DEBATE ON SALVATION

IS IT CONDITIONAL OR UNCONDITIONAL?

BETWEEN

T. S. DALTON (Baptist)

AND

T. R. BURNETT (Disciple).

NASHVILLE, TENN.:
GOSPEL ADVOCATE PUBLISHING COMPANY.
1897.

PREFACE.

This debate was held at Alexander, Erath County, Texas, beginning January 18, 1886, and continued four days and nights. Elder N. W. Little was Mr. Dalton's moderator; C. M. Wilmeth was Mr. Burnett's. Rev. Mr. Gaston was chosen President Moderator. The seven rules from "Hedge's Logic," governing public discussions, were read, and the proposition for discussion was then read:

"The Scriptures teach that the heirs of salvation and eternal life were by the God of heaven unconditionally elected or chosen thereunto, independent of the performance of conditions by man."

The President Moderator then introduced Elder T. S. Dalton to the congregation.

DALTON-BURNETT DEBATE.

MR. DALTON'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I feel myself happy this morning for the privilege we enjoy of meeting here with this friendly and hospitable people of Alexander, for a mutual and friendly investigation of the doctrinal differences existing between our two respective denominations, and I feel that I am honored with the privilege of investigating these points with a man of honor and ability; and I trust that each of us has a due regard for truth, and for each other as gentlemen and as brethren (at least of the common stock of Adam). Therefore we feel sure that good, and no evil, will grow out of this discussion. First, I define the terms of my proposition. By the Scriptures we mean the Old and New Testaments. We mean by "they teach" that they say it, either in the precise terms or terms necessarily conveying the idea. What we mean by heirs of salvation or eternal life are those that shall be so fortunate as to finally reach the climes of glory. What we mean by unconditional is that the person does nothing, either good or bad, to influence God to elect him or choose him. Is this satisfactory, Brother Burnett? ["Yes, sir."] Now, my congregation, we have agreed on the terms of the proposition. Now, the burden of proof rests upon me; and were it not that I know the Scriptures say it, I should quake and tremble; but as it is, I rejoice that it falls to my lot to vindicate God's eternal truth.

We wish, first, to rivet on the minds of this audience that nothing comes up in the history of the world that is new with God; for Acts 15: 18 says: "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." Also in Job 23: 13: "But he is in one mind, and who can turn him? and what his soul desireth, even that he doeth." Hence whatever God does, he does sovereignly, and does because it was his mind and purpose to do it; and whatever is God's mind now has been his mind from all eternity, for he is "in one mind." But perhaps Brother Burnett will say: "This is all true, but how does God do it unconditionally?" We have affirmed that he does; now let us prove it. Our first argument is: "It is unconditional because it is not of works;" in proof of which we invite your attention to Rom. 11: 1-7: "I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work. What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded." Now, my friends, I call you to witness this day that Paul here positively

affirms that this election is of grace, and not of works; therefore it must of necessity be unconditional, and this must forever settle this question. But Brother Burnett will try to make it appear that Paul had reference to works under the legal dispensation, but I call upon you to witness that Paul referred back to those ancient worthies, and then leaves them and comes up to the date in which he lived, and said there was yet a remnant according to grace and not of works. Therefore the question is settled that God's people are elected without the performance of conditions on their part.

And again, Rom. 9: 11-13: "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Now Brother Burnett may try to make the impression on your minds that God never hated Esau until he laid his mountains and his heritage waste, but this has no bearing on the point at issue. The text says that the election was not of works, but of him that calleth; therefore must have been unconditional.

Our next proof-text is 2 Tim. 1: 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."

This text shows us that the heirs of salvation and eternal life were embraced in God's purpose before the world began, and also that there was grace given them in Christ Jesus before they had being actually; and the other texts we have quoted show that God's people, or the heirs, were chosen in Christ in consequence of

that grace, and not on account of their acts either good or bad; and in Eph. 1: 3, 4: "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, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." Here we have the plain statement that this election or choice took place before the foundation of the world; and Paul says it is of grace, and not of works. Well may he say it, for none of us had being before the world to do these works; therefore of necessity it must be unconditional. Now Brother Burnett has one of three things to do—that is to prove that Paul has not told the truth, or that these passages are wrongly translated, or else that he and his brethren existed before the foundation of the world to perform conditions in order to their election; otherwise my proposition stands sustained. Now I want you to watch him closely, ladies and gentlemen; see how he will quirk and twist, to try to do away with the force of these plain declarations of God's word.

My second argument is: "It is unconditional because faith is the result of election, and not the cause." In proof of this we call your attention 1 Pet. 1: 1, 2: "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." From this I show that God's people were elected, agreeable with the foreknowledge of God, and unto the obedience of Christ, and not our obedience; for the grammatical construction of this text shows that we were elected to the obedience and

the sprinkling of Christ's blood. Now Brother Burnett, I have no doubt, will endeavor to make the impression on your minds that this obedience is ours, and sprinkling of the blood is Christ's; but the grammar of the text shows clearly that the obedience, as well as the sprinkling of the blood, is Christ's; therefore must be unconditional on our part, for we are elected to Christ's obedience.

Our next proof-text is Acts 13: 48: "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." From this we have a clear statement that ordination came first, and belief comes in as the result, or follows after; therefore belief cannot be the condition or cause of ordination, but must of necessity be the result of it. Therefore ordination or election is unconditional. Brother Burnett, I have no doubt, will try to make you believe that this is a wrong translation, and he will tell you that it should read, "as many as were disposed to have eternal life believed." I will therefore forstall you that this word "ordained" is translated from the word *tetagmenoi*, which is defined by Liddell and Scott, "To set in order regularly;" hence to change the verbage of the text to read, "As many as God set in order regularly to eternal life believed," would not change the meaning that we give it one whit, but, if possible, would make it stronger. Therefore our proposition is sustained until Brother Burnett shows that these texts do not mean what we say they do; and we know full well that he can never do that.

Our next proof-text is John 15: 16: "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of

the Father in my name, he may give it you." From this text we show that their bringing forth fruit was not the condition of the choice, but the result of it. Jesus chose them that they should bring forth fruit, and not because they did do it. Therefore the choice was unconditional on their part.

Our next proof-text is Isa. 43: 19-21: "Behold, I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth; shall ye not know it? I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert. The beast of the field shall honor me, the dragons and the owls: because I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen. This people have I formed for myself; they shall show forth my praise." From this text I show that they showed forth God's praise because he had formed them to that end, and not in order to get God to form them. They were his chosen before they showed forth his praise; therefore their choice was not conditioned on their actions, but alone upon the mercy and grace of God. Unconditional upon the part of man is just what my proposition says, and I am willing to risk the matter just here, and give Brother Burnett the balance of the day, if he wants it, provided he will show us that these texts do not mean what they say. If they mean what they say, my proposition is sustained. I hope he will do his best on these, and we will give him more.

We call your attention next to Psalm 65:4: "Blessed is the man whom thou choosest, and causest to approach unto thee," etc. Here David shows conclusively that coming to the Lord is not the condition of the choice; for God chooses first, and then causes them to approach to him. Again, John 10: 16: "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice," etc. This

shows that Jesus is going to bring them; therefore their coming is not the cause of their being his sheep, neither the condition by which they become his, but he brings them because they are his elect or chosen sheep. Again, Isa. 48: 10, 11: "Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver; I have chosen thee, in the furnace of affliction. For mine own sake, even for mine own sake, will I do it: for how should my name be polluted? and I will not give my glory unto another." Here the Lord says he chose them for his own sake, and not because they were so good and obedient, and he declares that he will not give his glory to another, but he takes it all to himself. Therefore what God did for us he did it because it was his will and pleasure to do it, and not because of any good foreseen or otherwise in us. Again, Jer. 1: 5: "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." Here God said he sanctified Jeremiah, or elected him, before he was born; therefore the prophet did not exist to perform conditions, and his election must have been unconditional. We trust that Brother Burnett will make some disposition of these things; a mere shuffling put-off will not do. [Time out.]

MR. BURNETT'S FIRST REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I appear before you to present the negative of the proposition under discussion. That system of interpretation is the correct one that harmonizes all the passages, and no system can be correct that sets one text of scripture against another, and makes the Bible a con-

tradiction. I deny the proposition read before you, because it is in direct conflict with hundreds of plain scriptural statements. If Elder Dalton's theory be true, then I am a skeptic, for I know the Bible is a self-contradiction.

My opponent spent some time in proving what needed no proof and what is not denied, but failed to furnish proof on the precise point where proof is demanded. He needed not to prove that God foreknows all things, or that God is immutable, or that God has a purpose, or that God is a sovereign, or that salvation is of grace; for these things are not denied. But he should have shown that the salvation which is according to the foreknowledge and purpose and grace of God is received by man independent of any condition to be performed by him. All of us believe that salvation is by grace, but grace may be conditional. The purpose of God may be conditional. A gift may be conditional. Hence it can be seen that Elder Dalton has not produced proof on the point where proof is demanded.

I said that his theory was in direct conflict with many statements of the Scriptures. I will now read you a passage in the first book of the New Testament, and one in the last book of the New Testament, in confirmation of my assertion: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. . . . Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it." (Matt. 7: 21-27.) "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." (Rev. 22: 14.)

These scriptures are in direct antagonism with the proposition in debate—as much so as words can make them—and the proposition is therefore not true. Entrance into the kingdom is made conditional upon doing the will of the Father, and the right to the tree of life is made conditional upon doing the commandments. If Elder Dalton's theory were true, the text in Matthew would read: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, nor he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven; but he that was unconditionally elected thereunto before the foundation of the world. Therefore whosoever is unconditionally elected to salvation, I will liken him unto a wise man, whether he hears and does these sayings of mine or not." The text in Revelation would read: "Blessed are they that were unconditionally elected to salvation before the world began, that they might have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city." I have quoted these two passages from the first and last books of the New Testament as an earnest of what I have in store for my friend, and I have a hundred more between the two that literally destroy his proposition.

But I must give attention to some of his proof-texts. Elder Dalton quotes Rom. 11: 1-7: "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then is it no

more of works." If this had said that there is a remnant according to the unconditional election of grace, and that the works referred to are the conditions required in the gospel in order to salvation, the proof-text would be worth quoting; but, as it does not read that way, it is worth nothing to my friend's proposition. Let us suppose that Elder Dalton is correct, and that the works here referred to as opposed to grace are not legal works or human works outside of the gospel, but faith, repentance, baptism, and the good deeds required in the Christian life. Then how easy it is to place Paul and Peter in conflict! Peter says: "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." (Acts 10: 34, 35.) Paul, as interpreted by Elder Dalton, says that it is of election and grace, and not of fear or any kind of works that we can do, that we are accepted with him. Paul and Peter are in direct conflict, and the Bible is not true. This establishes my charge at the outset that this unconditional doctrine destroys the Bible and makes infidelity. Simon Peter was not a Baptist, and did not believe my friend's hard doctrine. He had formerly held to the doctrine that God was a respecter of persons, and that the Gentiles were unclean reprobates; but the vision upon the housetop cured him of that delusion, and he said: "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons." It also taught him that fearing God and working righteousness had something to do with the acceptance. I advise my opponent to get upon the housetop and obtain a vision from heaven, or read the New Testament and learn from Peter's vision. Baptists have a great many visions that do not teach them half as much gospel as they could learn from this vision of Peter.

Brother Dalton quotes Rom. 9: 11-13—the case of Esau and Jacob. I wonder if he thinks this was a case of election to salvation and eternal life? There is not a word about salvation or eternal life in it, and it therefore proves nothing for the proposition. He next quotes 2 Tim. 1: 9: "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." This text proves nothing for the proposition, inasmuch as none of us believe that God calls and saves sinners according to their works which they do before they are called. But if my friend thinks that God calls and chooses persons to salvation, "independent of conditions performed by man," I will read him Paul's statement to the Thessalonians: "But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth: whereunto he called you by our gospel." (2 Thess. 2: 13, 14.) God chooses or elects persons in accordance with his purpose and grace, and from the beginning, but not independent of conditions. He chooses to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. Belief of the truth is a condition performed by man. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." This settles the question.

He next quotes Eph. 1: 4, 5: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ." I have already shown how God chooses to salvation through belief of the truth, and have only to explain how he predestinated them

" unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ." This is easy. Read Gal. 3: 26: " For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." They were the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, and not independent of conditions performed by them. So this text furnishes no proof to my friend's proposition.

He next quotes 1 Pet. 1: 2: " Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." He says the election is according to the foreknowledge of God, and unto Christ's obedience, and is therefore unconditional. It does not follow. The election of the strangers scattered abroad was undoubtedly just like that of the Thessalonians, and theirs was " through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," and not unconditional. So this text proves nothing, and must be given up. A candidate for Governor is elected according to the constitution through the votes of the people. Is he elected before he receives the votes? The Thessalonians were elected or chosen through belief of the truth. Were they chosen before they had the belief? If election caused their faith, how were they elected through faith? Here is work for more than a day for Brother Dalton. The idea that election causes faith is in conflict with the spirit of the gospel. Christ says: " He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed." Because what? Because he hath not believed. But faith is produced by election, and God failed to elect him, and he cannot elect himself. How is he condemned?

My opponent next comes to Acts 13: 48: "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed." The word " ordained " should be " disposed," and is so rendered by Wilson and others. If these persons were first unconditionally ordained to eternal life, and then believed, what goes with the statement of Paul, " He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him? " (Heb. 5: 9.) And why did Paul preach to some in this same chapter (Acts 13) who were not " disposed to eternal life " that " through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses? " And why did he say, a little farther on, " But seeing you put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles? " This does not suit the unconditional gospel. Paul should have said: " But, seeing you belong to the reprobate class, and God did not judge you worthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles who were elected." So away goes this proof-text.

The calling of the Apostles, in John 15: 15, has nothing to do with the proposition, and I will let it go without reply; also the quotations from Isaiah and Psalms. The bringing of the sheep that were not of this fold, " because they were sheep " (John 10: 15), does not prove that they were made sheep unconditionally, and proves nothing for the proposition.

I have noticed all of Elder Dalton's proof-texts, and shown that not one of them teaches unconditional election to salvation. I now have one hundred texts that I could quote which flatly contradict his proposition. I have time for but a few. Jesus said: " He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 16.) Also: " God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3: 16.) Also: " He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned al-

ready, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John 3: 18.) Also: "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." (John 8: 24.) Paul said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Acts 16: 31.) Peter said: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (Acts 2: 38.) In these texts faith, repentance, and baptism are made conditions of salvation and eternal life, and they are acts performed by man. Therefore Elder Dalton's proposition is not true.

MR. DALTON'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you again to pursue my line of argument in favor of the proposition which has been read in your hearing. But, before I proceed further with the subject, courtesy demands that I should examine the negative proofs presented by my opponent; and I feel so sure that this congregation has been able to discern his utter failure to notice my arguments that it would be wholly unnecessary for me to while away time to call your attention to it. He tries to make it appear that I have spent a great deal of time proving what needed no proof, which is true. The doctrine of unconditional election needs no further proof than is given by Jesus Christ and his apostles, and were it not for such men as Brother Burnett, it never would have been denied, therefore would not have needed to be proven; but there have ever been opposers of the truth, therefore we have to continue to prove it. But we will give him proof enough before he is done with us.

Before we proceed further, we want you to notice his grand argument on Rom. 9: 11-13. He says: "I wonder if he thinks this was a case of election to eternal life? There is not a word about salvation or eternal life in it, and it therefore proves nothing for the proposition."

We feel sure if we were to present such an argument as that our brethren would dismiss us and tell us to go home. Paul says in this that the "election is not of works, but of him that calleth," therefore unconditional. Brother Burnett proposed to show us that salvation or eternal life was of grace, and yet conditional on our part; and of course he proposes to prove that faith, being the condition, is the act of the creature. Paul says: "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves." Is it not a little strange that Paul would say "not of yourselves" if he designed to teach that faith was the act of the creature? We are surprised at Brother Burnett for using such proof. Paul says faith is the fruit of the Spirit, and again he says Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith; and if Paul told the truth, Brother Burnett has not; and now, my friends, it is for us to say which we will believe—Paul or Burnett. He quotes, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness," and says that here belief is the condition; therefore salvation is of grace, and yet conditional. He quoted several other texts trying to prove that faith was the condition of salvation, but all of them are answered by the same argument. The Bible says faith is the gift of God; Brother Burnett says it is the act of the creature. Being the gift of God, it cannot therefore be the condition of salvation or election. We must confess that we were surprised that Brother Burnett would quote Peter's language (Acts 10) to prove that salvation was condi-

tional. He says: "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." If he had just said, "He that will fear God and work righteousness will be accepted with him," then Brother Burnett would have had a case in point; but Peter failed to say that. He said: "He that feareth and worketh is accepted." Therefore his fearing God and working righteousness is an evidence that he is accepted, and not the cause of his being accepted, therefore not conditions at all. Brother Burnett, you will have to get up something better than that, and I am confident that your brethren expect you to do better than that. Now, if you have got anything, for the Lord's sake, and for the sake of your sinking cause, let us have it.

