say, It is enough; come up higher; enter thou into the joys of thy Lord. Then, and not till then, shall the saints of the Most High enter into the full enjoyment of that rest that remains for the people of God; there the wicked shall cease from troubling, and the weary will be forever at rest. Yes, they shall then come from the East and West, from the North and from the South, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God their Father, there to enjoy His smiles world without end.

We now accept the gentleman's challenge given yesterday evening, allowing him his own-time in the year, and any number of days from four to twenty, and if we live if we will meet him; and if we do not, some of our brethren will. [Here Mr. Franklin objected, on account of the distance and consequent expense.] We will say to the gentleman, and audience, that we will entirely obviate this difficulty, for we pledge our honor as a gentleman that we will defray all necessary expenses, both to and from our self. [The gentleman was now silent.] Well, we told the audience, yesterday, that we had heard such boasting before, and that it was done for special effect. We now commend you to God and the word of His grace, which we know is alone able to save you.

Time expired.