

IS SALVATION CONDITIONAL OR UNCONDITIONAL?

A DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

C. H. CAYCE, Primitive Baptist,

AND

F. B. SRYGLEY, Christian.

Conducted in the Primitive Baptist Meetinghouse, Third Avenue,
South, Nashville, Tenn., December 25-30, 1911.

MODERATORS:

John R. Daily, for C. H. Cayce; J. W. Shepherd, for F. B. Srygley.

REPORTED BY

Miss Grace Dawson, Nashville, Tenn.

PUBLISHER'S PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The second printing of this valuable book is long over due. Most men of this age have so little conviction for the truth it is hard for them to stand up for what they profess to believe. I am encouraged to know that there a few left who are interested in knowing what the real issues are and that they are interested in defending them - either in a private or public way. It the day in which this debate was held it was a common thing for representative men to be asked to go forward and defend the principals of truth as they were believed and held sacred by various religious bodies. The men who held this debate were certainly representative men of their denominations. This debate is considered by many to be one of the best ever held between the denominations represented by the disputants. We would encourage an earnest reading of the following pages.

For several years we have had considerable encouragement from different ones to republish this and other debates (some others are now being prepared). It is hoped that this book will serve to re-awaken a godly zeal among the people who hold the truth to be precious.

Although this book was not copywrited, it is republished with the permission of Eld. Hartsel Cayce, (son of the late Eld. C. H. Cayce, one of the disputants in this debate), of the Cayce Publishing Company.

- Elder S. T. Tolley

INTRODUCTION.

The following discussion between C. H. Cayce, of the Primitive Baptist Church, and F. B. Srygley, of the church of Christ, was held at the Primitive Baptist meetinghouse, on Third Avenue, South, Nashville, Tenn. It began on December 25 and closed on December 31, 1911. John R. Daily, of Indianapolis, Ind., was the moderator for Cayce, and J. W. Shepherd, of Nashville, Tenn., for Srygley. The interest aroused by the discussion demands its publication. The debate was largely attended.

The public is indebted to Brother J. C. McQuiddy, who kindly consented, in deference to the general demand, to make arrangements for its publication:

The vital importance of the two propositions discussed, together with the recognized talent, ability, and wide reputation of the debaters, is, I presume, a sufficient apology for the present volume. The points at issue are so fundamentally opposite, and, at the same time, are so vitally connected with the question of human salvation, that they cannot be too seriously considered and examined.

The grounds covered in this debate have long been the subjects of careful and continued controversy. The first proposition contains the kernel of the controversy that has been waged so long upon the work of the Holy Spirit. It is contended, on one side, that, in conversion, the Spirit of God operates directly, apart from preaching, upon the heart of the sinner, and thus, without the word, convicts and converts

him. On the other side, it is contended that, in conversion, the Holy Spirit operates through the preaching of the word. Brother Cayce, together with Brother Srygley, heartily concurs in the belief that the Holy Spirit is the great agency in conversion. Indeed, all are happily agreed in saying that, if the sinner is converted at all, it is the work of the Spirit of God. The controversy is over the manner in which the Spirit does the work.

The second proposition assumes that the Holy Spirit, through the word, as preached by inspired men, has given certain terms, or conditions, upon which the blessings of the gospel may be enjoyed. The contention is that faith, repentance, and baptism are these conditions.

No man can afford to allow prejudice or passion to prevent an impartial investigation of any question.

We very heartily commend a careful perusal of this volume. As long as the points at issue among religious people are discussed, in the proper manner and spirit, good only can be accomplished. No man, with the cause of Christ at heart, who recognizes the benefit of high-toned, honorable discussion, can afford to harbor bitterness or enmity or to indulge for a moment in those low wrangles in which opponents seek for victory and not for truth. To investigate and examine any question, as continual agitation purifies the ocean, will naturally increase information and knowledge. If a proposition is true, it cannot be injured by investigation, but, on the other hand, will be confirmed and demonstrated.

Miss Grace Dawson, an expert in stenographic work, of this city, has, as nearly as possible, given

each speech as it was spoken. The candid inquirer, in an honest search for light, upon reading both sides, can "prove all things" and "hold fast that which is good."

JAMES A. ALLEN.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY THE MODERATORS.

MR. DAILY.—The proposition which we have met to discuss, or to begin the discussion of, this evening, reads as follows: “God gives eternal life to an alien sinner without a condition upon his (the sinner’s) part, and the Scriptures so teach.” Elder C. H. Cayce in the affirmative; Elder F. B. Srygley in the negative.

It is agreed to discuss this proposition and the second proposition, and to be governed by the rules laid down in “Hedge’s Logic” as rules of logic, which I will now read:

Rule I. The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the precise point at issue, should be so clearly defined that there could be no misunderstanding respecting them.

Rule II. The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality in respect to the subject in debate. Each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge, and desire for truth, with himself, and that it is possible, therefore, that he may be in the wrong and his adversary in the right.

Rule III. All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided.

Rule IV. Personal reflections on an adversary should in no instance be indulged.

Rule V. No one has a right to accuse his adversary of indirect motives.

Rule VI. The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.

Rule VII. As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced, on either side, should be examined with fairness and candor; and any attempt to ensnare an adversary by the arts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning, by wit, caviling, or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy.

Rule VIII. That in the final negative no new matter shall be introduced.

These are the rules by which these speakers have agreed to be governed, and as moderators we propose to see that they are governed by these rules. We are sure that that is their desire, as well as ours, and that they will observe them as they should, which I believe they will, and the audience should observe that respect for the occasion that should be observed, and there will be little for the moderators to do other than to count time.

MR. SHEPHERD.—I most heartily indorse what Brother Daily has said with reference to the rules, and wish to add a few words. I have found in an experience of several years that when these rules are strictly observed good results follow, because they are absolutely fair to all parties. They narrow the discussion to a specific proposition. All matter that does not add to the proof of the specific proposition under discussion is ruled out, and I request the disputants to bear this in mind.

The seventh rule says that a disputant shall not endeavor by wit or caviling to confuse his opponent or to draw him off of the subject under discussion, and we, as moderators, are here for the purpose of seeing that this rule is observed. We want them to stick to the subject. All stories that do not bear directly on the subject under discussion are ruled out. The very wording of this rule excludes them. Brother Srygley, I do not want you to introduce anything of that kind—not a thing. I want you to present the truth with all of the force and clearness that you possibly can. I want you to magnify the word of God. I want you to make those who hear you understand and appreciate that the object of this debate is to get the truth before them that they may meditate upon these things, that the truth may make an impression on their hearts and bring forth fruits in

their lives. So far as anything else is concerned, it is not to be even mentioned.

These things are vital. They look unto the salvation of immortal souls. And with these things before their minds, I hope that they will continue to press on from day to day in the presentation of the arguments pro and con.

Now there is one other thing to which I call attention. I have never known but little trouble to come up in debates when the first rule is observed. Notice it: "The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the precise point at issue, should be so clearly defined that there can be no misunderstanding respecting them." Now when this is done the points at issue are clearly defined, and the debaters come to them at once, and that is what we demand.

And now, a few words to the audience. I do not anticipate anything along this line, but I want this to be understood, and I feel that my fellow-moderator will bear me out in it: that so far as demonstrations are concerned, they are ruled out. We do not want any demonstrations. We are not here for that purpose. You are here, I trust, for the purpose of listening respectfully to the arguments presented on both sides; and when you shall have done this, do not go any further. Do not think about taking part in this debate by giving demonstrations, either favorable or unfavorable. Brother Daily, do you agree with me in this?

MR. DAILY.—I agree with you.

FIRST PROPOSITION.

MR. CAYCE'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad of the privilege of appearing before you this evening, surrounded by as favorable circumstances as we all are, and I wish to say in the beginning that I do not ask, in this discussion, my opponent to show any quarter. Truth is what I want. If the position that I occupy is not true, I want to know it. I trust that my heart is open for a reception of the truth, if my position is not correct.

I affirm the proposition which you have heard read: "God gives eternal life to an alien sinner without a condition upon his (the sinner's) part, and the Scriptures so teach."

As the result of a challenge being sent by my opponent, or his people, to this church, I stand before you, affirming this proposition.

The rules you have heard read require, first, that the terms of the proposition, or point at issue, should be so clearly defined that there can be no misunderstanding respecting them; so I shall define my proposition.

By the term "eternal life" I mean that life that prepares and qualifies sinners of Adam's race to live with God in heaven; that life that will continue on, after the separation or dissolution of soul and body, eternally. God gives that.

By the term "gives" I mean that God bestows it; he imparts it; that he gives this life to an alien sin-

ner, one who is separated from God by reason of sin and transgression.

An "alien sinner." I mean by that the same as to say a "dead sinner;" a sinner who is in a state of death in trespasses and sin. God makes that sinner, who is in a state of death in sin, alive again; raises him up out of a state of death into a state of life. God does this without a condition on the sinner's part—that is, without anything that the sinner must do as a condition in order to that end. God does not require works by the sinner, or obedience on the part of the sinner, in order that he bestow that life on him.

By the "Scriptures" I mean that which is recognized as the written Word of God, the books of the Old and New Testaments.

I think the proposition is clear. I think we can all understand just what the proposition means. However, it is somewhat awkwardly worded, for which I am not responsible.

My first argument is that God gives spiritual or eternal life to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because the alien or unregenerate sinner is represented in God's word as being in the flesh, and they that are in the flesh cannot please God. In support of this argument I call your attention to Rom. 8: 5-9: "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the

Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." In order that this may be plain, I have put on the blackboard Rom. 8: 8, 9—a portion of the ninth verse: "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." Under this I draw this perpendicular line. On the left side of the line the character is in that condition which the apostle calls "in the flesh," and in that condition the apostle says he cannot please God. On this side of the line, the right side, he is in that condition of which the apostle says: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." That is, the character on this side of the line can please God, being in possession of the Spirit. On the other side of the line he is destitute of the Spirit, and hence in that condition which the apostle calls "in the flesh;" and the apostle emphatically says he cannot please God.

THE DIAGRAM ON THE BLACKBOARD.

"So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." (Rom. 8: 8, 9.)

In the flesh.

Cannot please God.

Not in the flesh, but
in the Spirit.

Can please God.

If my proposition is not true, then God does give eternal life on conditions—the sinner must perform certain conditions in order that God bestow this life on him; and if the alien or unregenerate sinner must perform conditions while he is on that side of the line, I maintain that, as the apostle emphatically

says he cannot please God, the conditions which he performs must be displeasing to God, if he performs conditions on that side of the line. The apostle emphatically says he cannot please God.

In order that my proposition be overthrown, it must be proven that the sinner performs conditions which are displeasing to God, and as a result of the sinner displeasing God, God bestows eternal life on him; for the apostle emphatically declares that while in that condition he cannot please God. So if he performs conditions in order to be placed on the other side of the line, it must be true that these conditions are displeasing to God, for on that side of the line he cannot please God.

I request that this be examined, and that the brother show in his reply to my speech what the sinner can do on this side of the line in order that he may be placed on the other side of the line. It makes no difference what he may say is required of the sinner that he be placed on the other side of the line, the apostle, by inspiration, stands before him with the affirmation that the sinner cannot please God.

I next call attention to my second argument. The alien or unregenerate sinner is in a state of death. Gen. 2: 15-17: "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Here we have the man in his primitive state, as he fell from the plastic hand of his Creator, placed in the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it; and his Sovereign gave him a law to govern him in his living, and the penalty of that law was death. "In the day

that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." If the sinner is not in a state of death, then God either failed to inflict the penalty or else he falsified when he said the penalty was death, one of the two.