No, Brother Burnett, Peter and Paul do not conflict; for Paul shows that salvation and election are not of works, and Peter shows that the good works follow after salvation and election, and are only the evidences of salvation, and not the cause or condition of it. Therefore there is no conflict, but perfect harmony throughout the entire Bible.

Brother Burnett says: "When Paul said not of works, he meant works under the legal dispensation." How do you know, Brother Burnett? Paul never said so. Paul said "not of works;" therefore it does not matter what kind of works you may try to ring in, Paul still confronts you, and says, "not of works, but of him that calleth."

He then comes to the wise man that built his house on the rock, and the foolish man that built his house on the sand. The whole of this Sermon on the Mount was to the disciples, and no part of it to ungodly sinners; therefore when Jesus spoke of the wise man, he

meant the wise Christian, or saint, that obeyed the commands of the Lord and thereby built on the rock, and all the raging storms of life can never move his house. The other was the foolish Christian, or saint, that refused to obey his Lord, and built on a sandy foundation; and when the storms began to beat, his house fell—not the man, but the house. He therefore suffered loss, but he himself was saved, so as by fire.

Brother Burnett then proposes to notice Acts 13: 48, "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed," etc., and says that the word "ordained" should have been translated "disposed," and should read, "As many as were disposed to eternal life believed." Now remember, my friends, we called your attention to this, and told you he would say this should be the rendering of the word. Now Liddell and Scott are acknowledged by the literary world to be good authority, standard authors, and they say the rendering is: "As many as God set in order regularly to eternal life believed." Now the only question is which shall we accept—Liddell and Scott or Brother Burnett. My mind is made up: I shall accept Liddell and Scott, for they were not as hard pressed when they defined the word as Brother Burnett is, therefore were better prepared to give an impartial decision.

Brother Burnett then comes to Peter: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." He says this obedience is ours, and goes to 1 Thess. 2: 13 to prove it; but the grammar of this text is that we are elected to the obedience of Christ and the sprinkling of the blood of Christ; and you know it, Brother Burnett. But he is compelled to deny the Bible or his theory, and he therefore prefers to deny the Bible.

Now, my friends, did you notice his dodge on Eph. 1: 4, 5? He says: "This election and predestination could not be unconditional, because the same writer says in Gal. 3: 26: 'Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.'" Wonder! O, heavens! How does this prove that what Paul said to the Ephesians was conditional? Why, I believe, Brother Burnett, that we are children of God by faith in Christ, and I believe also that God predestinated us to the adoption of children unconditionally. God predestinated that we should be adopted through faith in Christ; yet faith is not the condition but the evidence that gives us knowledge of our heirship through Christ. Therefore Paul says: "Faith is the evidence of things not seen."

"Not of works," in 2 Tim. 1: 9, means not according to a plan which we fixed, but one that God fixed for us to obey. When Paul says "not of works," Brother Burnett says it is of works. We wonder what will be the next.

Brother Burnett quotes: "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed." Of course every unbeliever is condemned, but why is he condemned? Just because he will not believe? O, no; he is condemned because he has violated the law of God, and his unbelief only evidences that he is in a state of condemnation, and is not the cause of it. If he was not in a condemned state, therefore he is an unbeliever.

We have followed him through his argument. We will now proceed with our line, but first let us ask: Why did he not notice John 15: 15; 10: 14; Isa. 43: 19-21; Ps. 65: 4; Isa. 48: 10, 11; Jer. 1: 5? Just because he could not. They therefore stand out before him like an impregnable wall, and his brethren

will expect him to notice them, but they will expect in vain; for he cannot, and Brother Burnett knows it.

We will next call your attention to 1 Pet. 2: 9: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." From this we show that these people did not show forth the praise of God in order to become the chosen generation, but they showed forth God's praise because they were the chosen or elected of God, therefore not conditional.

We call attention next to James 2: 5: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?" You will perceive, my friends, that God did not promise these things on condition that they would love him, but he promised it to those that do love him. Therefore love to God is not the cause or condition of the choice, but the result of it; therefore unconditional.

We call your attention next to John 6: 37-39: "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." Here the Lord positively says his Father gave him his people, and he affirms that they shall, every one, come to him, and does not say a word about the conditions that they are about to perform; and we presume that if Jesus had intended for us to perform conditions in order that he should raise us up at the last day he would have said something about it, and not left us in the dark on the subject.

We next come to Rom. 8: 28-30: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified," etc. All of this Paul affirms that the Lord did for us, and no conditions either spoken of or implied; therefore for us to conclude that God intended for us to perform certain conditions in order that we be predestinated, called, justified, and glorified, is an unfounded presumption, to say the least of it.

We trust that Brother Burnett will give these things a scanning notice, at least.

MR. BURNETT'S SECOND REPLY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is quite apparent to all of you that it cannot be said of this debate, "not of works." My opponent has given up the idea that his proposition can be established without work, and human work at that, and a good deal of it. He works harder than any man I ever saw, to have no faith in works; but, no matter how hard he works, his doctrine is predestinated to unconditional overthrow, unless the Bible is false. He has come a thousand miles to prove what he says needs no proof, except among persons who oppose the truth; and how has he proved it? By flatly running over a score of plain texts of scripture, and making utter nonsense out of them.

The first point in his rejoinder is the reference to the case of Esau and Jacob, and he wants my brethren to dismiss me because I met his argument here by saying that it was not an election to salvation or eternal life. I am very sure that if I knew so little about the Bible as to suppose that this case had any bearing upon the proposition under discussion, my brethren would dismiss me from the debate. What is the proposition under discussion? It is the election to salvation and eternal life. Was Jacob elected to salvation or eternal life? What has the election of Jacob to be the father of the twelve tribes to do with the proposition we are debating? Nothing. Now, if I were these Baptist brethren, I would send Elder Dalton back to Tennessee. To suit his doctrine the passage should read: "For the children, being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to unconditional election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto her, The elder shall be unconditionally reprobated to eternal damnation, and the younger shall be saved."

To meet my argument that salvation is by grace, but not unconditional, because it is through faith, he says faith is the gift of God, and not an act performed by man, and perverts Paul's language to prove it. Paul says: "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that [salvation] not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Paul never said faith is the gift of God. The pronoun "that" in the sentence does not refer to faith as its antecedent, for they are not of the same gender (in Greek), and pronouns must agree with their antecedents in gender. The pronoun *touto* ("that") is neuter gender, while *pisteos* ("faith") is feminine gender. If Brother Dalton would study grammar, he would not make such blunders. But suppose he is correct, and

that Paul meant to teach that faith is the gift of God, and not an act performed by man, then how foolishly the apostle talked to the jailer at Philippi! The jailer asked: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" The apostle answered: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." If Brother Dalton had been there, he would have said: "Hold on, Brother Paul; you have given that man the wrong answer. He asked what he must do, and you know faith is not something man has to do." Paul would have doubtless answered: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." Which will you believe—Paul or Dalton?

But my opponent runs off to the spiritual gifts, in 1 Cor. 12: 8-10, where it is said: "To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy." Do you not know, Brother Dalton, that this has reference to the miraculous gifts in the church at Corinth, and not to the faith that saves the sinner? Well, if you had read the first verse of the chapter, it would have informed you: "Now, concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." The faith here given was not given to all, but to a specified few. If it were the faith through which we are saved, it would have been given to all the Corinthians, for they were all saved. "To one [not all] is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another [not all] . . . faith by the same Spirit." So my position stands. Elder Dalton has not touched it. Salvation is by grace, but it is through faith; and faith is something man has to do (see case of jailer above), and "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness," and "by faith we have access into this grace." Is not the case made out?

He next comes to Acts 10: 34, 35, where Peter says, "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him," and says that as "is accepted" is present tense, the acceptance is before the fearing and working. He overlooked the fact that all the verbs are in the present tense, and that Peter placed them in the order in which they belong—fearing, working, accepting. Brother Dalton displaces Peter's order, and puts it: Accepting, fearing, working. Which will you take—Peter or Dalton? Brother Dalton ought to be grammarian enough to know that the present tense does not reach back to the foundation of the world. If I should say, "He that receiveth the votes is elected Governor," would you say that the election is before the receiving of the votes? You will have to say that if you accept the astonishing criticism of my learned friend from Tennessee. Here it is:

He that feareth him is accepted.

He that receiveth the votes is elected.

He claims that the person who fears and works was accepted before the foundation of the world, because the verb "is accepted" is in the present tense. This would be a good place to put in my friend's pious exclamation: "Great heavens!" To suit your doctrine, Brother Dalton, this passage would have to read: "I perceive that God is a respecter of persons, for in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness was accepted with him before the foundation of the world, and can't help it, while all the rest of mankind are left out in the cold." You will have to get a better vision from the housetop than that, my friend, or your proposition is gone, world without end.

If all who fear and work have been unconditionally accepted from the foundation of the world, how could Peter perceive from that that God is no respecter of persons? It teaches exactly the opposite—that God is a respecter of persons—and an uninspired man can perceive it. But, if in every nation he that feareth and worketh is upon those conditions accepted of God, it shows that God is no respecter of persons, and that is exactly what it showed Peter. If this intelligent audience cannot "perceive" that Elder Dalton has utterly failed to meet my argument here, then some people are unconditionally predestinated to stupidity. He has not met it, and he cannot meet it. But he says that if the verb "is accepted" were future tense, and read, "shall be accepted," it would prove my position. I gave him a verb in the future tense in the case of the jailer: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Does he accept that? Does he not say that the jailer was saved before the foundation of the world? He reverses Paul, as well as Peter, and says the jailer was saved before he believed.

He next comes to the wise man who built his house on the rock, and the foolish man who built his house on the sand, and says this whole chapter was addressed to the disciples of Christ, and that the wise man is the wise Christian man, and the foolish man is the foolish Christian man. Well, that does not alter the question in the least. Brother Dalton and I are discussing the conditions of salvation, both present and future. If the kingdom here referred to (Matt. 7) is the eternal kingdom, then "he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" shall enter into that kingdom, and Brother Dalton's proposition is gone. The persons referred to were not in the kingdom referred to, and doing the will of the Father gave them entrance

into it. The verb is in the future tense also. He that doeth the will (present tense) shall enter in (future tense). Here is grammar for you, Brother Dalton. But was not that a grand dodge my friend took on the falling of the house that was built on the sand? The house fell, but the man was saved. When the floods came and the winds blew, the house went down, but the man got out and swam ashore. Well, the Book is utterly silent as to the salvation of the man in the house on the sand, and where the Bible is silent you should be silent, Brother Dalton. You should not add anything to the Book—even to save the precious, sweet old doctrine of election and predestination.

He next comes to Acts 13: 48, "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed," and says Liddell and Scott do not define the word to mean "disposed." No, but other lexicons do, and I showed that that definition was the only one that would harmonize the teaching of the whole chapter. Why did not Brother Dalton notice what I said on the 38th and 46th verses of the chapter? He jumped clean over that. In the 48th verse it is said, "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed;" and Brother Dalton says this included all that could be saved in that place, for it says, "as many as were ordained," and none but the ordained could be saved. Now, pray tell me why Paul preached to the reprobate Jews in that place, who were not disposed to eternal life, and said, "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 13: 38, 39); and "seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles" (Acts 13: 46). Why

did Brother Dalton skip this argument? He had no answer for it. To suit his doctrine Paul should have said: "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that I cannot preach unto you the forgiveness of sins, nor offer justification to all them that believe, for ye are not ordained; but, seeing that God put it from you, and judged you unworthy of everlasting life, lo, I turn to the Gentiles who were ordained." Here would be a good place to put in another pious ejaculation: "Now if you have got anything, for the Lord's sake let us have it." I know these old Baptist brethren want something better than dodging and squirming.

He next comes to Gal. 3: 26, and says he believes persons are children of God by faith, and that he also believes in unconditional election. You cannot believe both doctrines, Brother Dalton. If a person is a child of God by an unconditional election before the foundation of the world, he is not a child by faith in Christ. Faith is an act performed by man, as we have already shown; and if a person is a child by or through faith, he is not a child until he has the faith. The President is elected by or through the votes of the people, and he is not elected before he receives the votes. Will Brother Dalton say that a person is not a child until he has faith? Let him take a stand here. He says that "God predestinates that we should be adopted through faith in Christ." Then God predestinates that we should be adopted through a condition performed by man, and his proposition is gone. Farewell, Brother Crawford.

He next comes to the quotation, "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed," and says: "Of course every unbeliever is condemned. But why is he condemned? Just because he will not believe? O, no. He is

condemned because he has violated the law of God, and his unbelief only evidences that he is in a state of condemnation, and is not the cause of it." Now, Brother Dalton, I did not think you would flatly contradict the apostle that way. John says: "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed." Elder Dalton says: "Just because he will not believe? O, no." John and Dalton are in direct conflict, and you can follow the one you like the best. Which will it be?

Brother Dalton has introduced several passages which I do not notice, because they are not worthy of notice. They have no bearing upon this question. What has the choosing of the Israelites to be God's peculiar people to do with our proposition? What has the ordaining of Jeremiah to be a prophet for the nations to do with our proposition? When he introduces anything that has connection with the question I will be with him, and will stay with him.

He next introduces John 6: 37-39: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me." Why did Brother Dalton stop reading at the 39th verse? Why did he not read the 40th verse? I will read the two verses: "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. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." Is that unconditional salvation, Brother Dalton? Is it election before the foundation of the world. It is the will of the Father "that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." Here are conditions.

His next effort is on Rom. 8: 28: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that

love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." Yes, the called according to his purpose; but it was not the purpose of God to call anybody to salvation independent of conditions performed by man, and here is where the doctrine breaks down. Brother Dalton lacks a word or two in every text he quotes. God calls persons to salvation "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," as has already been shown.

I have now followed him around through all his meanderings, and you see he has produced nothing in support of his proposition. I reject this hard doctrine, not only because it contradicts the Bible, but because it destroys all human responsibility. According to it, a sinner is no more responsible for not being a Christian than Elder Dalton is for not weighing four hundred pounds. Suppose he were damned for that? A man might as well curse as pray, or go to the saloon as to the Sunday school, if his fate is fixed from the foundation of the world by a decree that is unconditional.

MR. DALTON'S THIRD SPEECH.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you to renew my arguments in support of my proposition; but we will first review Brother Burnett's speech. He says we labor very hard, and yet do not believe in works. In this he is mistaken. We believe in works, but not works in order to election, but because of election. Men do not perform the duties of an office in order to their election to the office, but because they are elected; therefore I work hard because I have been elected, and am performing the duties of my office. His flimsy shuffling put off on

Rom. 9: 11-13 is unworthy of notice, and we are sure that this congregation has already seen it; we therefore pass it. Brother Burnett says that I, to meet his argument on salvation by grace, and yet not unconditional, because it is through faith, said that faith was the gift of God. Now Brother Burnett must know that I did no such thing. I said the Bible said that faith was the gift of God. And why did he not take up my proof-texts and reply to them? Just because he is better at answering an argument that never has been made than he is in answering those before him. He is particularly gifted in setting up a man of straw and punching it to atoms, but let him come square to the issue. He seems to think that I would do well to study grammar awhile, which doubtless would not be amiss, but he would do well to lay aside his grammar and study the Bible awhile. Brother Burnett says that faith is a spiritual gift. Well! Well! Who disputed that? Of course it is the gift of the Spirit; that was our position taken from the start; but Brother Burnett says all did not have it. True, but the reason why they did not was because God had not given it to all. Therefore Brother Burnett has cut his own head off. His criticism on Acts 10: 34, 35 is really too worthless to deserve notice; but as he misrepresented me, perhaps it would be well enough for me to call attention to it. He says my position is that those that fear God and work righteousness were acceptable to him before the world began. I said no such thing, but I said that fearing and working righteousness was an evidence that we were accepted with him—that is, the good works are evidences of a renewed heart, and not the cause of it; therefore all of his long preamble on that subject falls at his feet as worthless. He comes again to Acts 13: 48. This text seems to weary my brother.