Gen. 3: 4, 5: "And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." "As gods"—not as God, but as gods—in the plural number and with a little "g;" idol gods, or false gods, "knowing good and evil."

Now, then, I maintain that God told the truth when he said, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," and that Satan told a falsehood when he said, "Thou shalt not surely die." One or the other of these characters told the truth. If Satan told the truth, then God misrepresented the matter. If God told the truth, then Satan did not tell the truth; and if God told the truth about it, then the sinner is in a state of death, for we admit—surely that will not be disputed—that man did transgress God's holy and righteous law, bringing sin into the world, "and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."

Here, in Rom. 5: 12-14, we have the broad statement made by inspiration—the apostle penned this, and he was moved by the Holy Spirit to pen the language: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." This will embrace all of the posterity of Adam. "For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." The

people who lived from Adam to Moses were not under personal law, as was Adam, yet death reigned. Notwithstanding the fact that they had not personally transgressed the law as Adam did, yet death reigned from Adam to Moses; and as death reigned from Adam to Moses, then all are under sin. Death reigns over the entire human family, and without the intervention of divine grace in extricating from that death in sin all would be ruined and lost forever.

Eph. 2: 1: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." Here the apostle tells us that all the time prior to the time that these persons were quickened into divine life they were in a state of death, and hence the proposition must be true that the alien sinner is in a state of death.

My next argument is: Eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because they do not perform good works. Moral works are not referred to, but spiritual works. Bear that in mind. Rom. 3: 8-23: "And not rather, (as we be slanderously reported)"—now it was charged against the apostle that he preached, "Let us do evil, that good may come," but he denied that charge; he said it was a slanderous report; and he stated of those who made the charge that their damnation was just; that is just what he said of them—"Whose damnation is just. What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise." He says their condemnation was just who make this slanderous charge against us, and then asks: "Are we better than they?" Then he answers: "No, in no wise." If we are no better than they, and their condemnation is just, then our condemnation is just; and if our condemnation is just, then we have no claim upon the Lord. "For we have before proved both

Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." I do not have to prove that, for the apostle has already said for me that he has proven it. Will you accept what he says? "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." All the Jews are under sin and all Gentiles are under sin, as they stand related to Adam and under the law. "As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable: there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes." Remember that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. They haven't even the beginning of wisdom in a state of nature, and as they are in this deplorable state which the apostle here describes, it must necessarily be true that if they are ever the recipients of eternal life, it must be without a condition on their part. They do not do good works. Certainly the brother will not argue that the sinner obtains eternal life by doing bad works, and we have proven that they do not perform good works. They haven't even the fear of God before their eyes. .

"Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Here

the apostle, after describing the condition of the human family in a state of nature, now draws the conclusion that no flesh shall be or can be justified in the sight of God by the deeds of the law. Why? None perform the deeds of the law, none live up to the law's requirements. They are all condemned by the law, and the law cries out: "Guilty, guilty; pay that thou owest." That is the law's demand, and the condition of the sinner is such that he cannot meet the law's requirements. If my proposition is not true, it must be that the sinner obtains life in obedience to the law, and the apostle here emphatically declares that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." That is the condition of the human family—none of them doing good works.

Ps. 53: 1-3: "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God. Corrupt are they, and have done abominable iniquity: there is none that doeth good. God looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, that did seek God. Every one of them is gone back: they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Here the prophet David emphatically tells us that God looked down from heaven upon the children of men to see if there were any that were doing good, and he emphatically declares none do good, none are righteous, no, not one. If my proposition is not true, then it must be that either God does not give eternal life at all, or, if he

does, he gives it on condition of doing bad things, for it is emphatically declared that they do not do good; it is emphatically declared by inspiration.

Gen. 6: 5-12: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Here is what God saw: that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that the thoughts of the imaginations of his heart were evil, and that continually. It was that way all the time, and remember that the Savior says that out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh; and if every thought and imagination of the heart is evil, and that continually, and out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh, that is the way he will talk. "And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt: for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth."

Ps. 10: 2-11: "The wicked in his pride doth persecute the poor: let them be taken in the devices that they have imagined. For the wicked boasteth of his heart's desire, and blesseth the covetous, whom the Lord abhorreth. The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God: God is not in all his thoughts." Here the prophet emphatically tells us that the wicked, the alien, unregenerate, will seek after God now and then? No, sir! Not at all. Instead of that, he says he will not seek after God. God is not in all his thoughts. He does not even think to care about God. He does not even think to love God. He does not even think to engage in the service of God. God is not in all his thoughts. "His ways are always grievous; thy judgments are far above out of his sight: as for all his enemies, he puffeth at them. He hath said in his heart, I shall not be moved: for I shall never be in adversity. His

mouth is full of cursing and deceit and fraud: under his tongue is mischief and vanity. He sitteth in the lurking places of the villages: in the secret places doth he murder the innocent: his eyes are privily set against the poor. He lieth in wait secretly as a lion in his den: he lieth in wait to catch the poor: he doth catch the poor, when he draweth him into his net. He croucheth, and humbleth himself, that the poor may fall by his strong ones. He hath said in his heart, God hath forgotten: he hideth his face; he will never see it." That is the condition of the alien, the unregenerate sinner.

Eph. 2: 1-3: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." All of these characters, prior to the time that God quickened them into divine life, were walking according to the course of this world. If God gives eternal life on conditions, this would have been the very place to have said so, for the apostle here tells just what these people were doing; all the time prior to the time that God gave them eternal life, they were walking according to the course of this world, and were by nature the children of wrath; and that is the condition that they were in, not doing good works; and as they were not doing good works, and yet God does give eternal life to some of Adam's race, it must be that he gives eternal life without conditions on the part of those to whom he gives that life. That must be true.

Eccles. 7: 20: "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." James 2: 10: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."

Eccles. 7: 20 tells us that "there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not," and James tells us that he that offends in one point is guilty of the whole law, so that the sinner in transgressing God's law in one point is guilty of the whole law, and hence condemned by the law; and if he ever receives eternal life, it must be, therefore, without conditions or works upon his part.

Gal. 3: 10, 11: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith." Here the apostle clearly and emphatically tells us that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God. As he is not justified in the sight of God by the law, it must be true that God bestows the eternal life, or gives eternal life, without condition on the part of the sinner, or the one upon whom he bestows that life.

My next argument is that eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because adults and infants are saved the same way; and as infants are not saved by performing conditions, so the adult is saved without performing them.

Mark 10: 13-16: "And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.

Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them." In connection with this I call attention to Luke 18: 15-17: "And they brought unto him also infants [Luke uses the word "infants;" they were children in their mothers' arms] that he would touch them: but when his disciples saw it, they rebuked them. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein."

Now I call attention again to the fifteenth verse of the tenth chapter of Mark: "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein."

I ask you, how does the little child receive the kingdom of God? Does the little child receive the kingdom of God by performing conditions? Can you make your conditions so simple and so easy to understand as that the little child can understand and perform those conditions? You know that the little child cannot understand the conditions, and therefore cannot be saved upon that platform; and the Savior emphatically declared that "whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child," in the very same way, through the very same process, as a little child—unless you receive it that way, you "shall not enter therein." This is the emphatic statement of the Lord. As you cannot reach the case of the little child with conditions, and as the adult is saved the same way the little child is saved, neither can you reach the case of the adult with conditions. Then it must be true, if God bestows eternal life at

all, he does it without conditions, and it will not be denied that God does bestow eternal life. The question at issue, then, is: Does God bestow eternal life upon conditions or without conditions? That is the point of difference. I say it is without conditions, for the infant is unable to perform them, and the Savior emphatically declares that "whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God" in the same way, through the same process, that the little child receives it, "he shall not enter therein"—an emphatic statement that the adult must receive the kingdom of God in the same way, in the same manner, and through the same process that the little child receives it. If the little child receives the kingdom of God without conditions, because of his inability to understand them, then you must receive the kingdom of God in the same way, or you shall not enter therein. If you receive it by performing certain stipulated conditions, then the child must receive it that way, as you receive the kingdom of God in the same way the child receives it, or else you shall not enter therein—the plain statement of the Son of God.

My next argument is that eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because they cannot come to the Lord or do good works.

Jer. 13: 23: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil."

The plain statement of inspiration is that whenever the sinner can do good works in order that he may have a home at God's right hand, just about that same time will you see the leopard change his spots and the negro change his skin and become a white man.

Again, John 5: 37-44: "And the Father himself,

which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape. And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not. Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." Who was the Savior talking about? He was talking about characters that did not have the word of God abiding in them; he was talking about characters that were not believers. He was talking about characters that were destitute of the love of God, and he says: "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." If they will not come to the Savior that they might have life, and we persuade one to perform conditions, and thereby come to the Savior in order that they may have life, what have we done? Made the Savior out a falsifier. "I receive not honor from men. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you. I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive. How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" [*Time expired.*]

MR. SRYGLEY'S FIRST REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I take pleasure in replying to the address that you have heard, and I desire, before beginning, to make a few statements about debates. I believe in debates, and am heartily in favor of honorable controversy. I believe that people who differ about the word of God should meet as we have met here tonight, and discuss these questions in the right spirit, and try, if possible, to arrive at the truth with reference to the teaching of the word of God. I have always held myself in readiness to contribute anything I can to accomplish this end. However, I may say that many people enjoy debates very much that are not very good on the prayer meeting, and many attend debates very well that are not very good in the ordinary meeting.

I do not believe in debating just to show our strength, nor to show which can overcome the other; but I believe that the purpose of debating should be like preaching—to arrive at the truth with reference to the teachings of God's word upon all these questions about which we may differ.

I do not believe the gentleman's construction of the passages that he has read. I do not believe his proposition, and therefore I am here to meet, in an honorable way, the issue, and to show you that the passages he relies upon do not teach the doctrine for which he contends.

I wish to state, also, before beginning this investigation, that I believe that the terms of a proposition

should be so clearly defined that there can be no mistake concerning them, that the point at issue may be so clearly defined that all the people may understand exactly the point at issue, that they may be able to arrive at the truth on the question discussed, thus making this investigation profitable to all who may hear or read our speeches.

I do not believe that my opponent has sufficiently defined the term "alien" or an alien sinner. I believe that it is necessary for us to know the *sense* in which the Bible talks about an alien. It is a Bible word, and I believe that we ought to understand its meaning in the proposition in order to see if the alien sinner does receive eternal life without conditions upon his part.

Now the fact that the gentleman has stated in his proposition that the "alien" sinner receives eternal life indicates to my mind that he thinks there is some other kind of sinners besides the alien sinner. If so, I would like for him to tell us the condition of the other kind of sinners and what *they* get. If the alien sinner gets eternal life, and gets it without conditions, I would like to know what the other kind gets and how he gets it. I would like to be able to know him, and I want the audience to know who he is and what he receives.

Neither do I believe that the gentleman has sufficiently defined "eternal life." He says that eternal life means the same as "justified." I say eternal life is that life that the righteous have as a promise with God in heaven. Now the question is: When does the sinner—the alien sinner—get this eternal life? Does he obtain this eternal life here? If so, what kind of a life does he get when he goes to heaven? I believe it is necessary for us to understand what eternal life is, and I believe it is necessary for us to

understand when the alien sinner receives it so graciously without any conditions upon his part, as my opponent asserts.

But he stated a little further on in giving his definitions that eternal life is spiritual life. Of course it is spiritual, but spiritual life is not necessarily eternal. I believe there is a distinction in the Bible between states of life, and therefore I call his attention to this fact, and I want him to read a scripture that says that eternal life can be lived in this state. I do not believe it.

And then when he proves that the alien sinner receives eternal life without conditions, I want him not only to tell us what that eternal life is, but when he gets it; then I want him to describe it, so we can tell it; and then I want to know if he gets it in this life. If so, then what does that passage mean in Matt. 25: 46, where he says: "These shall go away into life eternal?"

If the sinner, the alien sinner, gets this eternal life in this state, while he is living here, then what kind of life is it that we receive when we go into the world to come? For surely the gentleman can see in Matt. 25 that the individuals about whom the statement was made went into eternal life after the judgment.

Furthermore, I want to ask him: Does a man get this everlasting life actually, or does he only get it in prospect? Is it in reality that he obtains it, or does he obtain it in this life in prospect? Does he obtain it as an inheritance or as a reality? If he has this eternal life in him, then how does a man go into that which he already has "in him?"

I believe it is necessary for us to understand this matter in order to arrive at the truth; and if he thinks he will get away from me on this point, I want to warn him now that he is mistaken.

I want to notice the gentleman's question and passages to which he refers. He says that God bestows eternal life, and bestows it upon the sinner whether he is willing or not. Does God give the sinner eternal life when he don't want it, or does he have at least to want it before he gives it to him? I would like to understand this, because I would like to be able to advise my friends here whether they have to want anything before God gives it to them.

Does God break down his own image and go right into the heart and give a man something that he does not want? I want to understand this, because this will help us in this investigation to know whether there is such divine violence taught in the word of God or not—whether man is in a receptive condition, and therefore able to appropriate eternal life, or can he refuse it? I want to know if God breaks down his own image and comes right in like a thief in the night, or even bolder, and gives to man something that he does not want.

He says again: "An alien sinner is a dead sinner." I want to state in this connection that sinners that are not aliens are represented in the word of God as being dead in sin. Again, are there any other kind of sinners called "dead" sinners? He read a passage to-night that was about the other kind.

He refers to Rom. 8: 8 to prove that those that are in the flesh cannot please God, and applies the passage to alien sinners; but those to whom reference is here made were not alien sinners, but erring children of God, or members of the church. Paul says: "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." (Rom. 8: 5, 6.)

Brother Cayce, by his diagram, has it that all the flesh is on one side, and on the other side it is all spirit, but he has that wrong. I believe that sinners are in the flesh when they are walking after the flesh, but I believe that they have some good in them. I know the preachers have never talked much in favor of wicked humanity, and I would not indicate that there are not some men too mean and too bad to have any good in them, but there is some good in a great many alien sinners; but here on this side of the line Brother Cayce says they are in the flesh, and on that side in the spirit. I want to state that a man on this side—*i. e.*, a Christian, if he means these are Christians and these are alien—that the Christian can have some carnality sometimes. Paul had it. He had to war against the flesh continually. He says: "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." (1 Cor. 9: 27.) This passage teaches that Paul himself was living in the flesh, but not subject to the flesh. The apostle tells us exactly how it is when he says: "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit." (Rom. 8: 5.)

I want to suggest that this is true of alien sinners, and it is equally true of the other kind of sinners—*viz.*, erring children of God. If they mind the things of the flesh, they will be after the flesh; but if they will mind the things of the Spirit—that is, do what God teaches—they will be in the Spirit and walking after the Spirit, and they will be the ones that will receive the blessings.

My friend's argument is that because Paul says a man is in the Spirit, there is no flesh about him. I take it that while the brother hasn't a great deal of

flesh, he still has some. All men have. But he must not follow it. Brother Cayce's idea is that when God gives to man eternal life, he breaks up and destroys all flesh. I deny that. The flesh, he says, is not subject to the law of God. That is so. God does not address his law to the flesh. The truth is, according to this apostle, we are in the flesh until we are entirely redeemed from this flesh by death, but we are not following it. We are holding it in check, holding it in subjection, but still it is there all the time; and so, my friends, I do not believe a man is in the flesh and out of the flesh at the same time, but a man may be in the flesh to-day and follow the Spirit to-morrow, or go back and follow the flesh again. The apostle teaches this in this eighth chapter of Romans. I really do not believe that this passage touches the question at issue.

But I notice that he refers us to the law imposed upon Adam in the garden of Eden. God commanded him not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. At the very beginning the Lord God gave the commandment to our father Adam, and he disobeyed it. This fact shows that Adam, though made pure, upright, and holy, yielded and fell upon the first temptation presented; and this is true of humanity in general—they never sin till tempted. I never sinned until I got a chance, and Adam sinned the first opportunity. But Brother Cayce says that Adam was dead. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Yes, but what does death mean? Does it mean a condition of absolute inaction or simply separation? Does it mean that Adam and his race died in the sense that he and they cannot hear, believe, and obey God? It means that they were separated from the garden of Eden, or dead in a sense. But if Adam was so dead that he could not

do anything or think anything, why did God place the flaming sword near the tree of life to keep off this "dead" individual? The truth is, he was not dead in the sense Brother Cayce claims. He was dead, but not so dead as Brother Cayce thinks he was. My friend refers to Rom. 5: 14, where it is said that death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned. Certainly death, physical death, passed upon all men, but all men obtain a resurrection in Christ, for Paul says: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order." (1 Cor. 15: 22, 23.) Let me suggest that all that we lost in Adam unconditionally we gain unconditionally in Christ. You need not worry about anything you lost in Adam, for we will receive all that back in the resurrection, through Christ. But the brother proved we lost our lives in Adam. We did lose our natural lives. We are not guilty of Adam's sin, but we suffer physical death on account of it. I did not eat the fruit, neither did you, yet we suffer the consequences of Adam's sin. Coriolanus was banished from Rome for transgression of the Roman law. His children were not guilty, yet they suffered the consequences of their father's sin. They were not guilty of their father's transgressions, but they were born away from the Roman government, and therefore were not citizens of Rome. We were born away from the tree of life, and must, therefore, die as a result of Adam's sin; but we gained that back in Christ unconditionally in the resurrection from the dead.

The apostle says: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." (Eph. 2: 1.) Notice, he does not say in *a* trespass and in *a* sin. If he had been talking about Adam's sin, he

would have said in *a* trespass and in *a* sin, for Adam was guilty of only one sin. Do you want to know whose sins they were dead in? In their own sins. Why were they dead? Because they walked after sin. Brother Cayce says: "God gives them life." He does give spiritual life, but he does not do it unconditionally. He does it on condition that they obey him.

Paul says: "Are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." (Rom. 3: 9.) Brother Cayce read a good deal from this third chapter of Romans, and came very near reading enough to ruin his contention. I don't think he stopped on purpose, but he stopped all the same. The twenty-second verse says: "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference." That looks like a condition, does it not? I do not know the reason he stopped with the twenty-first verse, but it is a good thing he stopped when he did, for here in the twenty-second verse it is declared that God gives it to *all them that believe*, for there is no difference. He was talking about the Jew and the Gentile. He was arguing with these Jewish brethren that with God they were no better than the Gentiles, for God proposed to save all men on condition that they obey him, for all, both Jew and Gentile, are under sin and need a Savior; but that does not prove he would save unconditionally. Paul said nothing about that in this passage, and therefore I insist that you will have to go to some other passage to learn how he saves them, whether conditionally or unconditionally.

David says that "there is none that doeth good." (Ps. 53: 1.) I believe this is true, that there is a

class of people he was talking about, and they were God's people, too, that had all gone astray, and therefore were under sin, and needed a Savior; but that passage does not prove that God will save them unconditionally, by any means. It does not say one word about how God would save them. He does not even say that they were *alien* sinners. They had *gone* astray. God's own people had gone astray.

Again, he refers to Eccles. 7: 20, which reads: "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." That is true. While the Savior was here on earth he would not let the lawyer call him "good." He said: "There is none good but one, that is, God." (Matt. 19: 17.) I do not believe that there is absolute goodness in any one, except in God, which only proves the need of a Savior for all.

There is one thing I notice. Half his passages did not have a single word of his proposition in them.

He refers to another passage which I do not believe teaches his doctrine either. The passage is: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." (Gal. 3: 10.) That is the old law. No one is justified by the law of Moses. "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith." (Gal. 3: 11.) But, according to my friend's contention, he cannot live "by faith," for he *lives* before he gets to faith.

He says adults and infants are saved alike. I deny that. I do not believe infants are saved at all. The Bible says not one word about their being saved.

But they are *safe*, because they are born in a saved state.

He says the sinner cannot come to the Lord, and he asks if the Ethiopian can change his skin or the leopard change his spots. Do you not know the Lord was talking about his own people when he said that? They had been in covenant relation with God. This does not touch his proposition. If you will read the last verse of the chapter, you will see it is Jerusalem he was talking about—God's people.

I note a passage or two to show you that the gentleman is wrong and cannot be right in saying that God saves unconditionally. I call your attention to a passage in the sixteenth chapter of Acts. There was a question asked by the jailer: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" I say there has never been a question asked fraught with so much interest to man as that one. If my friend had been there, he would have said: "Do? Why, do nothing! Don't you know better than that? God saves unconditionally." But here this man, this heathen jailer, asked Paul and Silas the question: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" It is not: "What might I do? What should I do?" It is: "What *must* I do to be saved?" It is not what must God do, what must the Spirit do, or what must Christ do, but, "*What must I do?*" And, do you know, Paul and Silas answered that question just like they knew my brother was wrong, when they said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." They answered the question like they thought he could do something. The first time they opened their mouth it was to tell him to *do* something. Yet our brother stands here and says God gives eternal life, which, he says, means regeneration or spiritual life, without any condition. If that

was known by Paul and Silas when the jailer asked this question, it occurs to me that when he says, "What must I do?" they would have answered: "Why, do nothing! God gives a man eternal life without his doing anything." I say that would have been the way of it, would it not?

Now, my friends, I have noticed his passages; and of course, as I have caught up, I just want to give him this to think about. You know if I catch up with him, just like the little boy—

MR. SHEPHERD.—That has been ruled out. No irrelevant stories will be allowed.

MR. SRYGLEY.—Excuse me. But I insist on this point, that certainly he thought he could do something. Here is another passage I want to give him. I am sure the gentleman's contention about those passages he read cannot be true, for the reason that in the fifth chapter of Hebrews the apostle, talking about *salvation*, said that he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. Paul says: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (Heb. 5: 8, 9.) This is the proposition exactly we are discussing, and the passage requires obedience in order to obtain eternal life. "Unto all them that" do what? That do nothing? No, but "*unto all them that obey him.*" Now you have it. And you tell me, then, in the face of that passage, that a man can obtain eternal life and not obey Christ? You tell me, in the face of that passage, that man can be saved in disobedience to God, when the passage says that Jesus became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him? I insist from this passage, as well as the other I mentioned, that his contention

about the passages he has read cannot be true. He is mistaken. He has read these passages over and over, and has not looked at these others. In studying the Bible, you ought to get all that God says, ought to hear him through, and I insist that the passages he has read can be explained without admitting that man is saved without condition. If man is saved without any condition, and the Lord does not save them all, all alien sinners, and one is as mean as the other and just as good as the other, why does the Lord not save them all? If the Lord saves one alien sinner without any conditions, will he save them all that way? If not, why not? Have not I a right to ask that? I have many friends out of Christ, who are alien sinners, and I want to know whether they have any hope or not, whether God ever loved them or not, whether Jesus Christ ever came to die for them. I have a right to know. I am not charging that the gentleman teaches that. I am here to follow him.