He reminds me of an old Baptist preacher who labored for two hours to tell who Melchisedec was, and after a two-hours' hitch he at last paused and said: "Brethren, I do wish the Lord had been a little plainer here." Brother Burnett labors very hard to prove that this text does not mean what it says, by running off to other texts; but when he returns, this text still stares him in the face and says: "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed." O what a pity the Lord was not a little plainer here for Brother Burnett's special benefit! He wants to know why Paul preached to others (or reprobates) who were not ordained to life. Just because, my brother, Paul was not sent there to discriminate; but Paul, not knowing who of them were ordained to life, preached alike to all, just as I do, and those that were ordained to life believed, and those that were not ordained to life put the word of God from them, and their putting it from them was only an evidence that they were not ordained to life. He now comes to Gal. 3: 26, and says that a person cannot be a child of God by unconditional election before the foundation of the world. We wish to rivet upon the mind of our brother that we do not teach the doctrine of actual eternal children; we believe and teach that we are elected in the mind and purpose of God, just as the Governor is elected in the minds of the people before the votes are cast, and the casting of the votes only manifests the choice of the people. Even so God gives faith to his people, and thereby manifests his choice of them in his mind and purpose before he gave them faith.

His next dodge is on John 6: 37, 38. We can but wonder, is it so that verse 40 contradicts 37, 38, and 39? This what we draw from Brother Burnett's exegesis of it. What if he did say that "every one

which seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life," does that prove that his Father had not given them to his Son prior to the time they believed? Surely not, for he says: "All that my Father hath given me shall come to me." Hence, their believing on him is only an evidence that they had been given to him before they believed, therefore cuts no figure in the case at all. Brother Burnett then comes to Romans 8: 28-33, and gives that a slight dodge, and then closes his speech by affirming that this hard doctrine destroys all human responsibility.

We must confess that we had never learned that inability destroyed responsibility before. Something new under the sun! Now, my friends, we have good news for you. Should there be any one present who is not able to pay his debts, you are not responsible, so says Brother Burnett. Now if he will just prove that, we have no doubt some of these people will feel good over it. If a man is not able to do a thing, he is not held responsible, so says the Apostle Burnett. He then says if my doctrine be true, "a man just as well curse as pray, go to a saloon as to the Sunday school," etc. If a man's heart and mind are on the saloon, there you will find him. If he loves cursing better than praying, he is sure to curse instead of pray; but a man that God has killed by his Spirit to all of those things has no desire to be there. Hence Paul says: "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" A man that has been killed to the love of sin has no desire to curse, but loves to pray; has no desire to visit the saloon, but delights in letting his light shine as a humble saint of God.

We have now followed Brother Burnett in all of his meanderings. We will now proceed to give him some more proof-texts in support of our proposition.

Why does Brother Burnett refuse to quote the texts of scripture that we have referred to, and run off after something else? It must be because he cannot answer them. He has utterly refused to quote them, but we will still heap more upon him.

We call attention next to Rev. 20: 11-15: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. . . . And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

And, again, Rev. 21: 23-27: "And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. . . . And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." But perhaps Brother Burnett will say their names were not written there until they believed, therefore it was conditional. Let us read Rev. 13: 8: "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him [the beast], whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." From these texts we show that the names of God's people were written in the book of life from the foundation of the world; therefore could not have been on account of conditions performed by us.

We call attention next to Isa. 53: 10-12: "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify

many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." From this we show that there was a division made, and God himself made it; and Jesus was offered to satisfy the demands of the law for those his Father gave him in the division, and we were not there to perform conditions; therefore what Jesus did for us must have been unconditional on our part.

Now we do hope that Brother Burnett will give these things a passing notice at least, and not do as he did before—not even quote them; but if he can't, he is excusable, of course.

MR. BURNETT'S THIRD REPLY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: My friend says he works hard because he is elected, not in order to election. His proposition is not elected, and that is why he works on this occasion. He knows if he does not work hard this people will never believe in unconditional salvation; but, despite all his work, and perspiration too, he is doomed to failure. Every lick he strikes makes it worse. There has been enough work wasted by Baptist preachers, in vain efforts to prove unconditional salvation, to save ten thousand sinners if devoted to preaching the gospel.

Brother Dalton admits that he could study grammar to a good purpose, but says I ought to lay aside grammar and study the Bible. No, no, Brother Dalton; I study the Bible with the grammar in my hand,

and I have both the Bible and the grammar on you in this discussion. Your theory harmonizes with neither Bible nor grammar.

My friend admits that the faith which was given by the Spirit, in 1 Cor. 12: 8-10, was not given to all, but to a few. Then it was not the faith by which they were made children of God. All the Corinthians were "children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3: 26); but all did not have this miraculous faith. "To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another faith by the same Spirit." Does Brother Dalton think there was only one child of God in the church at Corinth? Then why does he confuse this miraculous faith with the faith by which we are made children of God? He does it for a dodge. I showed that we are children by faith, and that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness;" and therefore we are children by a condition performed by man, and not as his proposition asserts. To escape the irresistible conclusion, he runs off to the miraculous gifts in 1 Cor. 12; but he cannot escape that way. If he is honest in his exposition of this 12th chapter of 1 Corinthians, he just simply doesn't know anything about it. He is at sea without chart or compass. You can see whose head is cut off in this controversy; and my opponent's head might as well be cut off, for any good it does him in his effort to escape the fact that faith is an act performed by man.

He comes next to Acts 13: 48, and says I remind him of an old Baptist preacher who tried for two hours to tell who Melchisedec was, and "did wish the Lord had made it a little plainer." The Lord made the 13th chapter of Acts very plain to me, if Brother Dalton's doctrine is not true; if his doctrine is true, the Lord did not make the chapter very plain. The salvation in it is made conditional upon acts performed by men, and these conditions stand eternally in our way if we try to hold to predestination. No wonder Brother Dalton shied around them! He is like the old Baptist preacher who found the word "if" in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians. He read: "By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you." He said: "Breethrin', this word 'if' is a very peculiar word; it is in the intolerable mood and everlastin' tense, for it is everlastingly gittin' in somebody's way." Paul preached to the reprobate Jews in this chapter, and offered them remission of sins in the name of Jesus, on condition that they would believe; but when they put it from them, and judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life, he turned to the Gentiles. Brother Dalton says Paul preached to these Jews through ignorance, not knowing that they were reprobate, and because he was not sent to discriminate. If he was a predestinarian, he was sent to discriminate, for that is a system of discrimination. Paul did not assign ignorance as the reason he offered them salvation and then turned away from them, for he was not that ignorant. His language is plain: "By him all that believe are justified." And then (46th verse): "But, seeing ye put it from you." Is that the way you talk, Brother Dalton? When you turn from those who will not accept your gospel, do you say it is because they judge themselves unworthy and put it from them, or do you say it is because God prejudged them and put it from them before the foundation of the world? I think you say you have no message for the goats, and only preach to the sheep. Paul got among the goats on this occasion; but as he did it through ignorance, not being very well learned in the predestinarian theory, we forgive him. This chapter does mean what it

says, but you must not put a construction on one part of it that makes nonsense of all the other parts. Remember, it does not say the persons were foreordained or unconditionally ordained.

Brother Dalton says, on Gal. 3: 26: "We wish to rivet upon the mind of our brother that we do not teach the doctrine of actual eternal children; we believe and teach that we are elected in the mind and purpose of God, just as the Governor is elected in the minds of the people before the votes are cast, and the casting of the votes only manifests the choice of the people. Even so God gives faith to his people, and thereby manifests his choice of them." If God does not choose his people actually from the foundation of the world, but through faith (an act performed by man), then they are not actually chosen from the foundation of the world, "independent of conditions performed by man," and away goes the proposition that Elder Dalton is defending. Which constitutes the actual election of the Governor—the choice in the mind or the choice at the ballot box? Suppose the votes are not cast; is he elected Governor independent of the votes? As Brother Dalton admits that God's people are not elected before faith, and as faith is an act performed by man (Rom. 10: 10), he virtually gives up the proposition. Farewell, Brother Crawford.

Brother Dalton says of John 6: 37-40, that the 40th verse does not contradict the other three verses, and that the condition of faith in this verse does not preclude the idea that the parties were given to Christ prior to the performance of this condition, and they shall come to him. If they were unconditionally given, and necessarily compelled to come, then faith is not a condition, and the 40th verse contradicts the

37th. But there is no conflict; the 40th verse explains all the others: "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." It was not the will of the Father to give the Son any that would not perform this condition. Brother Dalton says the Father gave them to the Son prior to their faith, but awhile ago he said God did not actually elect any one a child prior to faith. Well, God did not actually give these to the Son prior to faith; else he gave them before he elected them. They may have been in the mind and will of God, but he tells us here what the will was: "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." Just as well give it up, Brother Dalton! It is gone, like all the rest of your texts.

Brother Dalton says he never learned before that inability destroys responsibility. He is quite an old man not to have learned that simple lesson. All laws, human and divine, are based upon it—parental, social, legal, and governmental. He thinks some of you will be glad to learn that you will not have to pay debts that you are not able to pay. Well, Apostle Dalton will confer a favor by telling you how a man can pay a debt which he is not able to pay. That will be as great a feat as to explain some of the unconditional decrees of God. It will do to go along with the old Calvinistic song:

> You can and you can't,
> You must and you mayn't:
> You will and you won't,
> And you're damned if you don't.

He says that if a man's mind is on the saloon he will be there; but if God has killed him by his Spirit to the love of these things, he will not be there. But

suppose God fails to kill him by his Spirit, and then damns him eternally for not being dead, when he has no power to kill himself and there is no personal ability in the matter. Will Brother Dalton tell this people whether he thinks it would be just in God to damn a man for not weighing four hundred pounds, when he has it not in his power to weigh more than two hundred? "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life," says the Savior. Elder Dalton says they cannot come till they have life, and God does not choose to give them life, and damns them because they have it not.

The next scripture quoted is Rev. 20 and 21, where all that are not found written in the book of life are cast into the lake of fire; and he says they were written there from the foundation of the world, and not when they believed. He forgets that he has already said that nobody was actually chosen a child of God from the foundation of the world, but when he believed. Did God actually write them in the book before they were chosen? The legs of the lame are not equal, Brother Dalton. But the Bible does not say they were written in the book of life before the foundation of the world. This is Brother Dalton's gratuitous assertion. It says: "Written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." That is it. You ought not to misquote the Scriptures, Brother Dalton.

But our brother skipped the 12th verse of his quotation entirely in the 20th chapter of Revelation. What did he do that for? I will read it to you, and you can see why he skipped it: "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those

things which were written in the books, according to their works." The dead were judged according to their works, and not according to unconditional election. So away goes his proof-text in Revelation, as all the rest of them have gone. You have not a single text left, Brother Dalton. They are all captured and turned against you. I will not notice the quotation from Isaiah, for it says not a word on the subject we are discussing.

I repudiate the proposition of my friend, because it is not sustained by a single text of scripture and because it conflicts with hundreds of plain texts. I will note a few:

Bible: "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed." (John 3: 18.)

Dalton: "No, no! He is not condemned because he hath not believed, but because he hath not been elected."

Bible: "What must I do to be saved? . . . Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts 16: 30, 31.)

Dalton: "No, no! You have nothing to do."

Bible: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." (Acts 3: 19.)

Dalton: "Your repentance has nothing to do with it. If you are elect, your sins are already blotted out."

Bible: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." (Rev. 22: 14.)

Dalton: "Doing the commandments has nothing to do with it, and will give no one the right to enter into the city."

Bible: "In every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (Acts 10: 35.)

Bible: "He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (Heb. 5: 9.)

Dalton: "Tut, tut! He became the author of eternal salvation to all them that he chose. Obedience has nothing to do with it."

Bible: "Wherefore, my beloved, . . . work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." (Phil. 2: 12.)

Dalton: "You need not fear and tremble, nor work. Your salvation is sure, anyhow."

Bible: "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." (2 Cor. 5: 11.)

Dalton: "The Lord has no terror for the elect, and it is no use to persuade the reprobate."

Bible: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." (Matt. 11: 28.)

Dalton: "You cannot come unto him until you are saved and have rest."

Bible: "Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" (Matt. 19: 16.)

Dalton: "No good thing at all. You shall have it anyhow, if you are elect."

Bible: "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." (Rom. 2: 13.)

Dalton: "Tut, tut, Paul! That is Campbellism. Doing the law has nothing to do with justification."

MR. DALTON'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you again to pursue my line of argument; but before I proceed with my arguments further, courtesy demands that I should reply to Brother Burnett's negative arguments, but in this case he has produced none. I suppose, therefore, I would be excusable from this part of the task. His speech reminds me of a little stanza of poetry:

> He wired in, and he wired out,
> And he left the people all in doubt
> Whether the snake that made the track
> Was going north or coming back.

Brother Burnett still insists that faith is the act of the creature, and is therefore the condition of his salvation or election. Paul says (Heb. 11: 1), "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," and we can but wonder how it can be evidence, and yet be an act of the creature. We are to suppose by Brother Burnett's argument that a man acts his own evidence of things not seen, and also the man acts the substance of that for which he hopes, which any sane man must know is extreme nonsense. And again, in Rom. 12: 3, Paul says: "God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." Again (Gal. 3: 23) he says: "Before faith came, we were kept under the law," etc. If Brother Burnett is correct, he should have said: "Before faith was acted," etc. Again (Luke 17: 5): "And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith." Why ask the Lord to increase that which they themselves have acted? Again (Luke 17: 6): "If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed," etc. Why, surely if faith was an act of man, they could produce as much as a grain of mustard seed; and, as Brother Burnett says it is his act, I want him to act as much as a grain of mustard seed, and try his hand on some of these sycamine trees, and also move some mountains; and then, perhaps, we will believe his argument. Again,

in Heb. 12: 2, Paul says Jesus is "the author and finisher of our faith." How could this be true, and Brother Burnett's position be true at the same time? Paul says Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith. The Apostle Burnett says the sinner is the author and finisher of his own faith. Not much difference, is there, friends, between the Apostle Burnett and the Apostle Paul? One says it is, and the other says it is not; and of course Brother Burnett is correct.

Brother Burnett's way of getting around Acts 13: 48 reminds me of old Jack Pentecost, when the stars were falling. His wife went to the door and called him: "Law, Mr. Pentecost, just come and see!" "Ne—ne—no, Se—Se—Susan, I—I—s—see e—enough through the crack." Brother Burnett won't come to the door and notice the plain text: "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed." Why does he not meet that square in the face? Because he sees enough through the crack. Suppose those people did put Paul's preaching from them and count themselves unworthy of eternal life, does that argue that God would have ordained them to life if they had not done it? If so, why does not Brother Burnett show, and then tell us why these others did not believe before they were ordained to life? As many as were ordained believed, which shows clearly that those who did not believe were not ordained.

Why should Brother Burnett leave the subject in debate, and say that I have no message for goats? He never heard me say such a thing. I guess he wanted to kill time awhile. I have got a message for him, let him be either sheep or goat. That is: Unless God has ordained him to eternal life, and he has believed as a sequence to that ordination, heaven he will never see.

Brother Burnett now gets off on a cavil over our position in regard to the Governor being elected in the minds of the people before the votes are cast, and wants to know if he was actually elected. Yes, sir, he was actually elected, but not manifestly elected. God's people were actually elected in the mind and purpose of God before time, and in time he manifests that election through faith—that is, gives them the evidence of their election—and this is what brings joy and comfort to the poor soul.

His shuffling "put-off" on John 6: 37-39 is not worthy of notice; that still stands out before him as an insurmountable wall that he never will be able to overcome. Jesus still says: "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." To suit Brother Burnett it should read: "Of all which he hath given me I should lose none, if they will believe and hold out faithful to the end."

Brother Burnett gets off into children's play such as this: "Suppose the votes are never cast?" Suppose God fails to kill the love of sin, etc.? This is too much after the order of children's foolishness to deserve notice. Let me suppose a little: Suppose God had never existed; suppose there never had been any world; suppose you had been a horse instead of a man; and suppose and suppose and suppose; and you might suppose on until doomsday; but what does it amount to? God says: "Whatsoever I have purposed shall come to pass. I have purposed; I will also do it." God says he will; but suppose de doesn't—then what? Why, he ceases to be God; and if that is the character of your God, Brother Burnett, I had just as soon worship a frozen pumpkin.

Brother Burnett says inability destroys responsibility. Good news for you, friends! If there are any here in debt, and you are not able to pay, you are excused, you are not held accountable, you are not responsible; so says the Apostle Burnett. Can it be true that there is a law that releases a man from responsibility because he is not able to pay? I wonder if any court on earth would not render judgment against a man who was not able to pay? Why, yes, and a court of justice would render judgment against him just as though he was able, except Brother Burnett; and he would, too, if he was just out of this debate, so he would not be so pushed; but it is an adage that "necessity is the mother of invention," and we find it true in Brother Burnett's case, for he has invented something new under the sun. He wants me to tell how a man can pay a debt that he is not able to pay. Why, my dear sir, he can't pay unless he is able; but he is just as responsible for the debt he has contracted as though he could, and you would hold him so, too, sir, if you were only out of this difficulty you are now in.