If God saves some alien sinners without conditions, how many does he save that way? Does he save them all, or just a few? And if he only saves a few, why does the Lord make this difference? Why does he not save everybody, if he saves them without condition? I am not charging consequences, but am anxious to know what he teaches on this point.

I want to call your attention to a passage or two to show the conditions upon which the Savior saves. Paul says: "We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." (2 Cor. 5: 20.) If a man cannot do anything— [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you again in the affirmative of the proposition that "God gives eternal life to an alien sinner without a condition upon his (the sinner's) part, and the Scriptures so teach."

I wish to call your attention first to a statement that the gentleman made in his speech, near the close, that he had answered every proof text which I had introduced. I wish to call your attention to the fact that I introduced Gen. 3: 4, 5; Rom. 5: 12-14; Gen. 6: 5, 12; Ps. 10: 2-11; James 2: 10; Mark 10: 13-16; Luke 18: 15-17 (he made some little statement in regard to this text, but paid no attention to the argument and did not tell what the text means); John 5: 37-44. These are passages that are not noticed. I can tell you every one that he has noticed: Rom. 8: 5-9; Gen. 2: 15-17; Eph. 2: 1; Rom. 3: 8-23; Ps. 53: 1-3. Eph. 2: 2, 3—he did not notice this; the second and third verses were used in a separate argument from the first verse. He also noticed Eccles. 7: 20; Gal. 3: 10, 11; Jer. 13: 23. These are the passages that the gentleman has noticed. I introduced seventeen proof texts in my speech, and he pretended to notice eight out of the seventeen. That is how far along he is.

Now he says I have not sufficiently defined my proposition. He says that we should understand the term "alien." If he doesn't understand the term "alien" to mean as I defined it, let him say what he thinks it means. I defined it as being one separated

from God by reason of sin and transgression, cut off from God. If this is not a state of alienation, tell us what it is.

He asks me to tell what other kind of sinners there are besides alien sinners. I will say to you, there are *saved* sinners and *unsaved* sinners. An alien sinner is an unsaved sinner, one in an unsaved or unregenerate state. The saved sinner is one that has been born from above, is in a saved state. There are two kinds of sinners, then.

He asks: Does one have eternal life in this world, or while here? If not, then not one of Adam's race is in possession of the Son of God, for John says: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Not only is that true, but the Son of God falsifies when he says we have passed from death unto life. The Son of God emphatically says that the believer has everlasting or eternal life. Let the gentleman deny it if he dares.

He wants to know, if we have eternal life, what is meant in Matt. 25: 46, where it says: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." They go away into that eternal life which God has given them, which God has bestowed upon them. I think it means just what it says.

He asks: "God bestows eternal life upon the sinner whether he wants it or not, does he?" The inference must be, from his—may I say, sarcastic—way of asking this question, that the man never possesses life, never becomes in possession of life, until he first wants the life. I will ask the gentleman to tell us: Did you want your natural life before you were born into the natural realm? Now please answer that, will you? and don't forget it. He asks: "Is he in

condition to receive it if he wants it?" The idea conveyed, then, is that the man must want the life in order that God bestow it upon him. I have shown you the condition of the man who is destitute of that life. He is not in love with God; he is in love with sin, drinking sin down as the thirsty ox drinks the water; rolling sin under his tongue as a sweet morsel; the poison of asps is under his lips; the world is what he loves; godliness he cares nothing about. The contention of the gentleman is that a man must want what he does not want in order that he get what he does not want. He must desire what he hates in order that he obtain that which he does not desire. That is his contention exactly. The sinner does not want God. He does not love God. He hates God. He loves sin. That is his delight, but godliness he cares nothing about; but he must quit loving that that he does love, and want godliness—what he doesn't want—in order to get what he doesn't want. That is the gentleman's contention exactly. That is logic for you!

He refers to Rom. 8: 8, 9. He says these are not alien sinners. True, Paul was writing to the church of God at Rome; and in writing to the church at Rome, he describes in that chapter, in the fifth verse, the difference—draws a line of distinction—between those that are in a saved state and those that are in an unsaved state, or the unregenerate sinner, and says that "they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh." Notice the plain, emphatic statement of the apostle. These characters on this side of the line mind the things of the flesh. If they mind the things of the flesh, the apostle having told the truth about it, do they mind the things of the Spirit? If they mind the things of the flesh, and do not mind the things of the Spirit, and if they must

perform certain conditions in order to get on the other side of the line, then they must mind the things of the Spirit. The apostle emphatically declares that they that are after the flesh mind the things of the flesh. They do not mind the things of the Spirit. "But they that are after the Spirit," on this side of the line, in contradistinction from "they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh," on the other side of the line—"they that are after the Spirit [do mind] the things of the Spirit." He must be on this side of the line in order that he mind the things of the Spirit. He must be on this side of the line in order that he care anything about the things of the Spirit, or be concerned about them; he must first be on this side of the line.

I demand that the gentleman tell us what the sinner can do to get on the other side of the line. I want him to tell. He must do that to refute my proposition; and unless he shows what a man can do on this side of the line to get on that side, my proposition must stand, since it takes that to overthrow the proposition.

If to be carnally minded is death, to be on that side of the line, carnally minded, is to be in a state of death. The gentleman says that God says the flesh is not subject to his law. Please give us book, chapter, and verse where he says that, where he says the flesh is not subject to his law. I want to know where he said that. Please give us book, chapter, and verse. We want proof now.

On this side of the line is to be carnally minded, and to be in that condition is to be in a state of death, and the gentleman says death means separation; and if they are in a state of death, then they are separated from God and from eternal life; and if my proposition is not true, then it devolves upon him to

show that the dead man can do something in order to obtain life. On that side of the line he is in a state of death; but he says: "They are dead; O, yes, they are dead, but not so dead as Cayce thinks they are." I never said how dead I thought they were. Did you hear me say? "They are not so dead as Cayce thinks they are!" I wonder how he knows how dead Cayce thinks they are. Did you hear me say a word about how dead I thought they are? He says: "They are dead, but not so dead as Cayce says they are." If they are not as dead as Cayce thinks they are, they are not dead. Will the gentleman tell us that the word "dead" is an adjective, that it may be compared? Is there a ten-year-old schoolboy in this town but what knows better than that? Is there a ten-year-old schoolboy in this town that does not know that there is no such thing as degrees in death; that the word "dead" is not an adjective, that it may be compared? If there is, he had better be taken out of the school. Positive, dead; comparative, deader; superlative, deadest! How dead is he, Brother Srygley? Now if he is not as dead as I said he was, he is not dead. I did not say he was any deader. I just said he was dead. God's word says so, and as Cayce said the same thing, Elder Srygley being witness, Cayce told the truth about it when he said the sinner is dead—God's word said so.

"So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." On that side of the line, in the flesh, the apostle emphatically declares that he cannot please God. If he must perform conditions in order that he get on the other side of the line and become in possession of the Spirit of Christ, or eternal life, then he must do that which is displeasing to God in order to get on that side of the line, for the apostle emphatically declares that on this side of the line he

cannot please God. I want to know how the man, on the other side of the line, by doing things displeasing to God, gets on this side the line. Don't forget that. If you do forget it, I will call your attention to it again. I do not intend for you to forget it.

He says alien sinners are in the flesh when walking after the flesh, but that they have some good about them. Why does he not tell us what it is? I demand, since you affirm that they have some good about them, that you tell us what that good is, and in what place may that good be found. Is that good in the man's head, or is it in his heart, or is it in his mouth, or is it in his throat, or is it in his eyes, or is it in his hands or in his feet? Where is that good? I want you to tell us where that good is. I have shown you from the apostle's statement that it is not in his eyes, because "there is no fear of God before their eyes." I have shown you that it is not in the mouth, for it "is full of cursing and bitterness;" that it is not in the throat, because the "throat is an open sepulcher." I have shown that it is not in the heart, because the heart is deceitful and wicked. I have shown that it is not in their ways, for "destruction and misery are in their ways." I have shown that it is not in their feet, for "their feet are swift to shed blood." Where, then, is any good about them? I want to know if the gentleman's religion is all head religion.

Gen. 2: 15, 17. God said: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." He says that is true; that they were separated from the garden. You remember his calling your attention to the fact that God placed at the east of the garden a flaming sword and cherubims which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life, lest man reach forth

and take of the fruit of the tree and live forever; but the gentleman says the man can perform conditions now and partake of the tree. He has got the Lord fooled, hasn't he? Since the man is a violator of God's law, now, lest he reach forth his hand and take of the fruit of the tree and live forever, God drove him out of the garden, placed him where he could not reach that tree, as a result of disobeying the command of God. That is the reason why he is placed where he cannot reach forth his hand and take of the tree of life and live forever. Then the man cannot perform the condition in order that he live. Thank you, thank you, Brother Srygley, for giving me the text.

He refers to 1 Cor. 15, and says all that you lost in Adam you have unconditionally in Christ. In the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians the apostle is dwelling upon the resurrection of the Lord's people. "As in Adam all die"—who die? God's people—die, not died, but in the present tense. "As in Adam all die," die, now, in Adam; you die. Every day we are surrounded by death, and we see our fellow-men fall in death, dying in Adam—"as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." He did not read the next verse: "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." These are the characters. There is the order. "Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming;" every one of them raised in Christ.

He refers to Eph. 2: 1, "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins," and says it is *trespasses* and *sins*. True. *Dead in trespasses and sins*. That is exactly what it says, and they are sinners, and I have shown you that the apostle emphatically declares that the whole race are

under sin, and hence all the race are sinners, and all, therefore, in that state of death; and as they are in a state of death, if they live, the life must be given without conditions or works on their part. It must be that way.

He replies to Rom. 3: 8-23. I say he "replies" to it. He does not. He makes a wrong statement, however. He says that I stopped just before I read verse 22. He makes a positive false statement before you. I do not charge that he does it intentionally, but he made it, all the same. Either he was so absorbed in something else that he did not hear what I said, or else it is a wrong statement intentionally, one of the two, for I did read it. Listen. See whether I did or not. Twenty-second and twenty-third verses—the gentleman stopped himself before reading the twenty-third verse, after saying I stopped before reading the twenty-second. Let me read, beginning with the twentieth verse on down to and including the twenty-third verse, and see whether you remember that I read it: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." You remember the argument I made on that. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."

Didn't I read it? Read it emphatically, that the apostle here declares "both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin," and "have come short of the glory of God," the last one of them. That is the argument that I made upon that, that all have come short of the glory of God, and all in sin, and resting

under the condemnation of the law. If we are not saved unconditionally, then it must be by obedience to the law, and the apostle emphatically says that we are not justified that way, not saved that way.

He says that God proposed to save all that would obey him. Book, chapter, and verse, please? I want citation of that. Proof is necessary in debating. But how many assertions did he make! Assertions are not proof. It requires proof, if you please.

He refers to Ps. 53: 1 to 3. He says: "Yes, there is a class; God is talking about all that are gone astray." Mark, he says now it says class, and yet God says all. He wants to divide, and say class. You mind if he does not get out of that class business before he gets through. That is all I will say about that at present, but just mind and see if he does not get out of that class business.

Eccles. 7: 20: "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." I showed you from this that the prophet declares that there is not one that sins not.

James 2: 10, which he does not notice: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." So if he transgresses one point he is guilty of the whole law, and therefore condemned by the law, and hence impossible for him to be saved by performing good works or conditions.

He refers to Gal. 3: 10, 11: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith." You remember his comments on that. He says that I will be saying, before this thing is

over, that they live without faith. Just wait until I say it. Just wait until I say it.

He denies that infants and adults are saved the same way. "I deny that," he says. "Infants are not saved," the gentleman says. He says: "They are safe." All right. Can you tell me how anything can ever be lost that is safe? Now don't forget that. You tell me how anything that is in a safe condition, and safe, in a safe state, how it will ever be in an unsafe state, and how it will be in a lost state, how it will ever be lost? Now don't forget to notice that.

He denies that infants and adults are saved the same way. All right. Listen. Mark 10: 15: "Who-soever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." The Son of God says if you do not receive the kingdom of God as a little child does—that is, in the same way, through the same process, in the same manner the little child does—you shall not enter therein. Hence, if they are not saved the same way, it is a universal damnation to the last one of the adult family of Adam's race. Will the gentleman grapple with that and tell us what the text means?

He refers to Jer. 13: 23: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." He says God was talking about his people in that. All right. Then here are the alien or unregenerate sinners, those not God's people; and these over here are God's people. He says God was talking about them when he said that: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Then, according to the gentleman's contention, God's people cannot do good things, but the unregenerate can. Children of God cannot, but the children of the devil

can. God's people cannot do good things, but the devil's children can. That is the position the gentleman is in by his contention. He did it himself. I didn't put him there.

He refers then to the jailer. The jailer says: "What must I do to be saved?" Wasn't that jailer an awakened character? Certainly he was, else he wouldn't have realized any danger. He must have been an awakened character. Then it was too late for the apostle to tell him what he must do in order to be awakened; but the apostle said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." He says Cayce would have said: "Not do anything. Just sit right still, and don't do anything." Wait and see what Cayce says. The apostle says: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Did he stop there? "And thy house." The belief, then, of the jailer would save himself and his family. Would the gentleman say that the believing of the father or the mother saves the children in an eternal sense? Will he? "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Why, he stopped in the middle of the sentence. To read the whole sentence would prove too much for him. It would place him in a position that he must say the belief of the father or the mother or the guardian will save the children, as well as themselves; it will save the whole family, if the head of the family, if the father, will just believe—that will save the whole family.

Heb. 5: 9: "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Now let us see about that. Here is a character that does not obey him. Here is one that does obey him. "He became the author of eternal salvation." If he is the author of eternal salvation, then he is the beginner of it. He begins it and car-

ries it on; and, remember, he says emphatically, "being made perfect," and, as a literal translation would give it, "having been made perfect," "he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Made perfect, a perfect Captain. It must be true, then, as he is a perfect Captain, and the author of eternal salvation, that he saves every one whose salvation he undertakes. The gentleman contends that he won't save any one but those who perform conditions. I say every one who has yet or ever will really and truly obey the Lord from a spirit of love for God will be saved in heaven. I maintain that. I ask the gentleman, *do you believe it?* Do you believe that every one who ever has yet really rendered service to God from a spirit of love to God will be saved in heaven? Put that down, Brother Srygley. I demand that you answer that. Do you believe they will all be saved in heaven? I challenge him to say whether he does or not.

He refers then to 2 Cor. 5: 20, but as he did not get through with that, I will leave it.

I proceed now with my affirmative arguments. My argument that I was on was that eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because they cannot come to the Lord or do good works. I quoted Jer. 13: 23 and John 5: 37-44.

I now call attention to John 6: 44: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day." Here the Savior emphatically declares that no man can come to him unless drawn by the Father. "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save

he which is of God, he hath seen the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." A plain statement of the Son of God that that character, the believer, has everlasting life. That character, in a state of unregeneracy, the Savior emphatically declares cannot come to him; that "no man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." If he must perform conditions, then the Savior was wrong when he says: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him."

Mark 10: 15: "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." In the very same manner, in the very same way— [*Time expired.*]

MR. SRYGLEY'S SECOND REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The gentleman complained at the very beginning of his speech that I had not noticed certain passages. Well, I shall take my own time, and in my own way reply to him. It is not the number of passages introduced that proves a proposition, but their relevancy to the question in controversy. I have no reason to hold back anything. I feel sure that there is not a passage he has introduced that will in any way prove his proposition, and therefore I can have no inclination to dodge any of them. I can, with perfect safety, examine all of them, if I have time, for none of them prove his proposition.

He says I did not notice Gen. 3: 5, where Adam sinned, in disobedience to God's law, and died. I noticed it in my way; but I want to say, in reference to the disobedience of Adam, that the Lord gave him a commandment, and said: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Adam evidently understood that command, and he could have obeyed God, else God would not have given him the commandment; but the devil told them a falsehood, that they should not surely die in the day that they ate thereof, and they believed that falsehood. As long as Adam and Eve believed God and obeyed him, they were happy and all right; but when they disbelieved him and believed the devil instead, and disobeyed God, they brought ruin upon themselves and their posterity. In fact, that was the sin, the belief of a falsehood, and obedience to it that brought death

and ruin on the human family. He says that I said that God placed a flaming sword to keep the way of the tree of life. The Bible says that. He furthermore said, according to my position, no man can get back to the garden of Eden. The tree of life has been transplanted in the paradise of God, and man can get there, by faith and obedience to God, but he cannot get there in disobedience. You see, if a man would retrace his steps, what he must do. Adam lost by believing a falsehood and disobeying God, and I insist that man returns to God by belief of the truth and obedience to it. He did not go away from God by doing nothing. He got away from God by believing a falsehood and obeying it, and he returns by believing the truth and obeying it. If I walk over here three steps and wish to get back, I retrace my steps, go back as many steps as I came forward. Adam heard a falsehood, he believed it and obeyed it, and thus he was banished from the garden of Eden. My friend says I teach that a man can get back to God. I do teach that he can go back to the tree of life, or into God's favor. He returns by retracing his steps. He hears the truth, he believes it and obeys it, and that puts him back. He says I did not notice that before. Well, he is not the judge. I leave that entirely to the audience, as to what I said on that point.

He says I did not notice James 2:10. You ought to know that that was written to the brethren, and not to the alien sinners. I am sure he is not making the distinction between the alien sinner and the sinner who is in God's covenant that he should, for I am sure these were not alien sinners. The passage says if a man transgresses in one point, he is guilty of all. That is true. If a mule is in the lot, and jumps over one panel of the fence, he is out, as well as if he

had jumped every panel; but this has nothing whatever to do with the question at issue.

The erring child of God must get back by obedience. God has made provision for this, full provision. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." (1 John 1: 9.) The brother has it that he forgives without any conditions; but when we turn to the word of God and read you the conditions, we know he is mistaken in his contention.

Again he says that the difference between the alien and the sinner who is not an alien is that the alien is an *unsaved* sinner and the other sinner is a *saved* sinner. Well, I want to ask, is it possible for the saved sinner to become an unsaved sinner? Can the saved sinner go back into sin and do according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth; and if so, will he still be a saved sinner? The prophet said that his righteousness would not be mentioned unto him, but in his trespasses and in his sins that he sinned, in them shall he die; and therefore I say the alien sinner can turn away from sin and inherit eternal life, and the Christian, who has entered the service of God, can turn back to sin and do all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, and he will die, too, for all his righteousness will not be mentioned. (See Ezek. 18: 20-32.)

My opponent says that he that hath the Son hath life. I ask again: Is he actually in the enjoyment of the eternal life, or has he it only in prospect? It would be natural to say that if there is a girl in this city whose father left her a million dollars, that she will get when she is twenty-one years of age, while now she is only fifteen, that that girl is worth a million. It is not in actual possession. It is in the hands of her guardians, perhaps, but she will get

it in actual possession on condition that she lives till she is twenty-one. I believe we have everlasting life in that sense, but we will actually come into possession of it when we go away into eternal life. That is the way. I am sure it is.

John says, in speaking of eternal life: "This is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life." (1 John 2: 25.) Is one actually in possession of a thing which is only promised? Brother Cayce says he actually has it. John says it is a promise, and Paul says: "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." (Titus 1: 2.) Can a man hope for a thing that he already has?

The Savior says: "And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life." (Matt. 19: 29.) Brother Cayce says he has it now. And again the Savior says: "Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting." (Luke 18: 29, 30.) Brother Cayce says that "the Bible says he that believeth on the Son has everlasting life." I know it does, but that means in prospect. He is living here in this fleshly life now, and will come in possession of eternal life in the world to come. He says they have it in them, and then they go into it. I don't understand how that is. "Hath everlasting life" means we have it in prospect. This I have shown you. And they come in possession of it in the world to come. There is no reason in it as he puts it—first in him and he in it.

Paul says: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. 8:7.) My opponent says: "I want you to show me where it says the fleshly mind is enmity against God, and where the fleshly mind is not subject to the law of God." Paul says: "Because the *carnal* mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." I said flesh and carnality mean fleshly. That is what I believe, and so I used flesh instead of carnality. Does the gentleman say the carnal mind is not the fleshly mind? I am sure it is.

Again, he says: "One must want what he does not want." I say a man must want eternal life. Still Cayce says the Book teaches that he does not want it. Well, some folks do not want it, but some do. Those that want it will get it by complying with the conditions presented, and those that do not want it will not get it, for they will refuse to comply with the conditions.

Again, he comes back to his diagram and to the eighth chapter of Romans. He says I did not answer it. I am sure I did. Notice the first verse of that chapter. It says: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Notice, here are two conditions that must be present before a man is in that place that there is no condemnation resting upon him. First, he must be in Christ. Second, he must walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. If those brethren could not walk after the flesh, why was Paul exhorting them not to do it? I say there is danger, brethren, of even Christians walking after the flesh. I am sure that we sometimes follow the things of the flesh.

He says, again: "I demand that the gentleman tell

what the sinner must do in order to be saved." He has no right to make such a demand on me at this time. I am following him. I am not here to prove anything. I am here to examine the passages he relies on to prove his proposition for two more nights. After that I will tell him on what conditions God saves men. It is illogical to make such a demand on me now.

He says he wants to know where God says that the flesh is not subject to the law. Paul says: "For the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. 8: 7.) Carnality means fleshly here.

He says he wonders how I know how dead Cayce thinks they are, and then he says he would just like to get a schoolboy to compare dead—dead, deader, deadeat. Let me suggest here that this term "dead," or death, is a figurative word in this connection, and the Savior here teaches that the man is separated from God and from truth and righteousness, and is in that sense dead—dead, not literally, but only in a figurative sense. The child of God is represented as being dead, too. He is dead *to* sin. He is dead and alive at the same time. So is the sinner. The sinner is dead *in* sin, but alive *to* sin; but the righteous man is dead *to* sin, but alive to Christ and to righteousness.

When a man dies the natural death, the spirit is separated from his body. The sinner is said to be dead, and he is, in a figure; and Cayce says he cannot hear. But he can hear politics; he can take part in all the affairs of this life; still he is figuratively dead. The word "dead" is used figuratively. Cannot he hear God and obey him? The gentleman does not know what spiritual death means.

I want to reply to the whole speech, if I have time.

Again, he says he demands that I tell what good there is in a sinner. I am not here to tell. I am following him. I am in the negative. I am here to examine his proof, but if it will accommodate him, I will say that there are sinners in this city who love their wives or families, and do good to them, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and do good in many ways.

I said there is good in some sinners. I did not say there is good in every one. I believe a man can get so wicked that the gospel will not reach him, and some of those the gentleman read about were perhaps in that condition; but when the sinner gets so bad he cannot hear the gospel and believe it, then he will be lost.