Brother Burnett, on Rev. 20 and 21, simply assumes the position that their names were not written in the book of life before the foundation of the world, and we have no authority for his statement except his bare assertion. John says they were written there before the foundation of the world, and the Apostle Burnett says they were not; hence, friends, it is left for us to decide which we will believe—John or Burnett.

He says he will not notice Isa. 53: 10-12 because it has no bearing on the subject. Yes, the reason it has no bearing is just simply because he can't answer it, and he knows it; therefore policy says let it pass unnoticed.

All of his supposed parallels drawn between us and the Bible, at the close of his speech, have been answered; therefore we deem it unnecessary to repeat the same thing over and over, but will just say that we believe and teach repentance, doing the commandments, working righteousness, fearing God, etc. But all of this has nothing to do with our election to eternal life or eternal salvation. We believe it to be the duty of Christians to work out their salvation with fear and trembling; but to take those things spoken to the brethren, and hand them to the world at large, is taking the children's bread and giving it to the dogs, which the Savior strictly forbids.

Now we have followed Brother Burnett through all of his crooks and turns, and we have the same inquiry to make that we have ever made: Why has he not noticed my proof-texts? We called his attention, in our last speech, to quite a number of texts that he never has noticed. We thought, He surely will now; but, alas, not noticed yet! But they still array before him, and this people have them in remembrance. We have no time to wait on him longer; we shall continue to shower them down.

Our next argument is that if Christ died for the eternal salvation of all the race it legally and necessarily follows that all must and will be saved. Please hear Paul to Titus (2: 14): "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." We challenge Brother Burnett's attention to this. For what intent did Jesus give himself for us? "That he might redeem us from all iniquity." If Jesus does this, please tell this people, Brother Burnett, how much iniquity we rid ourselves of by performing conditions.

Again (Gal. 3: 13): "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." Will Brother Burnett please tell this people, if Christ has redeemed the race from the curse of the law, what will ever curse one of them? Brother Burnett is a Universalist. I thought he would land there before this debate closed.

Again (1 Pet. 1: 18, 19): "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ," etc. Now, what have we? "Sinners redeemed from all iniquity," and from the curse of the law, and from vain conversation received from their fathers; and yet eternally damned because they will not perform conditions. Wonder, O heavens! Let us see how this would sound beside Paul to Heb. 9: 12: "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Now, my congregation, I call you to witness that Brother Burnett has sinners redeemed from all iniquity (eternally), and redeemed from the curse of the law (eternally), and redeemed from the vain conversation received from their fathers (eternally), and yet damned in hell to all eternity; which no sane man can believe. Therefore it follows that all for whom Christ died to save eternally must and will be saved.

We call attention next to Rom. 4: 1-6: "What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not

reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works."

O, how different are the teachings of Brother Burnett to that of Paul in the above! Here we are plainly taught that God imputes his righteousness to the people "without works." Brother Burnett says it is for their works. Not much difference, is there? Paul says that the man that works has his reward of debt, and not of grace. The Apostle Burnett says if we will work we can reap a reward of grace. Hence to believe Paul's teaching is to believe that election and salvation are unconditional on our part—just what our proposition says.

It is Christians commanded to perform conditions, and not ungodly sinners; for Paul to Colossians (3: 1) says: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above"—not, as Brother Burnett says, seek those things which are above in order to arise with Christ. None are commanded to seek except those that are arisen with Christ; and those that are arisen with Christ, Paul says in Eph. 2: 4-6, have been quickened together with Christ, and saved by grace, and raised up; and not a word is said about the conditions they performed. But after this has all been done for them, then Paul says to them: "Seek those things which are above." Again, Jesus says: "If ye love me, keep my commandments." (John 14: 15.)

Brother Burnett would lay before you, my friends, a list of commandments, and tell you that you must keep them in order that you may be saved and love the Lord; but Jesus says: "If ye love me, keep my commandments." 1 John 4: 7 says: "Every one that

loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." Jesus does not ask you to keep his commandments unless you love him, and John says if you love him you are born of God. Is it too late now to perform conditions in order to be born, as Brother Burnett teaches?

Brother Burnett, please give these things a passing notice, at least, in your next speech. Your brethren will expect it of you.

MR. BURNETT'S FOURTH REPLY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Elder Dalton's charge that I do not notice some of his proof-texts must be growing monotonous, since you are aware that I have not only noticed all the texts that he has produced that have any bearing upon the question, but have turned them all against him. This charge comes with poor grace from my opponent, who in his last speech passed by in utter silence eleven of my plainest proof-texts that flatly contradict his proposition. He would not even look at them through the crack, as old man Pentecost did. Why did he not notice John 3: 18: "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed?" Why continue to repeat that faith is not a condition performed by man, and has nothing to do with salvation or condemnation, when Jesus here says emphatically that he is condemned because he has not performed the condition? Did Jesus know nothing of the meaning and use of words, or had he failed to learn the predestinarian doctrine? If faith is something man cannot do, and has not to do, Paul talked very foolishly when, in answer to the jailer's inquiry, "What must I do to be saved?" he commanded, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt

be saved." If Elder Dalton had been there, he would have said: "Why, Paul, faith is the evidence of things not seen, and you know it is extreme nonsense to command a man to act evidence." Paul would doubtless have said: "You put a wrong meaning on the word 'evidence,' by reason of your nonsensical predestination. The Bible says, 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness,' and the Bible does not tell falsehoods." Paul says man believes; Dalton says man does not believe. Therefore one or the other tells a falsehood. You can believe the one you wish—Apostle Paul or Apostle Dalton. Paul commanded the jailer to believe; Elder Dalton says it is extreme nonsense to command a man to believe. Therefore Paul commanded extreme nonsense. You can take your choice, ladies and gentlemen, and follow Paul or follow Dalton. The word "evidence," in Heb. 11, is rendered "conviction" by Wilson and by the Bible Union and others, and does not mean what my opponent would make it.

But he quotes Rom. 12: 3: "According as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." Does Elder Dalton think that God measures out faith as a farmer measures corn? "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." God gives the testimony in his word, but "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." Brother Dalton, don't you wish the Lord had not made this quite so plain? You can see it through the crack.

Next (Gal. 3: 23): "Before faith came." Certainly faith came—this system of faith under which we live—but it does not save man unconditionally.

Next (Luke 17: 5): "Lord, increase our faith." Does Elder Dalton think the faith here referred to is the faith that saves the sinner? A particle of it as

large as a grain of mustard seed would remove a sycamine tree. How much of it has Elder Dalton got? Can he remove one leaf of a sycamine tree? "O ye of little faith!" He has such a poor knowledge of the Scriptures that he confounds the miraculous faith of 1 Cor. 12: 9 and Luke 17: 5 with the common faith that saves the sinner. We might admit that Jesus increased the faith of his disciples by increasing the testimony, and yet it would not prove that the act of believing is not performed by man. Elder Dalton thought it was extreme nonsense for Paul to command the jailer to believe; we are now going to show that Jesus commanded the same nonsense. On one occasion he said to Thomas: "Be not faithless, but believing." That was monstrous nonsense, if Elder Dalton's doctrine is true, and Thomas has no power to believe; but we believe that the nonsense is in the doctrine of Dalton, and not in the command of Jesus.

Heb. 12: 2: "Author and finisher of our faith." Certainly Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith, for he arranged the system and gave the testimony; but "with the heart man believeth." There stands that text, Brother Dalton, right in your path, like a Banquo's ghost, and you cannot escape it. It is a millstone around the neck of your proposition, and will sink it into oblivion.

Acts 13: 48: "Ordained to eternal life." He says I am like old man Pentecost, and will not look square at this passage. Yes, sir, I looked square at that text in my first speech, and saw that your definition of the word "ordain" made the Bible a contradiction; for Paul told others there who were not ordained (disposed) that "through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be

justified by the law of Moses;" but when they refused to believe, he said: "But seeing you put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." Why does not Elder Dalton look at these statements, and harmonize them with his proposition? We have shown that the word "*tetagmenoi*" (ordain) has the meaning of "dispose," and that it is so rendered by Wilson and others in this place. It is rendered "determine" in Acts 15: 2, and "addict" in 1 Cor. 16: 15, showing that a certain disposition or state of mind is contained in the word. It cannot mean unconditional foreordination, for that sets the passage in antagonism with the whole Bible, and no theory can be true that makes the Bible a contradiction.

Elder Dalton says he has a message for me, whether I am a sheep or goat, and that is if I am not unconditionally elected to salvation I will never see heaven. I thank God that Elder Dalton was not a preacher in the apostolic day. Those preachers brought me a better message than he brings, for they said: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." They also said that "Christ Jesus by the grace of God tasted death for every man," and that God "will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth;" and that he is "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." I am glad you were not there, Brother Dalton, and that your doctrine was not there. If I never reach heaven, it will not be because God failed to prepare a plan for me and had no mercy for me, but because I do not accept the mercy he has given. If God should damn me for not doing what I have no power to do, I would spend eternity in con-

temptation of its injustice. I would make the vaults of hell resound forever with the charge: "Unjust! unjust!" I would sooner worship a frozen monkey than such a God.

Elder Dalton, you have not yet told us whether you think God would be just to damn you for not weighing four hundred pounds, when you have it not in your power to weigh over two hundred. Will you tell us?

He thinks I have made a great discovery that disability relieves from responsibility, and he is afraid some of you will take advantage of the discovery and not pay debts that you are not able to pay. Well, if he has discovered how a man can pay a debt that he is not able to pay, it is a greater discovery than mine, and more of you will take advantage of it. He should make it known at once. It will be worth ten thousand times more than the gospel he preaches. Let us have it, Brother Dalton.

He quotes, "Whatsoever I have purposed shall come to pass," and says if God purposes the salvation of a sinner it shall come to pass. That makes Elder Dalton a Universalist. God "will have all men to be saved," and is "not willing that any should perish," and "commandeth all men everywhere to repent;" hence he purposes their salvation. You are improving, Brother Dalton, but you did not purpose to do it. Now, if you will show that God purposed to save anybody "independent of conditions performed by man," you will do some work for your proposition. You have not yet done that.

The gentleman now says that God actually chooses people before the foundation of the world, but manifests the choosing when he gives them faith. If he will produce one text of scripture that says that, I will give up the question. Paul contradicts him. Paul says we are chosen to salvation "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," and belief of the truth is an act performed by man.

He again comes to John 6: 37-40, and says it was the will of the Father that all he gave the Son should come to him. Now let him show that the Father gave him any for salvation or eternal life independent of conditions. "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." (Verse 40.)

Elder Dalton says I assumed that the names were not written in the book of life before the foundation of the world. No, sir; I assumed nothing. I said you misquoted the Scriptures when you made them say that in Rev. 20 or 13. John does not say the names were written before the foundation of the world, but that they were "written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." There is a difference, you see. Brother Dalton should not misrepresent the Scriptures, even to save his precious old elect doctrine. He has not yet told us why he skipped the 12th verse, which says the dead shall be judged according to their works. You can guess.

He quotes Titus 2: 14, "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity," and he wants to know how much iniquity we are redeemed from by conditions performed by us. Let Peter answer: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." (Acts 3: 19.) How many sins are blotted out by repentance and conversion, Peter? Elder Dalton says they were all blotted out when Christ died, and there is no need of repentance and conversion for this purpose. So he is in conflict with Peter, and with Paul, and with John, and

with Christ, and with all the divine teachers. Better give it up, Brother Dalton!

He says he believes it is right for Christians to work out their salvation, but is opposed to giving these texts to aliens. His proposition embraces salvation from sin and salvation in heaven, and applies to Christians as well as sinners; and Peter taught that Christians had to perform conditions in order to be saved. He said: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fail: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." Does Brother Dalton ever preach to his brethren that way? Does he ever tell them to give diligence to make their calling and election sure? He has told them a thousand times that the election was sure anyhow, "independent of conditions performed by man," but he never tells them to make it sure. How can he? Why should he? Here he conflicts with Peter. Peter was not a predestinarian.

He again falls back to grace and works, and says salvation is not imputed for works. Certainly; but the gospel conditions are not works—not our works. Nevertheless Jesus says: "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed. Ah, Brother Dalton, that word "because" is a millstone around the neck of your proposition, and it might as well be cast into the middle of the sea.

You quote: "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness." Yes, but "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness;" and so it was a condition performed by man, though not put in the catalogue of human works. Faith is a

work of God performed by man. "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (John 6: 28, 29.)

We have now

> Followed the snake that made the track,
> Both going north and coming back,

though sometimes the track has been rather dim and quite crooked. Brother Dalton is the snake that made the track, for he is in the lead in this discussion, and is responsible for all the crookedness. As his crookedness is predestinated, he cannot help it.

MR. DALTON'S FIFTH SPEECH.

Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you again to pursue my line of argument. Brother Burnett in his last speech reminded me of the old Kentucky hunter. While on a hunt he saw something through the bushes, and, after peeping through for some time, he at last decided to shoot; and after he had shot he went around to see the result, and to his surprise he found that he shot at a calf, but had missed it; and he said, "Well, I shot to hit if it was a deer, and miss it if it was a calf;" and we suppose that Brother Burnett shot to hit if it was a deer, but, as it was a calf, he missed the whole thing. He thinks that my continual charging upon him that he had not noticed my arguments must be growing monotonous. While we admit this to be true, necessity compels us to do it; for he has thus far failed, and we doubt not that it is somewhat irksome to him to have these plain dec-

larations of God's word continually set before him, and he cannot answer them, but so it is. Brother Burnett, you will just have to bear it the best you can, for we expect to continue our claim that our proof-texts deserve notice, and there are many you have not quoted, and you know it. He says that we passed unnoticed eleven of his proof-texts in his last speech which he ought to know we did not, for he has simply introduced the same routine of scriptures in every speech since he began. Where Jesus says, "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed," we have told this congregation repeatedly, their not believing was an evidence of their condemned state, and not the cause of it; and now for Brother Burnett to come up at this late hour and say that we have failed to notice it—well, we really expected better things of him, but so it is. He has to have something to say to kill time.

Brother Burnett gets off something new on faith again. He has two kinds of faith: one to remove mountains and pluck sycamine trees, which he calls "miraculous faith;" and then he has a faith that saves folks, which he calls "common faith." We can but wonder what will be the next. Paul says: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." Brother Burnett says: "One Lord, two faiths (one miraculous, one common), and one baptism." Brother Burnett seems determined to sustain his creed, even if the Bible is against him. Brother Burnett says that the word "evidence" in Heb. 11 is rendered "conviction," and does not mean what we said it did. Well, what have we in that to base our belief upon? Nothing but Brother Burnett's bare statement. Now, if it does not mean what we say, let him show what it does mean. Brother Burnett

proposed to show that according to our doctrine Jesus commanded nonsense, and he proves it by this. The Savior said to Thomas, "Be not faithless, but believing;" therefore belief is a condition of salvation. Wonder, O heavens, at the words of Burnett's mouth! Just simply because Thomas did not believe that Jesus had risen from the dead, and said he would not till he felt the nail prints in his hands, and thrust his hand in his side, and Jesus came to him, who had long been one of his disciples, and had followed him during his personal reign on earth, and was truly one of his children; yet when the Savior came to him to show him that he was truly the Christ that arose from the dead, and told him to reach forth his hand and feel the nail prints, and also to thrust his hand into his side and to be not faithless, but believing, Brother Burnett concludes that he had to believe as a condition of his salvation, which we can't help but think that any man of Brother Burnett's judgment knows better. Brother Burnett comes to Hebrews 12: 2, and admits that Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith, and then says: "Jesus arranged the system and gave the testimony, 'but with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.'" Brother Burnett admits the truth, when he can't well get around it, and then comes in "but," "but," "but," and the third "but" takes all the truth out of his system. He believes that Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith, "but" man has it to do himself.

Brother Burnett tries his hand again on Acts 13: 48, and says the word *tetagmenio* has the meaning of "dispose," "determine," etc. Let us admit Brother Burnett's statement or definition, and see if that alters the case: "As many as were ordained," "as many as were

disposed," "as many as were determined." Who ordained them? God. Who disposed them? God? Who determined them? God. Now let us read: "As many as God determined, or disposed, or ordained to eternal life believed." Now, how much will Brother Burnett gain for his cause, even to admit that his definition be true? Positively nothing.

Brother Burnett says if God should damn him for not doing what he has no power to do he would spend eternity in contemplating its injustice, and would make the vaults of hell resound with the charge: "Unjust! Unjust!" God will never damn you for not doing, Brother Burnett, but it will be for doing. It is what we have done that condemns us, and not what we have left undone. But if God sends me to hell for doing something that I, of myself, could not undo, I will be man enough to acknowledge: "Just! just!" Brother Burnett says that I skipped Rev. 20: 12, because it did not suit my doctrine where it says the dead shall be judged according to their works, but the living (that is, those that are alive in Christ, and their names were written in the book of life from the foundation of the world) are judged according to Christ's works, as Paul said: "Some men's sins are open going before to judgment, and others they follow after, and those that are otherwise cannot be hid." Hence, the sins of the elect are judged and removed by the works of Christ, and those not represented by Christ—their sins will follow after them. Brother Burnett then overleaps Titus 2: 14, Gal. 3: 13, 1 Pet. 1: 18, 19, and Heb. 9: 12, by simply quoting Peter, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out," and makes the impression that we redeem ourselves from sin by repentance. We can but wonder what will

be the next. He then quotes Peter: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure," etc. Will Brother Burnett please tell this people whom we are to make our election sure to? To God? Surely not, for God knows all about that. Therefore by our good works we are to make it sure to ourselves and to our brethren. "By their fruits ye shall know them," says Jesus, hence our good works only manifest to those around us what we are, and do not make us. He then comes to Rom. 4, and says that the gospel conditions are not works. Well, in the name of high heaven, Brother Burnett, tell us what they are. If they are not our works, whose works are they? Just a little farther on he says: "Faith is the work of God, performed by man—that is, God does it for us; 'but' we have it to do ourselves." Jesus said: "This is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom he hath sent." Well, if it is the work of God, it can't be our work. Therefore, Brother Burnett has given up his whole argument from the beginning of this discussion.

Having followed him through all of his meanderings, we will now proceed to give him some more proof. Our next argument is: "It is unconditional because it is God's work that we are in Christ," in proof of which please read 1 Cor. 1: 30: "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." This shows that it is God's work that we are in Christ, and Paul says: "We are chosen in him before the foundation of the world." Hence, God did this for us before we existed, and must, of necessity, be unconditional. Eph. 2: 10: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works,

which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." From this we learn that sinners are created in Christ Jesus, and we know that none have creative power but God; therefore it is God that works to create us in Christ. Now the only question to decide is what God requires of us in order to creation. Suppose, Brother Burnett, you wanted to element a fish to live in the air. You must change its nature, and it requires creative power to do that; what would you require that fish to do? To repent (turn away from the water) and believe in you, as the conditions, and then you would take it and baptize it in the air, and then sing some Psalms over it, and pat it on the back, and, behold, it comes forth elemented to live in the air!

You know, Brother Burnett, that this of itself is something beyond the reach of science to change the nature of the fish from one natural element to another natural element; and, besides, that you would not require the fish to perform conditions in order to that end; but when it comes to changing the nature of the sinner that is elemented for this world and for sin, and you want to element him to live in a spiritual world, you will set conditions before him to perform in order to his creation in Christ, and that he may be elemented for heaven and immortal glory. This looks to me like children's play, and for want of better judgment, but so it is. This is Brother Burnett's (the great Texas champion's) theory.

Our next argument is: It is unconditional because Jesus sanctifies and cleanses the sinner himself, in proof of which please read Eph. 5: 25-27: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious

church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." All of this Paul says Christ will do for us, and not a word said about what we are to do as conditions; and surely if Paul had believed that it was conditional he would have said something about it. Please read next 1 Cor. 6: 10, 11: "Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

Here Paul says we are washed, sanctified, and justified, in the name of Christ and by the Spirit. But if Brother Burnett's theory be true, he should have said: "Ye are washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of Christ by the performance of certain stipulated conditions; but it is very evident that Paul did not believe what Brother Burnett does. Now the only question for us to decide is: Which shall we believe—Paul, the apostle of Jesus Christ, or Burnett, the great champion of Texas? Now, Brother Burnett, take these things up and reply to them, and perhaps these old Hardshell hens will not cackle so loudly. The reason they cackle so loudly is that they feel jubilant over the defeat of your false theory. Now come up to the issue, and make them hush their cackling. When you turn the truth down, then they will cease their laughing, and will begin to weep. Now, we trust that you will come to the issue, Brother Burnett, and not turn back from the snake as you did before, just as he started in his hole. When he presented Titus 2: 14; Gal. 3: 13; 1 Pet. 1: 18, 19; Heb. 9: 12, Brother Burnett could see enough through the cr—cr—crack, and he refused to follow the snake through. Come again, Brother Burnett; you shall not be hurt.

MR. BURNETT'S FIFTH REPLY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I admit that the snake has gone into his hole, and that it is a very dark hole, and has not even a crack; and, while I have followed its crooked track, both going north and coming back, I doubt if I can follow it through the hole. It would take the eye of inspiration to see any sense in much of what you have listened to in the last speech, or any connection it has with the proposition under discussion. I did not object to the Hardshell hens cackling; I only objected to their cackling when there was nothing in the nest. Our old dominiques out here in Texas never cackle unless there is something in the nest, but Elder Dalton's pullets over there in the corner cackle louder when there is nothing than when there is something.

He again calls up Titus 2: 14; Gal. 3: 13; 1 Pet. 1: 18, 19; Heb. 9: 12, etc., where it is said Christ redeemed us by his blood and purified us, etc.; and he asks me to notice them, as if I had not noticed all of them in a former speech. He doubtless thinks he can make some of you (who do not take notes) believe that he produces scriptures which I do not or cannot meet. This is quite cheeky in my friend, when he has not noticed those eleven texts that I produced which were in direct conflict with his proposition. He will not even look at them through the crack. Come out of your hole, Brother Dalton, and meet my arguments, and stop playing the politician.

My opponent says I am like the Kentucky hunter who shot so as to kill if it was a deer, but miss if it was a calf. No, sir; I shot so as to kill the calf. I knew it was a calf, and shot so as to bring it down; and here it is—two hundred pounds of as good, fat, sleek, predestinarian calf as ever greeted the eyes of a Texas people, and ready skinned to order.

My friend says: "We have told this congregation repeatedly that their not believing was an evidence of their condemned states, and not the cause of it." And you have just as repeatedly contradicted the Savior. He says: "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed." Christ says a lack of faith is the cause of condemnation, while Dalton says it is not the cause of it, but only the evidence of it. Ladies and gentlemen, you can follow Christ or Dalton, as you please. One or the other is wrong.

He next says I have two faiths, a common faith and a miraculous faith, while Paul has but one. Paul said in the Epistle to the Ephesians, A.D. 64, that there is "one faith," and there is but one faith by which sinners are saved; but there was a miraculous faith at the commencement of Christianity that could remove sycamine trees, and which was not perpetuated in the church. I asked Elder Dalton if he had this miraculous faith, and if he could remove one leaf from a sycamine tree, and he would not tell me. Why will you not tell us, Brother Dalton? If you had that faith as a grain of mustard seed, you could remove a sycamine tree, but you have not enough to shake a leaf on a sycamine tree. O, ye of little faith! Now, he knows he has not that faith, and it is only a dodge to get out of the difficulty in which I have placed him by showing that faith is an act performed by man. Is this the best that the great champion from Tennessee can do? If I were these old Baptist brethren, I would turn you off and hire you over. Paul calls Titus "mine own son after the common faith," which indicates that there was a common and an uncommon faith.

My opponent misconceives what I said about Thomas' faith. I referred to that to show that belief was his own act. Jesus said: "Be not faithless, but believing." If Elder Dalton's doctrine be true, that command was utter nonsense. Why should Jesus tell him to do what he had no power to do?

He says I admit that Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith, but quote, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness;" and says I put in a "but" to dodge the truth. No, sir; I put in no "but," but gave a quotation from Paul which shows that your idea of how Christ is the author of our faith is not the correct one. He is not the author of our faith in a sense that faith is an act of Christ and not of man, and therefore your proof-text does nothing to support your proposition.

My opponent at last admits that *tetagmenoi* (ordain), in Acts 13: 48, may mean "determine" or "dispose," but says God did the disposing or determining, and that does not help the matter. He dodges around the point again. The text does not say that God disposed them or determined them; for the word "God" is not in the sentence, but as many as were disposed (themselves) to eternal life believed. In 1 Cor. 16: 15 it is rendered "addict," and it says there the people addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints. I showed that Elder Dalton's idea of ordain (unconditionally foreordain) could not be the correct meaning here, for Paul said to others in this place who were not ordained (disposed) that to them was preached the forgiveness of sins. Why does not Brother Dalton come up and harmonize this with his theory, and show how nonelect and nonordained persons were offered eternal life if they would believe on Jesus? If he does not do it, this audience will know that he cannot do it; I have known all the time that he cannot do it, but he ought to try.

He says if I am damned, it will not be for not doing, but for doing, and that it is what we have done, and not what we have left undone, that condemns us. He exactly contradicts the Savior. The Savior says: "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed." Now, where are you, Brother Dalton? In direct conflict with Christ and the apostles, where you have been ever since this debate began. If I held a system that would not let me make one single argument without running in conflict with the Bible, I would throw it away and get a better one.

He intimates that the sinner is sent to hell for what he does, but the righteous are not sent to heaven on those terms. Well, he believes that damnation is conditional, at least. Now I want to ask him if he believes that a sinner's doom is fixed from the foundation of the world; and, if so, how can it depend on what he does? Has he given up half of the old-style Calvinism, and holds to unconditional salvation and conditional damnation? The Savior makes both conditional: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."

He next comes to Rev. 20: 12, where he before skipped a part of the passage, and now says the dead will be judged, every man, "acording to their works," but the dead are the wicked, and not the righteous. Well, since the foundation of the world there has never been such a dodge taken on a text of scripture. Elder Dalton believes that the wicked, or dead, will be gathered before the throne and judged, but the living, or righteous, will not be there; that's his position. Now let us try it. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then

shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Elder Dalton will have only the goats before the throne, and he will have some of the goats on the right hand, and they will hear the invitation, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;" and some of his goats will go away into everlasting punishment, and some into life eternal. You have got the goats into a bad predicament, Brother Dalton, and the best thing you can do is to just take it back and correct your mistake. It is not even good nonsense.

But, as if determined to advance from bad to worse, my opponent makes another plunge into the muddle of foolishness, and represents Peter as telling his brethren to make their calling and election sure to one another, but not to God. He says the election was sure from the foundation of the world, but they were to manifest its sureness to one another by adding the Christian graces. Such an idea was never in the mind of Peter, and he said nothing of the kind. He said: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." By diligence they would make their calling and election sure, and have an entrance into the everlasting kingdom of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. If Elder

Dalton does not repent of this misrepresentation of Peter, I fear he will never make his calling and election sure and enter into the everlasting kingdom, if he was predestinated before the foundation of the world. Peter here harmonizes exactly with the Savior, who says, in Rev. 22: 14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

My opponent becomes excited over the statement that the gospel conditions are not our works, though performed by us, and wants to know, "in the name of high heaven, what are they, Brother Burnett?" Well, if he will keep cool, and not swear, either by high heaven or the low earth, I will tell him. The gospel conditions—such as faith, repentance, and baptism—are the works of God, performed by man in order to salvation. Jesus said: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." Faith is not a work of God in the sense that God does the work, but in the sense that he requires it of us. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." Baptism is from heaven, and so is repentance; for God "comandeth all men everywhere to repent."

His next proof-text is 1 Cor. 1: 30, where Paul says Christ is made unto us "wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption;" and Brother Dalton says this was done for us before the foundation of the world, because we were chosen then. I have shown you that Paul says we are chosen to salvation "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," and not before the truth was believed; and I will now show you that we are sanctified through the truth, and not before the foundation of the world. "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth."

(John 17: 17.) There goes another one of your proof-texts, Brother Dalton; I take all of them as fast as you bring them out.

His next argument is that we are created in Christ Jesus, and therefore a thing created has nothing to do in creating itself. The brother is as wild as a buck on this point, too; for if he would keep his wits about him, he would know that the regeneration of a sinner is not a literal creation, but a metaphorical one. The Scriptures tell us how the sinner is created anew (born again), and what means God uses in his recreation; and in the use of those means the sinner has something to do. "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth. . . . Wherefore, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear." (James 1: 18, 19.) As man has to hear the truth and believe it, in order to be begotten of God, he is not created independent of conditions performed by him. So away goes another proof, Brother Dalton, where they all have gone.

His next argument is that salvation is independent of the conditions performed by man, because Jesus himself "sanctifies and cleanses" the sinner. (Eph 5: 25.) But I have shown you that persons are sanctified through the word of truth, and they have to receive that word. Peter says, "purifying their hearts by faith," and Paul says, "with the heart man believeth." Peter also says, "seeing you have purified your souls in obeying the truth." Now, if you take out the sanctification by the truth, and the pure heart by faith, and the pure souls by obedience, what sort of sanctification and cleansing will you have, Brother Dalton? I would be ashamed to produce such proofs as those to sustain a proposition. And this is the best that can be done by the great champion of Tennessee!

He next comes to 1 Cor. 6: 11: "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus." He thinks this is unconditional salvation. Jesus says we are sanctified through the truth, so that is not unconditional; Paul says we are justified by faith, so that is not unconditional; Paul says we are saved by the washing of regeneration (baptism), and Ananias said, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins;" so the washing is not unconditional. So away goes your last proof-text, Brother Dalton, and you have nothing at all to show for your proposition. It is gone, world without end. These old Baptist brethren expect a better defense than you are making for their cause, and they declare by their very countenances that they are not satisfied with what you have done. Their faces look so long I have a notion to call mourners. They do not look like they were elect before the foundation of the world, and they feel in their hearts that your proposition is predestinated to eternal overthrow, unless you perform better conditions than you have yet performed. Good-by, Brother Crawford! If you do not work harder, it can never be saved. I am getting hungry for some debate. If there is a text in the Bible that teaches unconditional salvation, let the gentleman produce it. He has not yet done so. I challenge him to produce the text. If he has any in reserve, let him bring them out. All he has produced thus far have been taken from him and turned against him, and he has not one left. I demand the surrender of the proposition, or that some proof shall be produced to sustain it.

MR. DALTON'S SIXTH SPEECH.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: As before, we are before you, but nothing to do. We had hoped that Brother Burnett would do something with our proof-texts in his last speech; but, behold, he comes forth with the same routine of words, and nothing in them. He says he will admit that the snake has gone into his hole, but he says that it is a very dark hole. He says it would take the eye of inspiration to see anything in it. In this he told the truth; and he has also admitted that he was not inspired by the Spirit to see the truth. We had been fearful all the while that this was the case, but still had hope, until now our hopes are blasted. When a man confesses a thing, we, of course, have to believe it; and we have now gotten where Brother Burnett cannot see us—sustained our proposition on unconditional election and salvation, gone into our hole, and left Brother Burnett, like the squirrel did John Smith's puppy, to bark at the hole and wonder how it got in there. You can call me politician or anything else, Brother Burnett, but never will we come out of this hole. We are here planted, and the Bible has closed the hole behind us, and you will either have to run over the Bible rough-shod or confess its truth to get us now.

Brother Burnett says he shot to kill a calf, and did it. Well, perhaps he did, but there is one thing sure: he has never hit the snake yet. Let him kill calves all he pleases, but it would be far better for him and his sinking cause to get that snake out of his hole. Brother Burnett refers to my language that I had told the congregation repeatedly that their unbelief was an evidence of their condemned state, and not the cause; and he says I have just as repeatedly contradicted the Savior. This, to say the least of it, is acknowledgment that I noticed his proof-texts. He has repeatedly charged that I had not noticed his proof-texts, but now confesses that I did so, and says that I contradicted the Savior every time I did it. Now, the question is, friends, which one of his statements shall we believe? We cannot accept them both, for they are cross.

Brother Burnett now gets off on faith again, and wants to know if I possess miraculous faith, etc. We answer that if we possess faith at all it is miraculous, because it is the gift of God, and not of our own production. Yes, sir, I can remove sycamine leaves, and have trimmed a tall sycamine tree in this debate. I can cast out devils—have cast erroneous devils out of many, and am trying to cast one out of you. Some are removed only by fasting and prayer, and it may be that you possess one of the same kind.

When Paul says "one faith," we are not put to the painful necessity to dispute it in order to sustain our creed (thank the Lord!) as you are.

We are surprised that Brother Burnett should quote Paul to Titus, "Mine own son after the common faith," and draw the conclusion that because Paul said "common faith" there are two faiths. It is not ignorance, my friends; he is just so pressed that he doesn't know what else to say.