We read: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (1 Cor. 15: 22.) He says I stopped at that without reading the remainder of the passage. The next verse says: "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." "They that are Christ's"—some are Christ's and some are not. Cayce says Christ's are those that have eternal life and that God has done something for, and those not Christ's are those that God has not done anything for. A man is Christ's if he keeps Christ's commandments. In the third chapter of Galatians the apostle is talking about them that are Christ's. In the latter part of the chapter he says: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Paul says, in the eighth chapter of Romans: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Then the man who obeys him, walks by his teaching, will be raised to everlasting life; and that man that has not believed and obeyed the Lord will be raised to everlasting gloom and despair.

Paul says: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." (Eph. 2: 1-3.) If the apostle wanted to teach that they were dead in Adam's sin, he would have said "dead in *a* trespass and in *a* sin," for Adam disobeyed but one commandment in the fall. The fact that Paul used the plural is proof to my mind that they were dead in their own sins.

He says God gives eternal life unconditionally. I do not remember a passage that he has read that says that God gives eternal life without any condition. He read one, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life," and that looks to me like a condition, but he says he had the life before he believed. A man cannot have life in unbelief.

He says again, infants and adults are saved the same way. I say that infants are not saved—they are safe. But he says the Lord said that they are saved the same way adults are saved. The Lord never said it. Cayce says, "If you do not receive the kingdom as a little child receives it," but the Book does not say that. It says: If you do not receive the kingdom as a little child, in the same trusting, loving way that a little child will receive a thing from its father or mother, you cannot enter therein. In all of my sins, I do not remember the day that I did not know there was beauty in holiness, and my Savior, through the gospel, came to me and found me in sin. He offered me something better than sin. It is like the mother when her little child has a dangerous knife in his hands. She offers him a beautiful apple, and in his eagerness to get the apple he drops the knife. That is the way the gospel came to me. He offered me something better than sin. I dropped it, and I took hold of that which was offered through obedience to God and the gospel of Christ. You re-

member how Paul puts this: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1: 16.) But it is the power of God to what? To salvation to him that believeth. But if I believed that man had eternal life without conditions, I would say that I can afford to be ashamed of the gospel, for it is not the power of God unto salvation. In fact, it is not God's power to anything. God came to me with the gospel in its beauty and offered me something better. Drop your sins and take salvation.

Brother Cayce's position is that God comes to you, and in his divine violence rushes in upon the heart of the sinner like a thief in the night, and gives you something you do not want. The Bible does not teach it. There is nothing in it that teaches it.

In regard to Rom. 3: 8-23, he says I made a false statement, and that he does not know whether I did it on purpose or not. I tell you I did not do it on purpose, if I did it at all. I did it with as good grace as I ever did anything in my life. I did not think he read the twenty-second verse. He says he did. Well, I was busy taking notes and may have been mistaken. One thing is certain: if you did read it, it did not help your contention. It says: "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference." Is that not a condition? If he read the twenty-second verse, I do not know how he gets over it.

God proposed to save all that would obey him. He says there is not much in that. Well, there is this in it: Your contention is wrong if that passage means just what it says, for it says: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he

suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (Heb. 5: 8, 9.) Brother Cayce says there is nothing in that. His proposition is not true if that is true. His proposition is that God gives eternal life to the alien sinner without condition, and this passage says he gives it to them that *obey* him. I would hate to be under it. Nothing in it, though, Cayce says.

Of the sixteenth chapter of Acts, he says: "Do you know that the brother takes the position that the father's faith saves the children?" "The brother" did not do any such thing. Let me read the passage again: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Acts 16: 30, 31.) His house is promised salvation on the same terms as the jailer. That is what it means, that the house will be saved exactly like the parents. But he says the passage teaches that the house or family was promised salvation on the faith of the jailer. It means that the children and all the family will be saved just like the father, or on the same condition. The jailer is going to be saved by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ. The others did not believe, did they? Read a little further. "And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." (Acts 16: 34.) So that was the reason the house was saved, because they did the same thing the father did. My opponent says that means that the children will be saved without doing anything. He is so anxious that one be saved without doing anything that he cannot see anything when it is right before his eyes.

The jailer said: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" Not what must God give, not what must the

Spirit *do*, not what must the apostles *do*, but what must *I* do to be saved, not in order to save himself. People do not save themselves; God saves them. You understand the difference between a condition of salvation and the Savior. This man was not his own savior. Christ was the Savior. The Bible teaches plainly that Christ saves. How was he saved? Without conditions? This passage does not indicate it. He said: "Sirs, what must I do" that the Savior may save me? And Paul and Silas told him what to do. My friend says he was already saved. But he was a heathen jailer. He had never heard of Christ, so far as this record goes, until that night. There could be but one possible chance for him ever to have heard anything about Jesus, and that was that poor afflicted girl that was healed, who said: "These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation." (Acts 16: 17.) My opponent says the jailer was already saved when he asked the question: "What must I do to be saved?" If this was true, why did not Paul and Silas say: "We will disabuse your mind. You cannot do anything. You are all saved; you have it, but you do not know it." It was the best place in the world to do it. I know why: *because it was not true*. He was not saved. So Paul and Silas told him, like they knew he could do something. They said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spoke unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straight-way." (Acts 16: 31-33.) And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them and rejoiced. Here is where the rejoicing came. They had obeyed the Lord. Here is where they had assurance

of remission of sins, because the salvation here must mean the salvation from past sin, and here is where the joy comes in. They had believed and repented of their sins. There is nothing said here about it, but that is implied. He evidently repented and was baptized between twelve and one o'clock. He came back into his house, then, rejoicing, believing in God, with all of his house. How simple is the plan of salvation!

There is another thing. He says there is not a just man on the earth—not one. I admit that. All have come under sin, and nobody lives absolutely free from sin. There is but one way that a man can be free, and that is by obeying the gospel of Christ, and after he does enter the service of God, he still is liable to do wrong; but when he does, he has an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit says: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1: 9.)

Again, Brother Cayce says that infants and adults are saved in the same way, but they are not. Infants are safe. They are not saved. The blessed little buds of life will blossom and bloom in the paradise of God. They need nothing but the resurrection. Life is what they lost in Adam; and they gain that through Christ. All they need is the resurrection from the dead. I do not believe that your little one, playing and laughing on your bosom, is as mean as the devil himself. I do not believe that he has been poisoned by sin and wickedness, and many of us have little ones in the paradise of God. He says that if they are safe, they will always be safe and can never be lost. I am sure that an infant can grow into an adult. The infant is safe; but when they are

grown they are adults; and if they are lost, they will be lost on account of their own sins. It is the easiest thing possible to understand the gospel. [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE'S THIRD ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I am before you again in the affirmative of the proposition which you have heard read: "God gives eternal life to an alien sinner without a condition upon his (the sinner's) part, and the Scriptures so teach." That is, the Scriptures teach that God gives eternal life to an alien sinner, a dead sinner, without conditions on his part.

Before resuming my affirmative arguments, I wish to notice the things that were said in the last speech last night that are worthy of notice.

First, I wish to call your attention to Brother Srygley's illustration as to how the man died, and as to how the man must live again. In the garden he heard a falsehood, he believed a falsehood, and obeyed a falsehood. In so doing, he went three steps away from God. Now in order that he may be saved in heaven, he must take three steps back—hear the truth, believe the truth, and obey the truth. I wish to illustrate that as he illustrated it. First, we find the man here in the garden of Eden, as he fell from the plastic hand of his Creator, where the tree of life is, this book representing the tree of life. The man, Elder Srygley tells us, heard a lie, believed a lie, and obeyed a lie—went three steps away from God, thereby going into death. Now let's try it. I am going to show you that his position—laying his position down as a platform—is too short at both ends and is broken in two in the middle. The man hears a lie—that is one step. He believes a lie—two steps.

Obeys a lie—that is three steps. He has gone three steps away from God, into death. The platform is too short at this end, for in John 8: 43 the Savior says: “Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye *cannot* hear my word.” The man must hear the truth, believe the truth, and obey the truth, in order to get back where he started from. The Son of God says that you *cannot* hear his word, and hence the platform is too short at this end to reach the case of the sinner. But suppose we grant that the sinner can hear, notwithstanding the Son of God says he cannot. Let’s grant, in order that we see the result of his position, that the sinner can hear. He hears the truth, he believes the truth, and he obeys the truth, gets back to the place where he was; but, behold, the tree of life is gone, Elder Srygley being witness, for he says it has been transplanted in the paradise of God. Where is it? The man has got back to the place he started from; but, behold, the tree is gone, Elder Srygley being witness, and the man cannot now eat of the tree of life and live forever. Hence the platform is too short at that end, because the man cannot hear; and too short at this end, for Elder Srygley himself says the tree of life has been taken away and transplanted in the paradise of God.

Is that the only reason it is too short at this end? No, sir. Where was the man at first? He was in the garden of Eden. In order that he be saved, he must be taken to heaven and immortal glory. If the man hears the truth, believes the truth, and obeys the truth, it takes him back three steps and lands him into the garden of Eden, and fails to land him into heaven, into immortal glory.

But I said it was broken in two in the middle. Elder Srygley says he goes away from God, and

comes back in the same way that he left. Isa. 42: 16 says: "I will bring the blind by a way that they knew not; I will lead them in paths that they have not known." Hence they do not go back the same way that they left. It is a way that they knew not, and a way that they have not known. Hence his position is too short at both ends and broken in two in the middle.

In reference to James 2: 10, he says: "James was talking to the brethren." That is the language he uses. James *was* talking to the brethren; but in writing to the brethren James makes a plain, positive statement of a fact. That fact is that whosoever shall transgress in one point is guilty of the whole law. The alien sinner is a transgressor. Hence he is guilty of the whole law. In order that he be saved in heaven by obedience, he must keep the whole law, and that perpetually, too.

In reply to that, or in speaking of that, he referred to Ezek. 18, and in Ezek. 18 a blessing is promised to those who obey the law, but only temporal blessings; these people are promised the temporal blessings under the law, the protection of the law, by living in obedience to the law; but these were temporal blessings. He must give an instance where the alien sinner is under consideration.

But then he says that no one actually has eternal life now. Hence, according to the Elder's own statement, as no one has eternal life now, his religion is a dead religion. I guess, when this thing winds up, we will have a second-class funeral. Dead religion! His own admission! No eternal life now! Nobody has it! Dead religion, the Elder himself being witness—they only have the promise of it. He refers to 1 John 2: 25: "This is the promise which he hath promised us." Notice that—"this is the promise

which he hath promised us." The promise was made a long time ago; not the promise made now, but the promise made a long time ago. What was it that he promised a long time ago? Eternal life. And John was writing to people to whom God had made that promise. God had now fulfilled that promise. How do you know? 1 John 5: 11, 12: "And this is the record, that God *hath* given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son *hath* life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Now let the Elder tell you that he does not possess eternal life. If he does, I will say that he is without Christ. "He that hath not the Son of God hath not life." "He that hath the Son hath life." If he has Christ, he has eternal life; and if he says he does not have eternal life now, then he admits he does not have Christ, and Christ is not on his side of the question. He is destitute of Christ. It is a dead religion.

Titus 1: 2. God promised eternal life before the world began—before the ages of time began God made the promise of eternal life. He has fulfilled that promise now with this people, and has bestowed that life upon them; but the Elder said something about hoping toward eternal life, and at the same time not being in possession of it. I wonder if the gentleman thinks that a man who is destitute of natural or physical life can hope to have natural or physical life? Who is it that hopes to live? The man that has life, or the man who is destitute of it? The man that is already in possession of the natural life hopes to live the natural life. The man that is destitute of natural life is destitute of the hope of natural life. Hope springs from life. Hope grows out of life. Hence that character who is in possession of the hope of eternal life, and hopes to live

with God in the glory world, is in possession of the eternal life, from which the hope springs, and he expects, by reason of that life, to live on and on in all eternity with God in heaven.

Then he says something about Matt. 25, you know—"go away into eternal life;" then he says, "You are in it, and it is in you, and you are in it, and it is in you, and you are in it," and makes fun of it, you know; makes sport of it. All right. John 14: 20—Jesus says: "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." *You in me and I in you.* Now make fun of that, will you! Try your hand on that for a while.

He says, though, they must want life bad enough to obey in order to get it. I have answered that. Who is it that wants to live—the man that is dead or the man who is in possession of life? But he says they are only dead figuratively. Prove it, Elder. Assertion is one thing; proof is another. Let's try it. Eph. 2: 1: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." He says they are figuratively dead. All right. "And you hath he figuratively quickened, who were figuratively dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye figuratively walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now figuratively worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all figuratively had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, figuratively fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature figuratively the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is figuratively rich in mercy, for his great figurative love wherewith he figuratively loved us, even when we were figuratively dead in sins, hath figuratively quickened us together with Christ (by

grace ye are figuratively saved).” Now where are you? *Bosh!*

He says I have no right to demand that he tell what the sinner must do. Yes, I have. Let's see. “So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.” (Rom. 8: 8, 9.) The apostle said they that are in the flesh cannot please God. On this side of the line they are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, and can please God. Who is in the Spirit? That character that has the Spirit of Christ. It makes no difference what the character on this side of the line, he that is in the flesh, does, he cannot please God. He that lives after the flesh, it is emphatically told us, that character is destitute of the Spirit of Christ—the man that lives after the flesh, the man that is in the flesh—and he cannot please God. I ask the Elder to tell us what can he do to get on this side of the line. He cannot please God to get over there. The apostle emphatically declares that he is destitute of the Spirit of God on that side of the line, and he cannot please God. If he must get on the other side of the line by performing conditions, I have a right to ask what they are, and unless he shows what the man can do on that side of the line, while in the flesh, in order to get on the other side, and thus not be in the flesh, but in the Spirit, then my argument remains unanswered, and while that remains unanswered my proposition stands. It takes that to overthrow and disprove my proposition; it just takes that. He don't have it to do, of course not. He don't have it to do. He don't have to disprove the proposition. Why don't he do it? Because he can't. He would if he could; but if he could not, how could he?

1 Cor. 15: 22, 23—the twenty-second verse he introduced to prove that what we lost in Adam we gained in Christ. “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” I quoted it and called attention to the twenty-third verse—“But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming”—showing that the apostle is talking about the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, and then the Elder admits that there is a restriction in it. Shifts his position. Put your finger on him, will you?

He says the Lord never said an adult receives the kingdom as a little child, but as a little child receives a gift from its mother. Let us quote the text again. Mark 10: 15: “Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child receives a gift from his mother, he shall not enter therein.” No, sir! That is Srygley! That is Brother Srygley, but not Christ. Christ said: “Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.” What was he talking about? Receiving the kingdom of God. He was not talking about receiving gifts from the mother. Elder Srygley knows it.

“God offers life and immortality.” Give us book, chapter, and verse that says God ever offered life, will you?

Acts 16: 31. The jailer again. “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.” The language has in it that the jailer’s house are saved just the same as the jailer. I make that statement again: “Thou shalt be saved, and thy house.”

I now resume my affirmative arguments. I was on my fifth argument. I introduced Jer. 13: 23; John 5: 37-44; John 6: 44. He has not noticed John 5:

37-44 or John 6: 44. I now introduce Matt. 19: 16-26: "And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?" Now, here we have this proposition: Here is one that believed he would have eternal life by doing good things, by doing something. The Savior will try him on that platform, and we will see whether he can be saved that way or not. He was a pretty good young man in his own estimation, wasn't he? I guess he was just about as good in his own estimation as almost any people in this community are; don't you suppose he was? He says all of these he had kept from his youth up.

Now, if I love my neighbor as myself, and I have five dollars, I would be just as willing for my neighbor to have the five dollars as to keep it for my own. I would be as willing for my neighbor to have the five dollars as to keep it myself, else I do not love my neighbor as myself. Let's see if he does love his neighbor as himself. "Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions." He went away sorrowful. Did he love his neighbor as himself?

No, sir; he did not want to give up his possessions. Not only is that true, but it shows he did not love the Savior, for he did not want to do what the Savior told him to do.

“Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.” What have we here? That it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a man to enter into the kingdom of heaven on his own righteousness, good works, or deeds. I believe it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a cambric needle than for a man to be saved that way.

“When his disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who then can be saved? But Jesus beheld them, and said unto them, With men this is impossible.” What is impossible with men? Impossible to be saved. As it is impossible with men, then they are not saved by performing conditions. If any are saved, then it must be without conditions; but as some are saved, and it is impossible with men to be saved, then it must be that they are saved without conditions on their part. “But with God all things are possible.”

My next argument is, eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because sinners are justified by grace.

Titus 3: 3-7: “For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us,

by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Here we have it emphatically stated in the seventh verse that they are justified by grace. Grace is a favor that is bestowed upon one who is unworthy to receive, and hence he has not performed works and conditions in order that the grace may be bestowed. Hence it is a matter of grace. Not only that, but the apostle tells us in the third and fourth verses what they were doing. Were they doing good works? No, sir; they were doing bad works. "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." Now God bestows the grace, and takes them out of this condition wherein they performed these evil works, and places them in a saved state.

Rom. 4: 1-10: "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, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith

was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision." Righteousness imputed without works. Here is an imputed righteousness, and that without works; and as this righteousness is imputed to Abraham before circumcision and without works, it follows that the sinner is saved without effort on his part.

Heb. 7: 19-22: "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did: by the which we draw nigh unto God. And inasmuch as not without an oath he was made priest: (for those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec:) by so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." Jesus did not merely become security for his people, and promise to pay what they could not pay, but he is their surety; and as he is their surety, his name is placed in the contract instead of their name; and hence the Father looked to him for the payment of the debt. He paid the debt, made the atonement for them, satisfied divine justice in their room and in their stead, satisfied the law for them; and hence it is what Jesus did that saves sinners, and not what the sinners do for themselves that saves them.

Gal. 2: 16-21: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God

forbid. For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor. For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." If sinners are saved by performing conditions, they could be saved that way without the coming of Christ just as well as with it; and hence Christ died in vain, if that is the way sinners are saved. But the apostle forever settles that question, and states that sinners are not saved "by the works of the law," or by performing conditions.

Acts 13: 38, 39: "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

Rom. 3: 20: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin."

Rom. 6: 23: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Wages is what you get for what you do; you transgress God's holy law, and death is the result. But God gives eternal life. He bestows eternal life as a gracious gift, and takes the poor sinner out of that state of death in sin, and fits and qualifies him to live in heaven with Jesus and the holy angels, and takes him home to glory by and by, and thus sinners are saved by his grace. "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

My next argument is, eternal life is given the alien

sinner without conditions on his part, because it is the work of the Lord that puts the sinner in Christ, and not the work of the sinner; hence he is saved without performing conditions on his part.

1 Cor. 1: 26-31: "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption"—everything the poor sinner needs—"that, according as it is written, he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." It is of God that you are in Christ, and not the works of the sinner, and therefore it is without conditions on the part of the sinner.

My next argument is that eternal life is given without conditions on the part of the alien sinner, because the covenant of God's peace is an unconditional one, being like the covenant with Noah. Isa. 54: 9, 10: "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." What is it that shall not be removed? The covenant of his peace; and his kindness shall not depart from these characters that

are embraced in the covenant of his peace. That covenant is just like the covenant that he made with Noah. Did God say unto Noah, if you will obey my law and live uprightly, and all your posterity, that I will never again destroy the earth by flood or water? No, sir. If God had made a covenant like that, do we not know that this earth would have been destroyed long ago? Certainly. For we have all lived in disobedience. This covenant is just like the covenant that he made with Noah. The covenant that he made with Noah was an unconditional covenant, and the covenant of his peace is just like that. And as the covenant of his peace is just like that, then sinners are saved without conditions on their part, just like the earth is kept from being destroyed by water without conditions on the part of men and women. So the sinner is saved by unmerited grace without conditions on his part.

My next argument is that eternal life is given without conditions on the part of the alien sinner, because Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, and accomplished the work of redemption. The salvation of the sinner, therefore, does not depend upon works performed by him, but depends alone upon the finished work of the Lord.

Isa. 63: 1-5: "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, traveling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save." Mighty to save! Notice that, if you please. "Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my

garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me." Is it not a pity that God would not look again? He would see somebody now to help him, wouldn't he? Alien sinners, according to Brother Srygley's position, can help the Lord in the salvation of their souls by performing good works, and thereby bring themselves into favor with God. But he says there was none to help.

Zech. 9: 11: "As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water."

Isa. 42: 1-4: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law."

Isa. 45: 17: "But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end."

Matt. 1: 21: "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins."

I want the Elder to tell me, do you believe that Mary did bring forth a son? Do you believe that they did call his name Jesus? Do you believe that he saves his people from their sins? Do you believe

the angel from the glory world told the truth when he said, "He shall save his people from their sins!"

Matt. 18: 11-14: "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost. How think ye? if a man have a hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that which is gone astray? And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that sheep, than of the ninety and nine which went not astray."
[*Time expired.*]

MR. SBYGLEY'S THIRD REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you to reply to the speech that you have heard.

In the first place, my opponent said that my position that man returned to God by reversing his steps could not be true, because of the fact that nobody knows where the garden of Eden and the tree of life are, because the tree of life has been moved. Well, it seems to me that the gentleman mixes up things here considerably. I believe that the man gets back to God; and while it is stated that the tree of life is in the paradise of God, I understand, of course, that is figurative language, and the meaning of it is: we will come back to him, and we always come back from where we *started by reversing our steps*. Man, while in the favor and mercy of God in the garden of Eden, was living in obedience to the law of God. God gave him *one truth* to believe and *one commandment* to obey. The truth that God required him to *believe* was that "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The commandment he gave him to *obey* was: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen. 2: 16, 17.) But Adam was influenced by his wife, and led to *disbelieve* God, and that disbelief was of such a character as to lead him into *disobedience*. He disbelieved God and acted upon it,

and by doing that he lost the favor of his Maker, and was banished from the garden. This is the way all men depart from and forfeit the favor of God; and in order to *get back* to the favor of God, it is *necessary* for man to retrace his steps, to *believe*, not a lie, but the truth, and *obey*, not a falsehood, but the word of God. Hence, my friends, God has given man truth to believe and commands to obey in order that man may return to his loving favor, in all of which man becomes an active agent and not a passive recipient in the salvation of his soul, as my opponent would have you believe. Now the great central *truth* to be believed and the one specific and positive law to be *obeyed* in order for man to reënter the covenant of grace with God is expressed by his Son thus: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 15, 16.) Hence, when I said last night that man could return to the "tree of life," I supposed, of course, that the gentleman would understand that nothing more was meant than that man could come back to God; but, like a drowning man, he "catches at straws." Brother Cayce says: "The tree of life is gone." I ask: "Gone where? Is it not transplanted, standing in the midst of the heavenly paradise? (Rev. 2: 7.) And now what completely refutes my friend's position is that an inspired man says that in order to reach that "tree" we must *obey* Christ. "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto *all them that obey him.*" (Heb. 5: 9.)