He says I misconceived what he said about Thomas' faith. I may have missed his meaning, but I did not fail to know what he said. He made Thomas' belief a condition of salvation; that is what he is talking about, and that is what he said. If he did not mean it, I am at a loss to know what he did mean; but let him have it his way; we want to give him all the scope we can, for he needs it.

He says Christ is not the author of our faith in the sense that faith is an act of Christ, and not of man. Brother Burnett, faith is not an act at all; it is evidence, Paul says, and surely evidence is not an act of any one, and belief is the product or result of evidence. Hence man believes upon divine evidence, and, instead of its being a condition of salvation, it is the result of it. A man does not believe a thing to make it so, but because it is so; hence when the evidence is given that we are saved through the merits of Christ, we believe it upon the evidence; therefore it is the product of evidence, and not an act at all. Instead of a man acting it, he is actuated by it.

Brother Burnett comes back again to Acts 13: 48, and really does injury to his own cause. He says that I admitted that *tetagmenoi* may mean "determine" or "dispose." I said no such thing, but said I would admit it for argument's sake, and see what he had gained by it. We did that, and found that he gained nothing for his cause; but he, like a drowning man, is ready to catch at a straw, and now jumps over to 1 Cor. 16: 15, and takes up the word *etaxan*, which, being translated, means "addicted" or "devoted," and tries to make the impression that these were the same words in the original language, when Paul was calling the attention of his Corinthian brethren to the fact that Stephen and his household were the first fruits of Achaia—"*Kai*" *eis diakonian tois agiois etaxan eautous*—which simply shows that these saints in Achaia were devoted to the cause of God and administered to the poor saints, and has about as much connection with the word *tetagmenoi*, in Acts 13: 48, as Sut Luvingood's collar had with his shirt—that is, none at all; and Brother Burnett knows it; but he must say something.

He now gets off on conditional damnation, and says I have given up half of the old-style Calvinism. No, sir; we have not given up anything, because we never had it to give up. We believe that men are punished for their own disobedience to God's law; but we don't see how Christ met the demands of the law, did the conditions for some, and they are not saved without performance of conditions on their part. Paul says: "By the obedience of one many shall be made righteous"—not the obedience of many, but one. Hence those made righteous by the obedience of Christ are surely judged and acquitted in him, and all the rest of their sins follow after them.

That great judgment you thought you had found, Brother Burnett, was only a separation of the sheep from the goats—not judging them, but simply dividing them—and telling the sheep to come in and inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world; and telling the goats to depart, for he never knew them. That is all of that, Brother Burnett. You will have to get up something better than that, Brother Burnett.

He then comes to Peter ("Make your calling and election sure"), and we judge from what he said that he is going to make his election sure to the Lord, which we expect will be a good thing for him, for we doubt whether the Lord knows anything about it now. As for ourselves, we are satisfied we cannot learn the Lord anything; and if we can make it sure to ourselves and manifest it to those around us, we will do well.

Brother Burnett comes to his gospel conditions again, and still affirms that they are not our works, but are God's works performed by us—faith, repentance, and baptism are God's works, performed by us in order to salvation. Wonder, O heavens! give ear, O earth,

at the words of the mouth of the Texas champion! God's work performed by man! When God said, "Let there light," he waited for man to bring light! God's work performed by man! Well, well, well! Excuse us, friends, one minute, and let us meditate what will be the next. Surely necessity is the mother of invention.

He next says that I am as wild as a buck in saying that a thing has nothing to do in creating itself. He then gets up his means of creation: Hear, believe, and repent in order to his creation. O, my God, is it true that an unborn child has to hear, believe, and repent in order to have being in this world? Brother Burnett knows better, friends, but he is so pushed that he does not know what he is saying; you must excuse him.

He then takes up our proof-text showing that Christ sanctifies and cleanses the sinner himself, and tries to prove it to be untrue by quoting Peter, "Seeing you have purified yourselves in obeying the truth," etc., "purifying their hearts by faith," etc., just as though Christians did not have to purify themselves often by obeying the Lord after God has purified them by his grace. God sanctifies and purifies them first, and then it becomes their duty to keep themselves pure by obeying the truth. I am talking about the alien sinner, Brother Burnett, and not the Christian; so please don't take the children's bread and give it to the dogs.

He at last comes to the point, and says we are saved by baptizing. Washing of regeneration, in Titus, means baptism. Let us try that: "But according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration [baptism], and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." Hence baptism was shed on us through

Jesus Christ. Brother Burnett knows better, but he has to kill time.

I wish he would call mourners. I think all of his brethren would come to get me and my brethren to pray for them; if for no other reason, they would ask it for putting Brother Burnett up to fight against the truth, and getting him so unmercifully whipped. Brother Burnett has yielded nearly all the ground. Brethren, shall we open the doors of the church to him? He is about ready to come in. Brother Burnett, you will have to tell your experience. Tell us where God by his Spirit quickened you into life, and when you were relieved, and all about it. We are ready to hear.

With this speech I close my argument on this proposition. We have followed in all of Brother Burnett's tracks, and have shown that he has not produced the least semblance to proof against our many scriptures in support of our proposition. He has labored hard; he has done his best—has done all any of his brethren can do; but he lacks proof, or, if he had it, he could not produce it; but he hasn't got it, therefore he could not be expected to produce it.

We have presented to this congregation Ps. 139: 15, 16; Acts 15: 18; Job 23: 13, 14; Isa. 46: 9-11; 1 Pet. 1: 1, 2; 2 Thess. 2: 13; Acts 15: 13-15; John 13: 18; 15: 16-18; 1 Pet. 2: 9; Isa. 43: 10, 20, 21; Rom. 11: 1-7; James 2: 5; 2 Tim. 1-9; Eph. 1: 1-12; Ps. 65: 4; Isa. 48: 10, 11; Jer. 1: 5; Rom. 9: 11-26; Matt. 34: 24-31; John 6: 37, 38; 10: 15, 16; Rom. 8: 28-33; Rev. 20: 11, 15; 21: 23-27; Isa. 52: 10, 11; 35: 10; 53: 10-15; John 17: 1-3; Heb. 1: 3; 1 Cor. 1: 30, 31; Heb. 10: 9-18; Eph. 5: 25-27; 1 Cor. 6: 10, 11; Rom. 4: 1-10; and many others too tedious to mention, which remain unanswered and, we regret to

mine tree by faith. I will stop the debate right here, and give up the proposition, if the two hundred Baptists in this house will combine their faith and shake one leaf on that elm tree out there. Try it, Brother Dalton. You know you cannot do it, and all your noise and buncombe on this point is simply to dodge my scriptural proof that faith is the act of man, and that it is a condition of salvation. You have to deny the Scriptures, and claim a faith which you know you do not possess. It would be more commendable in you to give up the error than to show to this congregation that you have no faith. O ye of little faith! But he says he has trimmed a tall sycamine tree in this debate—by faith. It is a mistake. There have been a good deal of *w-o-r-k* and *w-i-n-d* wasted round about here, but not a twig is broken. Besides, I am not a sycamine tree. I am a Texas bois d'arc, with thorns on it; and that is what makes it miserable for the elect sheep when they "monkey" with it—ah! Every one of your predestination texts is impaled upon a bois d'arc thorn, and you cannot save them. He says he can cast out devils, but that is a mistake. Beelzebub cannot cast out Beelzebub, else his kingdom would be overthrown. If all the "erroneous devils" were cast out, there would be no Baptist Church or predestinarian doctrine.

"We are surprised that Brother Burnett should quote Paul to Titus, 'Mine own son after the common faith,' and draw the conclusion that because Paul says 'common faith' there are two faiths." Brother Burnett does not draw the conclusion from Paul's language that there are two faiths. You misrepresent me. There were two faiths—one miraculous and one common; but one ceased, and there is now but one faith, as Paul says in Eph. 4. Elder Dalton claims

to have the miraculous or uncommon faith, but gives no proof of it.

I referred to Thomas' faith to show that faith is the act of man. Jesus said: "Be not faithless, but believing." If Elder Dalton had been there, he would have said: "Lord, that is a foolish command; for you know Thomas has no power to believe, and you should not reprimand him for being faithless."

"Faith is not an act at all; it is evidence, Paul says; and surely evidence is not an act of any one." Why, then, did Paul tell the jailer, in answer to his question, "What must I do to be saved?" "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ?" Did Paul not know that the jailer could not do evidence, that he could not act evidence? You ought to have been there to instruct him, Brother Dalton. Your trouble arises from your unscriptural doctrine and from the faulty translation of King James' version, which makes Paul say that faith is evidence. Paul never said that. The Greek word means "conviction" or "assurance," and is so rendered by other versions. You also make the mistake of calling belief a result of faith (!), when you ought to know that the two words are derived from the same Greek word, and are identically the same thing.

"Instead of its being a condition of salvation, it is the result of it." Why, then, did Paul tell the jailer to believe as a condition of salvation, and why did Jesus say: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved?" Brother Dalton, if I had as unscriptural theory as that, I would hide it in the snake's hole and never let it see the light of day again.

He next comes to Acts 13: 48 ("ordain"), and tries to make you believe that the word *etaxan*, in Acts 15: 2 and 1 Cor. 16: 15, is not the same with *tetagmenoi*, in Acts 13: 48. Now, Brother Dalton,

do you not know that it is the same—two variations of *tasso*—or don't you know a Greek verb from Sut Lovingood's collar? In Acts 15: 2 it is rendered "determine," where the disciples determined, or decided, to send Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem; and in 1 Cor. 16: 15 it is rendered "addict," where the house of Stephanas addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints. It does not mean "foreordain;" and you cannot twist it so as to save your doctrine, Brother Dalton. But you again failed to tell us why Paul preached forgiveness of sins to the unordained Jews in Acts 13, and told them if they would believe they should be justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses. Now you have not another speech, and cannot tell us; and it leaves your doctrine in a bad predicament. It flatly contradicts unconditional salvation. You should have at least tried; for I have pressed it on you in nearly every speech, and these people certainly expected it of you.

Brother Dalton says he never held but half of the old Calvinistic doctrine. He believes sinners are damned for their disobedience, but the righteous are not saved for their obedience. He is half-converted. Another debate may cure him. But the Savior makes both salvation and damnation conditional: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." You have the last end of the commission right, Brother Dalton, but not the first end. You believe half that Jesus says, which does pretty well for a predestinarian Baptist; but you don't know how "by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" if righteousness is conditional. Well, John says, "He that doeth righteousness is righteous;" and Peter says, "He that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him;" and

Jesus says, "It becometh us to fulfill all righteousness;" and Paul says, "He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." So you see that it is true, whether you understand it or not.

Elder Dalton thinks that when Jesus sits on the throne of his glory and divides the sheep from the goats, that is just a separation, and not the judgment. Well, it contradicts his doctrine, all the same: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat." Condition performed by man! But I will show that this is the judgment. Jesus will sit on his throne. Then it is his seat. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ." (2 Cor. 5: 10.) Jesus will sit on this seat when he comes. Now hear Paul again: "Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing." (2 Tim. 4: 1.)

He next comes to Peter's exhortation, and says he told his brethren to "give diligence to make your calling and election sure"—to one another. Now you know, Brother Dalton, Peter said no such thing. You have added just that much to his language, and you ought to fear and tremble to take such liberties; but it is all the way he can sustain his unscriptural doctrine, friends, and you must forgive him.

He next throws up his hands in astonishment at what Jesus said to the Jews, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent," and thinks necessity is the mother of invention. Well, if he had been there, perhaps he could have said it better, and helped Jesus out of his necessity. No doubt he could have made the words harmonize a great deal better with Baptist doctrine and with the proposition he is defending. He could have told the Jews that

faith is not a work, and that man could not work it, and that they did not have to work it. He would have made a very different Bible if he had had a chance to work the works of God in revealing the plan of salvation.

He comes again to the new birth, and puts in another "O my God!" because I said that the sinner had something to do in being born of God. James says so, and Paul says so, and I will let the gentleman throw his exclamation points at them, as he has been doing all this debate. James says: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth; . . . therefore let every man be swift to hear." Paul says, "Ye are all the children of God by faith," and "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." Now where are you, Brother Dalton? You must pity him, friends; for he cannot defend his doctrine without running over all the apostles.

The way he escapes from my proof that persons are sanctified through the truth, purified in obeying the truth, and purified by faith, is amusing. He says that this refers to Christians; that they have to do this for themselves, but God does it for sinners. Here would be a good place to put in: "O ye heavens!" Brother Dalton has Christians that are not sanctified, not purified, not justified, not saved; and they have to do this for themselves. What next?

He quotes Paul to Titus, "According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration [baptism] and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through our Lord Jesus Christ;" and he wants to know if we think baptism was shed on us. No; we think Elder Dalton should study grammar. The word "which" does not refer to baptism, but to the Holy Ghost.

He next wants mourners called, and wants to pray for me and my brethren. What good would the prayer do, Brother Dalton? If your doctrine is true, our fate was fixed from the foundation of the world; and all the prayers in Christendom could not do us any good. You also talk about "opening the doors of the church." Where did you get that? I do not think you carry the keys of the kingdom of heaven. But perhaps you mean the Baptist Church. Well, I will not join that; for I cannot find it in the Bible, any more than I can find your do-nothing predestinarian doctrine; and I have not yet dreamed up a Baptist experience.

I will now bring my remarks to a close. I have followed the snake that made the track, both going north and coming back, and into its hole. I have met all the predestinarian texts, and shown that they do not teach that doctrine, and that it is not taught in the Bible. I have produced many texts and many arguments that remain untouched, and teach as clearly as words can speak that salvation is conditional. I will not ask this intelligent audience to beware of Brother Dalton's doctrine. While I believe it has deluded thousands into lethargy and inactivity and into damnation, I do not think there is an intelligent man or woman who has heard this debate that will be in danger of accepting it. You know that it is not true. Here is my phalanx of proof-texts, which stands like a rock of Gibraltar, and which he has not been able to shake. They clearly prove that salvation depends upon conditions performed by man, and that his proposition is not true. Read them: Mark 16: 16; Rom. 10: 9; Acts 16: 31; Acts 8: 24; John 20: 31; Heb. 11: 6; Luke 13: 35; Acts 2: 38; Acts 3: 19; Acts 17: 30; Rom. 10: 9, 10; John 3: 16; John 3: 36; Matt. 7: 21;

Matt. 7: 24; Matt. 25: 35, 36; Rom. 2: 6-11; 2 Pet. 1: 5-10; Rev. 22: 14, and others.

I will not ask the Baptist brethren to discard Brother Dalton for his failure on this question. They should discard the doctrine that forces him to contradict nearly half the Scriptures, and which no mortal man can defend, and accept the gospel of Jesus Christ, which teaches that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Thanking you for your kind attention, I now close this proposition.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

MR. DALTON'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. President, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies, and Gentlemen: We are blessed this morning with health and privileged to meet under these favorable circumstances to investigate a subject of vital interest to us all. We have passed through the first proposition, and all has gone pleasantly; and we trust that all parties have been interested and edified. This morning we introduce a proposition which we trust will introduce new interest.

The proposition for discussion this morning is: "The Scriptures teach that in conversion, or regeneration, the Holy Spirit acts directly, or immediately, on the sinner's heart, and in many cases independent of the written or preached word of truth." This proposition we have the honor to affirm; and we feel happy with the thought that the Scriptures so abundantly testify to the truth of this proposition, which we will show before we are done. But it becomes our duty first to define the terms of our proposition. By "the Scriptures" we mean the Old and New Testaments. What we mean by "they teach" is they say it, either in its precise terms or terms necessarily conveying the idea. We mean by "direct" and "immediate" that there is nothing between the sinner's heart and the Spirit when the work is done. What we mean by "many cases" is that many are converted that never have heard the gospel preached. We feel

proud, my friends, that it falls to our lot to prove this doctrine. Now "to the law and to the testimony; if we speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in us." We will first call your attention to Jer. 31: 31-34: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

From this text we propose to show that God does this work for the sinner himself. We refer you to Heb. 8: 7-13, which teaches precisely the same lesson; and if my opponent should ask how God does this work, we answer him with Paul's language in 2 Cor. 3: 3: "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." Now, my friends, how God can write his law in the heart of a sinner by his Spirit and the Spirit not come in immediate contract with the heart we will leave for Brother Burnett to tell. God says he will do this work, and says he will do it with the Spirit. Now,

my friends, it remains for Brother Burnett to show how God does this and yet the sinner never come in direct contact with the sinner's heart. He may do it; but if he does, he will be wise enough to show how a man can write a letter with ink, and yet the ink not come in contact with the paper; but perhaps he will say there was a preacher there. What has that to do with this case? We are not denying that at all. Our proposition does not involve that he may count the pen the preacher in the case, and still it cuts no figure in the case. God does the work, and the Spirit comes in direct and immediate contact with the heart in writing; and that is what our proposition says, that is what we affirmed, and that is what we proposed to prove, and that is what we have proven; and now it remains for Brother Burnett to show that these texts do not prove that.

Our next proof-text is Heb. 11: 4: "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh." From this we show that Abel was in possession of faith, and made his offering in faith long years before the gospel was ever preached on earth by any man; and yet he showed the work of the law written in his heart. Brother Burnett will please tell this congregation who preached to Abel, give the name of the minister that God sent there to preach to him, so that Abel could possess that kind of faith which comes only by hearing some man preach.

We will invite you next to the case of Cornelius (Acts 10: 15): "And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." By this we show that God had

cleansed Cornelius before Peter was sent for to preach. Cornelius was a man that feared God, and gave much alms to the people before Peter went there. Now we want Brother Burnett to show who was preaching to Cornelius before he was cleansed, when he was converted. He told Peter when he got there that four days before that he was praying in his house and an angel stood before him and said to him: "Cornelius, . . . thy prayers and thine alms are come up as a memorial before God. And now send men to Joppa and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter: he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." Peter was then and there convinced that God had cleansed Cornelius, and he began to preach: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Peter then turns to his six brethren and says: "Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" These people had received the Holy Ghost before Peter preached to them. Here are two plain cases in point, and we trust that Brother Burnett will show who the ministers were in each case.

But lest he should say these are only a few cases, while our proposition says "in many cases," we will now call your attention to Rom. 2: 14, 15: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." It will be the duty of Brother Burnett to show us who was preaching to these Gentiles when the law was written in their

hearts. They were showing forth the work of the law written in their hearts before the gospel was ever preached to them, therefore there could be no such a thing as their having the law written in their hearts by means of the preached word of truth. Here we have "many cases," just what our proposition says. We hope that Brother Burnett has rested well through the past night, and has come forth this morning refreshed, and will take these things up and show how they are, if so be they are not as we say.

But before we quit this speech we want to give Brother Burnett one more case (Acts 9: 3-6): "And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven: and he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." Brother Burnett will please tell this congregation what preacher was along there preaching to Paul. This congregation is curious to know, Brother Burnett, and we expect you to tell. Your brethren will expect you to tell; and, should you fail, they will be disappointed. I will not, however; for we know you will never do it, for you cannot.

Now, friends, do not forget the proposition: "In conversion the Spirit operates directly on the sinner's heart, and in many cases independent of the written or preached word of truth." We have shown from the Bible "many cases;" therefore our proposition stands sustained until Brother Burnett can show that these

texts do not mean what they say. Now, Brother Burnett, come to the front.

MR. BURNETT'S FIRST REPLY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am happy to appear before you in opposition to the proposition read and to the speech to which you have listened; for if anything can be more unscriptural and absurd than my friend's doctrine of unconditional election, it is his doctrine of the direct operation of the Spirit. This will appear as we proceed; for I intend to follow right behind my opponent (as I did before), and take from him every text that he shall produce. Brother Dalton did not properly define the terms of the proposition. He left off the most important term of the proposition, the word "independent." This word signifies "not dependent, not relying on, separate from, exclusive, without." Now he must show that in conversion, or regeneration, God's Spirit operates without and separate from the written or spoken word "in many cases." I will not require him to produce "many cases;" but if he will just produce one case, I will give up the proposition. But he can never do this. There is no such case in the Book. Such a conversion has never occurred on this earth.

His first proof-text is Jer. 31: 31-34, where the Lord says, with respect to the new covenant, that he will put his law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts. He tries to prove by this text that, because the Lord does the writing in the heart, he does it without the word of truth. The text does not prove the proposition. I write in this notebook; but you see I do it with a pencil, and not independent of a pencil and words. The Lord writes in the heart, but not independent of the word of truth. James says, "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth;" and as begetting is an essential part of regeneration, the Lord does not regenerate without the word of truth. But to show how God writes without the word of truth, Brother Dalton goes to 2 Cor. 3: 3, where Paul says they were "the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God." Does this text show that God wrote on the hearts of the Corinthians independent of the word of truth? Paul says the epistle was "ministered by us," a preacher. Go to 1 Cor. 4: 15, where it tells how they were converted, or regenerated, and you will see that my friend's theory is not in a thousand miles of the truth. Paul says: "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." He continued at Corinth a year and six months, "teaching the word of God among them;" and "many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." That is the way Paul ministered the epistle. Does it look like it was written without words? In the fifteenth chapter he says he preached the gospel to these Corinthians, and that the gospel saved them. Did the gospel save them and not convert them? But my friend very strangely says that his theory does not require him to deny that there was a preacher in this case. It certainly does. That word "independent" requires him to show that the work was done without the word of truth. So he has lost the case.

He next comes to the case of Abel, and shows that Abel had faith, and wants me to tell who preached to Abel. I am not required to do that. It is his place to show that Abel received faith and was converted without words. He cannot do that, and hence the

case furnishes him nothing. Instead of showing us that God's Spirit operated on Abel independent of written or spoken words, he has not shown that the Spirit operated on Abel at all. Is that what you call debating, Brother Dalton? Because it is not stated that Abel heard any words, he concludes that there were no words heard; but it is not stated that there was any operation of the Spirit there at all, hence we conclude that—what? Now that is logic for you! But I am prepared to show that Abel heard words. Paul says Abel had faith, and says that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Hence Abel heard the word of God. This case is lost also, Brother Dalton.

He comes next to Cornelius, and tries to show from the words spoken to Peter on the house top—"What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common or unclean."—that Cornelius was at that time converted and saved. If the word "cleanse" there used shows that Cornelius was regenerated, it shows that some of the beasts in that vessel were also regenerated; for there were both clean and unclean beasts in the vessel. Does Brother Dalton believe any of those beasts were regenerated? He has undoubtedly put a wrong construction on the word "cleanse;" but even this absurdity does not help his proposition. I can admit that Cornelius was converted before he ever heard of Peter, and then he cannot prove that God's Spirit did it without the word. He has not shown that the Spirit ever operated on Cornelius at all before Peter came to him, much less that he did it without words. Here is where proof is wanted, and here is where no proof is furnished. Peter says, in the ~~thirtieth~~ and ~~thirty-first~~ verses, that Cornelius knew the word that was published throughout all Judea concerning Christ;

and it was while Peter was preaching to him that the Holy Spirit "fell on all them which heard the word." But I am prepared to show that Cornelius was not converted, or regenerated, until he heard Peter. The angel said: "Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." (Acts 11: 13, 14.) If Cornelius was regenerated before he heard Peter, he was regenerated and yet not saved. Peter says (Acts 15) that God "put no difference between them and us, purifying their hearts by faith;" and "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." This shows that their hearts were purified by faith, and their faith came by the word out of Peter's mouth. Hence if they were regenerated before they heard Peter, they were regenerated and still had impure hearts, and no faith and no salvation; and since Paul says we are "justified by faith," they had no justification. The idea is preposterous and absurd, and the gentleman's proposition is unscriptural and false.

He next runs away to the heathen, who "had not the law," but did (by a direct operation of the Spirit?) the things contained in the law, and thinks he has found a case. Do you think those heathen were converted, or regenerated, Brother Dalton? Do you think it was done by the Spirit without the word? Do the Scriptures say a word about it? Why do you not read us something the Scriptures say about it? Paul says it was done "by nature," not by a direct operation of the Spirit or by the Spirit in any way. So you have no proof here.

He next comes to Paul, and thinks he was converted by the Spirit without the word. Did he read you any-

thing about the Spirit in that case? Not a word. He read about a light shining (not the Spirit), and a voice being heard, but nothing about the Spirit operating independent of the word. He has a fine talent for proving what needs no proof and missing all the points where proof is demanded. If I could not debate better than that, I would take my hat and go home. But he wants Brother Burnett "to tell the congregation what preacher was along there preaching to Paul." Elder Dalton read what preacher was there preaching to Paul. "And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice [independent of the word] saying unto him." Did this voice speak without words? The historian says it spoke in the Hebrew tongue. Here we find the word in Paul's conversion, but where is the direct operation of the Spirit? It has not been found. So you see, friends, that Brother Dalton has produced nothing to establish his proposition. I have captured all his proof-texts, and must now rest on my oars for want of something to do.

I reject this proposition, because it is in direct conflict with the Scriptures. James says, "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth," not with a direct operation of the Spirit. Peter says, "Born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God," not by a direct operation of the Spirit. Paul says, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation," not a direct power of the Spirit. I trust Brother Dalton will try to do better in his next speech, and give us something that at least looks like argument.

MR. DALTON'S SECOND SPEECH.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies, and Gentlemen: We are before you again to consider further the proposition which has been read in your hearing; but before I present my argument further, courtesy demands of me that I should notice briefly the quibble of Brother Burnett. I am sorry that he does so near nothing in his last speech. Now, my congregation, what has he done with my arguments? You know very well that he has failed to touch them. He has bottle-whanged around, pawed and scraped like a yearling in a yellow jacket's nest, and in the end we can but adopt the adage: "A mountain labored and brought forth a mouse."

He claims that I did not properly define the terms of the proposition. I left out the word "independent." I will just simply admit his definition of the word and proceed. His exegesis of Jer. 31: 31-34 is indeed charming. He writes with a pencil in his book, etc. Very well, what does God write with? A preacher? He did not say so; he said with the Spirit of the living God. Brother Burnett writes with a pencil; God writes with his Spirit. Now, Brother Burnett, tell this people whether or not your pencil comes in immediate contact with the paper upon which you write. If not, tell us how you write in your book; then tell us how God would write his laws in the hearts of this people, and his Spirit not operate directly and immediately on the heart. Brother Burnett then comes to James, to that pet text: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." What has this to do with the writing of the law in our hearts? Nothing under the sun. He now tries to play off on the word of truth. He should remember that our proposition

says "written or preached word of truth;" there never has been a man converted that did not hear the voice of the Son of God, and Brother Burnett is now trying to play off on that. We will just simply call your attention to his dodge on Abel's case. Why did he not take that up and show us who preached to Abel? He could not do it, and he knows it; but as faith comes by hearing, therefore Abel heard some one preach. He says he is prepared to show that Abel heard words. I am prepared to show that no man preached to him. Therefore he heard only the voice of the Son of God. He then comes to Cornelius' case, and here tries to evade the force of the argument by playing on the word "cleanse." He overlooked our argument. I said that Cornelius was a man that feared God and worked righteousness before Peter went down there; and as none do that but regenerated persons, therefore Cornelius was a regenerated man. He says he is prepared to prove that Cornelius was not regenerated until he heard Peter. Now that is just the proof we want. Now, Brother Burnett, let it come. We say you cannot. Here's his proof: "Send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter, who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." He would fain make you believe that there is no such thing taught in the Bible as salvation, except regeneration and conversion. Peter's words did save Cornelius and his house, but not with an eternal salvation. There is an eternal salvation that is enjoyed only by the obedient children of God. But Cornelius was a devout man that feared God and worked righteousness and prayed to God before Peter went there, and Brother Burnett teaches (when not in debate) that God never hears the prayers of any but those that are his

children, but he can go back on that in debate, "and so he wraps it up."

He next comes to the converted heathen and tries to make the impression on your minds that Paul said this law was written in their hearts by nature. Paul said no such thing; I am ashamed of Brother Burnett. Paul said, "They did by nature the things contained in the law;" but he did not say the law was written by nature. God said he wrote the law; he said he did it with the Spirit, and Paul says these Gentiles had the law written in their hearts. Now, Brother Burnett, if God did not do it with his Spirit, then the Bible does not say anything, and you know it. Then why try to dodge the truth with such sarcasm? He then comes to Paul's conversion, and I was sorry to see his brethren with their heads so low. They expected better things of him, but the adage comes true again: "Blessed is he that expects nothing, for he shall not be dis-ap-pint-ed." He can only say that Paul heard something, but he can't tell who spoke to him. There is one thing sure: it was not any of Brother Burnett's brethren that spoke to him, for they did not exist then; it was not any of those that accompanied Paul, for they were astonished. Paul simply heard the voice of the Son of God, the Spirit shone with such glowing light and revealed to Paul how corrupt he was, and Paul fell to the earth. Brother Burnett, did you ever see that light? Did you ever hear that voice when no man spoke? If not, is there not a difference between you and Paul? In the close of his speech, he quotes the pet text from James again: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." And where Peter says, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God," etc., he makes this word of God the Bible, when he ought to know

that it has reference to Jesus Christ, the eternal word of truth, by which we are "born" or "begotten of God." But men in a press will take almost any position. We have followed him through his trace, crooked as it was, and will now give you some more proof in support of our proposition.

We will next introduce Matt. 13: 3-11: "Behold, a sower went forth to sow; and when he sowed, some seeds fell by the wayside, and the fowls came and devoured them up: some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth: and when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up, and choked them: but other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some a hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear. And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." We assume first that it is a logical principle that the same cause under the same circumstances will always produce the same effect. The seed sown were all the same, the sower was the same; but in the good ground only was there any fruit. Will Brother Burnett tell what made the difference in the ground? It could not have been the seed, for if so, all the ground would have been good alike, for it was all good seed. The disciples knew the mysteries of the kingdom, and the others did not. Will Brother Burnett tell why this was so? It must have been because God had written his law in their hearts by his Spirit, and the above parable shows very clearly

that the seed, which was the word of God, failed to be of any effect for good, except where the ground was made good before it was sown.

Jesus says in John 6: 63: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Therefore the word that Jesus spoke could not have been the same seed that were sown in Matt. 13.

We will next introduce 2 Cor. 3: 6: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Hence, if any of us possess life, the Spirit has given it to us; and to show you that the Spirit comes in immediate contact with the heart in this work we will refer you to Ezek. 36: 26, 27: "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." If this language proves anything, it proves that God's Spirit is put in the sinner's heart in conversion, and it is done without the agency of the sowing of the seed, as we showed by the parable in Matt. 13.

We trust that Brother Burnett will come within twenty feet of these, anyway. They are not infected with any contagious disease. Brother Burnett, come up to them and try your hand.

MR. BURNETT'S SECOND REPLY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Elder Dalton has again tried his hand, and, if possible, has made the matter worse. If I understand his classic phrase, "bottle-

whanging around," that is about what he has done. He continues to prove that which needs no proof, but fails to furnish any proof on the point at issue.

He first takes up his broken argument on Jer. 31: 31-44, and tries to mend that. He says that I write with a pencil, and God writes with the Holy Spirit, and not with a preacher. Yes, but does God write with the Holy Spirit without words? That is the question. He knows he does not, and he has therefore not produced one point of an argument for his proposition. I might admit that God's Spirit comes down directly upon the heart, like this pencil upon the book, and yet there would be no writing without words. Brother Dalton, tell us where the Holy Spirit ever wrote anything in regeneration without words. Can you write in your book without words? When Jesus said he would send the Spirit to "convince the world of sin," he added that "he shall not speak of himself." That was a speaking Spirit, and not a dumb Spirit, such as speaks to Baptists without words.

He next comes to the "pet text" in James, where he says God "begat us with the word of truth," and admits that no man was ever converted who did not hear the voice of the Son of God. That is a surrender of the proposition. If no man was ever converted who did not hear the voice of the Son of God, no man was ever converted "independent of the written or preached word." Good-by, Brother Dalton. But he says the word in James is not the written or preached word. Why, then, does James say, "Wherefore, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear?" Hear what? Can a man be swift to hear words that are neither spoken nor written? And what does the apostle mean just below by saying, "Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and

receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls?" Is the "engrafted word" a word that has no word about it?

He next falls back to Abel, and asks why I did not show who preached to Abel. That is not in the proposition, Brother Dalton. Why did you not show that the Spirit of God operated upon Abel independent of written or spoken words? This is in the proposition, but you have furnished no proof upon it. You have not even shown that the Spirit operated upon Abel in any way. I showed that Abel had faith, and that "faith cometh by hearing the word of God," and therefore he was not regenerated independent of the written or spoken word.

He next comes to Cornelius, and says he was regenerated before he ever heard Peter, because he feared God and worked righteousness. But does he show that the Spirit regenerated Cornelius independent of the written or spoken word of truth? Here is where proof is needed, and where Brother Dalton does not try to furnish any. I might admit that Cornelius was regenerated before he heard Peter, and yet that would prove nothing for his proposition. He has not shown that Cornelius ever heard of the Holy Spirit before he sent for Peter. He thinks Cornelius was regenerated because he was a devout man. All the Jews were devout men, and feared God; but were they therefore regenerated in a gospel sense? Peter says we are "born again [regenerated] not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God;" and (two verses below), "this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Cornelius was regenerated, or born again, by the gospel word which was preached unto him. His heart was "purified by faith," and his faith came by the "word of the gospel" out of Peter's

mouth, as we have shown; and he was saved by the words of Peter, as testified by the angel.

Elder Dalton's assertion that regeneration and salvation are two different things is the sheerest bosh. I have shown from Peter that he was born again, or regenerated, by the word of the gospel, and that he was saved by the word of the gospel; hence Dalton and Peter are in direct conflict. What would you give for a regeneration that left the child unbegotten and unborn, unsaved and with an impure heart? That is the kin of regeneration Elder Dalton advocates. You had better fix it up better than that, Brother Dalton. These old Baptist brethren expect it of you. Brother Burnett does not teach that God never hears the prayers of such men as Cornelius, though unsaved. Please do not make any wild assertions.

He next comes to the "converted heathen," and tries to patch up his argument there. He denies that Paul said the law was written on their hearts by nature. Did Paul say it was written by a direct operation of the Spirit, independent of the word? That is what you have to prove, Brother Dalton, and what you do not prove. Paul said they "did by nature [not by a direct operation of the Spirit] the things contained in the law." If I were you, and could not furnish something on the proposition, I would take my hat and go back to Tennessee.

He next comes to Paul, and says I did not tell who spoke to him. I did. He heard a voice "in the Hebrew tongue." Elder Dalton says he was converted by the light, without any words; Luke says he heard a voice in the Hebrew tongue. Which will you believe? Brother Dalton, who told you that the Spirit shone with such "glowing light?" You know the Bible says not a word about it. You have not even

shown that the Spirit was there at all. And you call this debating! What does it matter if none of "Brother Burnett's brethren" were there? Were there any Baptists on the earth at that time? Christians are my brethren, and there were Christians on the earth at that time; but there were no Baptists for fifteen hundred years afterwards.

Now that pretty dodge on James and Peter, that the word of truth is not the spoken or written word, but the Son of God—I would be ashamed of that, Brother Dalton. James says: "Wherefore, . . . let every man be swift to hear" that word; and "be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only." Elder Dalton would say: "Be ye doers of the Son of God," and "receive with meekness the engrafted Son of God." Shame on such a dodge!

He next introduces the parable of the sower, and says the reason some of the soil did not produce fruit was that the Spirit did not go before the word and prepare the soil. Does the Book say that was the reason? The Savior says the devil caught away the word out of some hearts, and that the cares of the world choked the word out of other hearts. Not a word is said about the failure of the Spirit to operate; nor is it said that the Spirit operated directly on the heart of the good ground hearer, to make the soil good before the seed was sown. All this is in Brother Dalton's imagination, and not in the Book. Not a word is said in this parable about the Spirit in any way. So you have no proof here, and it does seem that any man with two eyes could see it.

He next quotes 2 Cor. 3: 6, "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life;" and he tries to make it appear that

the "letter" here referred to is the "word of truth." Now, Brother Dalton, that is almost blasphemy. If you do not know any better than that, you ought to stop debating and go and read the New Testament. Jesus says: "The words that I speak unto thee, they are spirit, and they are life"—not a letter that killeth.

He concludes with a quotation from Ezekiel, where God says he will give the people a new heart—that is, a pure heart. Does this prove that God gives people a new heart without the word of truth? Not at all. Peter tells how God makes a new heart: "Purifying their hearts by faith." How does faith come? "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." New hearts, or pure hearts, are made by the word of God, and not by a direct operation of the Holy Spirit. So he has lost this proof-text, and has lost all his proof-texts, and has nothing to support his unscriptural proposition.

Brother Dalton wants me to get within twenty feet of his arguments. Well, his arguments are not within twenty leagues of the proposition he is defending, but I have knocked the very heart out of all of them.

Where is your proof, Brother Dalton? If you have anything to offer in defense of your doctrine, do please bring it out in your next speech, and do not go "bottle-whanging around" all over creation.

MR. DALTON'S THIRD SPEECH.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am before you again to pursue my line of argument; but, as before, I am left with nothing to do. Brother Burnett is farther from the mark than ever, but duty demands of me that I follow him. He reminds me of

the Dutchman's cow. He said to his son: "Jake, you go down on that side of the creek, and I will go on this; for I know that old cow is on both sides of this creek." We will have to go on both sides, for Brother Burnett is on both sides of the creek.

Abel heard some one preach, yet nobody preached to Abel; Paul heard some one preach, yet nobody preached to Paul; Cornelius heard some one preach, yet nobody preached to Cornelius; the Gentile heathens did by nature the things contained in the law, and had the law written in their hearts, and they heard some one preach, yet nobody preached to them. They must have heard words, and "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" therefore they must have heard some one preach. Shame! shame! Brother Burnett, your brethren expected better things of you, or they would never have sent away up to Bonham after you.

His speech reminds me of a new Congressman, who arose with the dignity of a pope and said, "The generality of the people in general are oppressive on the generality of the people in general;" and an old Congressman, sitting by, said: "There now! you have come out at the same hole you went in at; you had better quit now." Brother Burnett has made a big hole, and come out at the same hole he went in at; and, like the Texas cows when the heel flies get after them, he has curled his tail and broke for the water.

He wants to know if I write without words. No, sir; but I write without any one writing or speaking to me; and I write those words on my paper with my pencil, just like God writes his law in the heart. My pencil comes in direct and immediate contact with my paper, and I write just the words I want there. Just so God's Spirit in his own hands comes in direct and

immediate contact with the heart, and God writes the words of the law in the heart without the preached word or written Scriptures—just what our proposition says.

You have given up all the points in the proposition. Abel truly had the word of the law written in his heart by the Spirit, but will Brother Burnett be so kind as to tell the people who preached to him or what Bible he read? Brother Burnett, tell us, will you? No, you will not; for you cannot, and you know it.

As regards my asserting that regeneration and salvation were two different things, I never did it. I said that every time the Bible spoke of salvation it did not mean regeneration or conversion, and I say so yet, bosh as it may appear to Brother Burnett. Paul wrote to his Philippian brethren, and said: "Work out your own salvation," etc. Surely Brother Burnett will not deny that these brethren were regenerated, born again, converted, before Paul wrote this; hence salvation there does not mean regeneration; and many other cases we might introduce, but presume this is enough. If he will not believe this, he would not believe if Paul were here and tell him.

He then comes to those converted heathen, and says they did by nature (not by direct operation of the Spirit) the things contained in the law. We never said they did this by direct operation of the Spirit, but we do say that their doing those things was an evidence that God by a direct operation of his Spirit had written his law in their hearts.

Paul heard a voice in the Hebrew tongue, but who spoke to him? What preacher was there to read the Bible or preach the word to him? Why did you not tell us if you ever heard that voice in the Hebrew tongue when there was no man to preach to you? If

not, tell us if your case or Paul's is not one or the other wrong. Paul did, and you did not; and yet no difference. O shame!

He next comes to the parable in Matt. 18. You will not deny that the seed sown was the word of God, I guess. The ground was the hearts of men and women. Some of the ground was good, and some not good. Some were good and honest hearts, and some were not. All men in nature are alike children of wrath. (Eph. 2.) Please tell us what made the difference in hearts. Solomon says: "The preparation of the heart is of the Lord." The Lord prepared some of their hearts, and not the rest. This is the general idea with all the wise men of earth but you and your colleagues. Now, sir, if it does not mean this, what does it mean? And again, Jesus said it was given to the disciples to know the mysteries of the kingdom, and to the others it was not given. We wanted you to tell what they possessed that the others did not, and you did not try. Why was it that the devil did not get any of the seed out of those good hearts? Was it not in consequence of a difference in the soil? If so, what made this difference? It was not the sowing of the seed, neither was it the seed itself, and the seed was the word; therefore the word does not prepare the heart as you teach. Jesus says: "Make the tree good, and its fruit will be good." "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works," etc. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing."

He next comes to our exegesis of 2 Cor. 3: 6 ("the letter killeth," etc.), and says our proposition is almost blasphemy, and we ought to know better, and leaves it. That is a grand argument, is it not? It still stands out before him: "The letter kills, but the Spirit gives

life." It just simply means what it says—the Spirit gives life, and the letter kills; and because he could do nothing with it, he simply turns off and says: "You ought to know better, Brother Dalton." We do not wish to know better than what the Bible says.

He says our arguments are not within twenty leagues of our proposition. If this be true, it is a good thing for him, for he cannot answer ours; and if they were in direct keeping with it, I can't tell what he would do.

We have "bottle-whanged" you now, Brother Burnett, until we are sorry for you; yet your foolishness has not departed from you. We have followed him in all his meanderings, and we will now give him a few more texts, and let him try his hand on them. We will next introduce Eph. 2: 4-6: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." In this Paul tells us that we are quickened with Christ; hence just as Christ was quickened, so are we; and to find how Christ was quickened let us read 1 Pet. 3: 18: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." Surely our opponent will not argue that some one had to be there to preach to Jesus; and as Jesus was quickened, so are we quickened.

Again (Eph. 2: 20-22): "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit." In the above Paul affirms that God had built these saints upon the foundation, and fitly framed them together, and made them to grow unto a holy temple in him, and had done it all by his Spirit, and not a word said about some one preaching to them or reading the Bible to them; and surely if Paul had wanted us to believe such a thing, he would have mentioned it somewhere in this connection. Therefore we conclude that Paul did not believe or teach it.

Now, we trust that Brother Burnett will give these plain declarations of God's word a passing notice, and make it appear like he was going to try to answer my arguments. Now, Brother Burnett, come up to these, like a man, and let us have some debate. I am getting very hungry, but there is no use to bring out text after text till some are answered. Now get up close to them; they will not hurt you; it will do you good to believe them.

MR. BURNETT'S THIRD REPLY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I would become very impatient with Elder Dalton in his utter failure to present anything in defense of his proposition, did I not know that he has nothing to present. There is not a text in all the Bible that teaches that in regeneration God's Spirit operates independent of the written or spoken word; and, having nothing to present, he can of course present nothing. You must excuse him for careering around all over the Bible, from Dan to Beersheba, and coming back to the place where he started without one syllable of evidence in support of his doctrine.

He says, with reference to the cases of Abel, Paul, Cornelius, and the heathen, that I am like the Dutch-

man's cow—on both sides of the creek. Well, his doctrine is not like the Dutchman's cow; it is not on either side of the creek. This audience will bear testimony to the fact that he has found neither cow nor tracks anywhere about the creek. He imagined that he found some tracks back there at the garden of Eden when he discovered that Abel had faith, but when I showed that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," all the tracks disappeared.

He next found tracks at Damascus, where the light shone round about Paul; but when I showed that that light was not the Holy Spirit, and that Paul heard a voice in the Hebrew tongue, the tracks all disappeared.

He next found tracks at Cesarea, about the house of Cornelius; but when I showed that Cornelius was saved by the words spoken by Peter, that he was begotten by the incorruptible seed or word of God, that his heart was purified by faith, and that the faith came by the word of the gospel out of Peter's mouth, the tracks all disappeared from Cesarea.

Then he fled into the wilderness, and discovered tracks among the heathen; but when I showed that the heathen did "by nature," and not by a direct operation of the Spirit, the things contained in the law, the tracks all disappeared here.

Now, Mr. Dutchman, you just tell Jake that that cow is on neither side of the creek, and not in the Bible.

He says I am like the new Congressman who came out at the same hole he went in at. Yes, sir; I am following Dalton, and he has come out at the same hole, and a very small hole it is. The generality of people in general will generally say that he has come out at the little end of the horn. We know that he has come out without any proof for his proposition.

He says he writes in his book without any one speaking to him, and that God writes on the heart by his Spirit without any medium between. Let him show where God ever wrote anything in regeneration without words, and I will give up the question. If God regenerates by his Spirit without words, how does he beget us "with the word of truth," and how is the gospel (good news) "the power of God unto salvation?" Paul told the Corinthians that they were God's epistle, but he added that it was "ministered by us," showing that God wrote that epistle by the medium of the word which Paul preached.

He tries to escape the dilemma in which he placed himself in regard to the conversion of Cornelius by saying that the "salvation" spoken of by the angel was not regeneration. I showed that this salvation was regeneration, because it was by the words that Peter spoke, and that Peter said the word of the gospel is the incorruptible seed which begets us, and that the word spoken by Peter produced faith which purified the heart of Cornelius. Brother Dalton, you are gone forever on the case of Cornelius.

He wishes to know if Brother Burnett heard a voice in the Hebrew tongue, like Paul, and if there is not a difference between his conversion and the conversion of Paul. Brother Burnett heard a voice in the English tongue, and it was the same voice that Paul heard in the Hebrew tongue. Does Elder Dalton think that the word of truth may not be spoken in either Hebrew or English? Perhaps he thinks the voice in the Hebrew tongue which Paul heard was like the voice which Baptists hear in dreams and visions, and which speaks without words. If that be so, it is no wonder they know so little about it, and can never tell whether they are converted or not. A voice that speaks with-

out words and a pen that writes without language must be very hard to interpret; but the voice that spoke to Paul in the Hebrew tongue was not like the voice that speaks to Baptists, for it used intelligible language, and its words are put upon record.

He next comes to the parable of the sower, and says the reason the soil did not all bear fruit was that God did not prepare it before the seed was sown. Does the Book say that was the reason? Doesn't it say the reason the wayside hearer did not bear fruit was that the devil caught away the word out of his heart, and that the thorny ground hearer let the cares of the world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word out of his heart? The stony soil was the only one that was bad at the start, and the record says that the stony ground hearer "for awhile believed." Now what is Elder Dalton going to do with that? He says that none but the elect can believe; yet here is the stony ground hearer that "for awhile believes," and in time of temptation falls away. He has not shown that the Spirit of God went before the word and prepared the heart of the good ground hearer, so that he could bear fruit, and passed by the others. Here is where proof is needed, and where no proof is presented. Brother Dalton expects us to believe without evidence, for he does not present any evidence. If he will show that the Spirit of God ever did go before the word, and prepare the heart of the sinner for the reception of the word, I will give up the proposition. Just one example will do, or just one text that states it. The fact is, he utterly misunderstands the parable of the sower, as he does nearly all the rest of the Bible, and puts a false construction upon it. The design of that parable is not to show the different kinds of hearts or soils in the world, but the different kinds of hearers of the word,

nd the disposition made of the word after it is heard; nd Jesus concludes the parable by saying: "Take eed therefore how ye hear." (Luke 8: 18.)

He next returns to his exegesis of the "letter that illeth," and affirms that that has reference to the word of truth, or gospel. Nothwithstanding Jesus says, "The words that I speak unto thee, they are spirit, and they are life," and Paul says the gospel is the "power of God unto salvation," and James says God begets us "with the word of truth," and Peter says we are "begotten again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God," Elder Dalton insists that the word killeth. Now, Brother Dalton, if you are honest in that interpretation, your brethren ought to send you to school. You are too ignorant to be trying to teach the Bible out here in this enlightened country. You ought to read the passage. Paul says: "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious?" Elder Dalton would have you believe that the apostles were not ministers of the word of truth, which they were commanded to administer in all the world; yet they were ministers of the Spirit, which they never were commanded to administer. It would be refreshing to have him tell us how the apostles ministered the Spirit without words; also to tell us what the apostles meant when they said to the disciples: "Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, whom we may appoint over this business, but we will give ourselves

continually to prayer and [illegible] of the word. How they could give themselves continually to the ministry of the word, when they were ministers of the Spirit and not of the word, is one of the mysteries that Baptistism. Brother Dalton, it will take a direct agency, miraculous operation of the Spirit to help you out of that difficulty. You never can get out of it by means of the word of truth.

He next quotes Eph. 2: 4-6, where it is said God quickened those who were dead in sin, "together with Christ," and he concludes that God quickens dead sinners into life, just like he quickened the dead body of Christ in the tomb. But the Book does not say that, Brother Dalton. The Book says God begets or quickens sinners with the "word of truth," and not without the word of truth, as you affirm. We are sorry you cannot make a single argument without contradicting the Scriptures.

I would notice his final text (Eph. 2: 20-22), if it had any bearing upon the question. The Ephesians were not built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets without the written or preached word. If you will go to Acts of Apostles, and read about the conversion of these Ephesians, you will find that Paul went into the synagogue and spoke boldly for the space of three months, and that he disputed in the school of Tyrannus for two years. So there is no proof here for your unscriptural theory.

I have now followed the gentleman through all his meanderings, until he has come out at the same hole he went in at, and shown that he has no argument to sustain his proposition. I shall demand the verdict of this intelligent audience for I have won it by every rule of logic and Scripture. He has not sustained a single point in the entire controversy. I demand an unconditional surrender.