Again, he quoted, as I understood, from Isa. 2: 16. I asked him the place, and he said: "Keep your ears open." He asked me last night where I was reading and I told him, but he refuses to tell me where he is reading. If you object to telling me, it leaves the suspicion that the passage gives you no support

other than to fill up space. It seems that the gentleman is trying to run off and get away from me, but I will follow where he leads, and turn enough of his proof texts against him to convince the candid of his erroneous position.

He says I must quote the passages which refer to the alien sinner. When he quoted James 2: 10 and I replied to it, he says: "Why, that is not the alien sinner." Well, why does he bring it up? I was replying to him when I quoted it; and if he did not introduce it as referring to an alien sinner, what point is there in it?

Last night one of his chief proof texts was: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." (Jer. 13: 23.) The context shows that Jeremiah was talking about God's people who had been in covenant relation with God, but turned away from him. I believe a man can do evil till he gets so he cannot do good, and when he gets into that condition he is in a condition to be lost.

Last night he said he thought I had "head religion." Well, it does not make any difference whether I have any at all, so far as the proposition is concerned. I can answer him, and that is what I am here for. I will remind the gentleman that we are not discussing my religion, but an entirely different proposition. I am in the negative, and I will reply to him as I see proper; and when it comes my time, I will tell him *where* and *what* the religion of Christ is. He says he thinks my religion is "dead." He should not worry about me, but about his proposition, which, if not *dead*, is in a very bad way. He wants to get me off the subject, but he will find it hard to get away from me. I intend that he shall defend his doctrine, for I will hold him responsible for the

positions he has taken, which are out of harmony with the word of God.

Again, he quotes, "He that hath the Son hath life," and says that "Srygley thinks he only has it in prospect." That is not what I *think*. He has life here; but I *am sure* the believer has *everlasting* life *only in prospect*. I call attention to the language of the apostle Paul, who says: "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." (Titus 1: 2.) He says God *promised* it before the world began, and that God did afterwards bestow it. My friends, God's promise here was made before the world, the present dispensation, began, and we are now living in hope of that everlasting life that is yet to come.

Again, Paul says: "But if we hope for that which we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." (Rom. 8: 25.) I call your attention to the fact that the Savior *himself* said that everlasting life *was in the future*. Brother Cayce says the Savior says he *hath* it; and if God says he has it, he has it actually, or in reality. In prophecy, God sometimes says a thing *exists*, when he only means in *prospect*. Turn with me to the book of Joshua, and I will read you a statement in proof of this. He says: "Now Jericho was straitly shut up because of the children of Israel: none went out, and none came in. And the Lord said unto Joshua, See, I *have given* into thine hand Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valor." (Josh. 6: 1, 2.) And yet it was *more than a week* before they possessed it, and still God's book says: "Now I have given into thine hand Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valor." Here he declares that they *have a thing* that they only have in *prospect*; and if these people could have Jericho in prospect, *can we not have ever-*

lasting life that way? *If not, why not?* That explains the passage that says we have it "in the world to come," and that explains the passage in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, where he says, "These shall go away into everlasting life," and this position explains the passage that says, "It is a *promise*," and the passage that says, "It is a *hope*;" but if you take *his* position, that because God says you have it, it means that you have it in actual possession, there is no possible way to explain these other passages. Do you know why he fights so on this? If I am right on this position, his proposition is not true. I do not care how many passages he reads, his contention cannot be true, if a man only has everlasting life in prospect in this life; and that, I am sure, is true. I have given you these reasons. I am perfectly willing to give more.

He says again, in his last speech: "Can a man who is destitute of natural life hope for it? No. Therefore he cannot hope for eternal life, unless he has it in actual possession." Well, he contends that a man who has not spiritual life is in the same condition as though he did not have natural life! But this is not true, for as long as a man has natural life he has hope, and the power to desire and expect things. If there is a man that has no hope, I suspect he is in the asylum. Without any hope of anything, man would be *insane*. Now, if men and women can hope for other things, why can they not *hope* for eternal life? But *he* says they are dead. He does not seem to understand what *death* is, and neither does he seem to understand what *life* is, in consequence of which fact he contradicts himself.

He seems surprised because I said that death in Eph. 2: 2 is figurative, and then he turned to the passage, and I thought he never would quit saying

“figuratively.” Yes, I said that; but his idea seems to be that if you once use a word in its figurative sense, you never can use it literally. Why did you quit saying “figuratively” when you did? You had just as well read the balance of the Bible and say “figuratively” before every word. That is not my understanding of figures. I might say that Brother Cayce is like a mule (I wouldn’t do it), but would that mean that I never could speak of him any more as a man, but ever afterwards as a mule? There is no reason in his contention here; but if that is the best he can do, that is the best you can expect of him.

Then he says, “You in me, and I in you,” and that the Bible says “that God is in us and we are in God.” Well, that is so, but I do not believe he knows *how* God dwells in a man. Does God dwell in us personally? No, but by faith. I really believe that my mother dwells in me. Though she has passed over the river of death, I yet have her spirit, and she yet dwells in my heart and life. I was taught by her in early life, and impressions were made on my heart by that teaching, and I feel sure that I have the spirit of my mother yet. But *he does not* even understand how God is in a man, and how Christ and the Holy Spirit are in us. In fact, when he reads anything of this kind, he thinks it is a *great miracle*, that nobody can understand it except the *elect*. Just ordinary folks cannot grasp it. The Bible is not so mysterious as all that, but addresses itself to man’s understanding.

And again, who is in the Spirit? He says those who have the Spirit. Paul says (Rom. 8: 9) if we are in the Spirit, we please God; and if we are not in the Spirit, we do not please him. I say that Paul was in the flesh and in the Spirit at the same time. He had a body of flesh, though he was following the

Spirit. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." There are *two laws* mentioned here—"the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," which Paul said had made him free from "the law of sin and death." "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. 8: 1-7.)

I understand that there is a carnal and a spiritual nature in all of us, and the difference between the sinner and the Christian is found in the fact that the Christian is being *led* by the Spirit, following the teaching of the Spirit of God, and the sinner is following the flesh, has turned away from the Spirit of God and its teaching and is following the flesh. And after a man has become a Christian, he has his faults and his failures. I have heard of people that after they became Christians lost their appetite for smoking; but if you have a habit of that kind, you will want to continue it as long as you live or until you overcome it. I say his idea of conversion does away with all the benefits that might be derived from the proper training of children. If they are as mean as they can be, and have contracted all manner of evil habits, and their evil habits are burned out at con-

version, God saves them, and all the flesh is destroyed, and the spiritual only remains after conversion. That is not the teaching of the Book. But this passage teaches that brethren who follow the Spirit and not the flesh will live; but if they follow the flesh, they will die.

He says of 1 Cor. 15: 22 that I had better look into that. Well, I did look into it. Paul was there talking about the resurrection, and he says that Christ was raised first, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. But in the same chapter he says: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order." And there is another passage that says: "They that have done good [are raised] unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Is there not a passage of that kind? Well, if there is, suppose you look into that, and you will see that your doctrine is not in it.

Again, he says: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child." I said that meant as a little child receives other things. He said that it means as a little child receives the kingdom. I deny that. I say a little child does not receive the kingdom. It was people old enough to be converted that Christ was talking about, for the text says: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." The little child does not receive the kingdom here. The little child only needs a resurrection to go home and live with God in that everlasting kingdom. All we lost in Adam unconditionally we gain in Christ unconditionally. We lost our lives in Adam. We gain a resurrection in Christ.

But he says the jailer and his house were all saved on the faith of the jailer. He said last

night that I did not read the passage that said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, *and thy house.*" That was the way I understood it. Did not you understand it that way, Mr. Moderator? And in his last speech he said I did not read that passage. If I should treat you about that as you did me, I would say that that is a falsehood, but I suppose it is only a mistake. He does not seem to know the difference between a falsehood and an honest mistake. When I made an honest mistake, if it was a mistake, he said it was a falsehood, and then added that it might not have been intentional, as though it could be a falsehood and be unintentional. He does not know what a falsehood is. It does not hurt me for him to say I told a falsehood. I do not care if a man calls me a liar, just so he does not prove that I am one.

I believe he says I have not noticed John 5:37, and for his accommodation I will notice it, though I am sure his doctrine is not in it. This is the way it reads: "And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape." I cannot see any of his doctrine here, for it does not say they *could not* hear his voice. "And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not." This is the thirty-eighth verse, and neither is his doctrine here. The trouble with these people was that they had not believed what they heard, and they were damned for it, while my opponent's doctrine is that a man is saved *without believing*. So I know he must have given me the *wrong* passages, if he thought they sustained his doctrine. He says I do not notice the sixth chapter of John, and I will now see if it is in there. He says it is, and I am willing to examine the passage. Beginning

with the forty-fourth verse we have: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day." The next verse says: "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." This says *they will come*. He says they do not have to come. God comes to them, and breaks down his image, and rushes in on their hearts, and gives them something they do not desire. That is his position, and, as strange and inconsistent as it may appear, he is striving to uphold it.

How does *he* have eternal life? He says in *actual* possession. I *deny it*. I say it is in the world to come. Here is another passage that supports my contention: "But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds." (Rom. 2: 5.) That is hard on his position, but I cannot help it. Does not that look like he gives it to the faithful, and gives it to them in the world to come, like the Savior said? My friend does not seem to know in what sense we have everlasting life. I do not, therefore, wonder at his being so crippled in his position.

He appeals for help to the rich young man, but he, too, fails him. The trouble with the rich young man was that he loved his money more than he did God. The nineteenth chapter of Matthew tells us that the rich young man came to the Savior and said: "Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" Now I imagine if my friend had been there, he would have said: "*Do nothing*. You cannot do anything." But the Master did not so teach. He

said: "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments.*" He saith unto him: "Which?" Jesus said: "Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The young man saith unto him: "All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?"

My friend would have said: "You just lack God giving to you eternal life, that is all." But the Savior told him to *do* something. Something he could *do himself*. "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor." But if my friend had been there, he would have said: "You lack eternal life, and that is given you of God without conditions on your part!" Can he not see that passage is against his position? If he thinks it is not, let him try it out. I want to see the passage that is not against him.

Again he says: "We are 'saved by grace.' " I believe we are saved by grace as much as he, but this does not forbid conditions. The apostle says: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." But he does not say we are saved by grace *only*. Brother Cayce talks that way, but the Bible does not.

Suppose a farmer has a fine field of corn, and I say: "How did you happen to have so much corn?" He would say: "My two boys made that crop of corn." But they did not make it without seed or without plows. Then another man comes along and says: "How did you make it?" And he says: "Made it with a plow." That does not mean that the plow alone made it; but he made it with a plow and a

horse. And the preacher comes along talking about the goodness of God, and the old brother says: "It is the grace of God that made the corn. If he had not given me the sunshine and the showers, I never could have made it. It is God's grace." Everything we have is an evidence of his grace, and because we are saved by grace is no proof that we do not have to believe in Christ and obey him in order to be saved—none whatever; and in Titus 3: 5 it is said: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us."

There are certain kinds of work in the Bible that are forbidden. If a man undertakes to do what his own judgment dictates and not what the Lord commands, that kind of work is forbidden. But this passage does not forbid obedience to God; for when a man is obeying God he is doing God's work, when he is doing just what God says in the way that he says do it.

I believe that God saves us according to his mercy; but how does he save us according to his mercy? He saves us by the gospel of Christ according to his mercy. The brother then read another passage: "Unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." (Rom 4: 6.) The apostle is talking about the works of the abrogated law when he says that righteousness is imputed without works, and is not condemning obedience to the gospel. If you will notice carefully the Roman letter, the object of the letter is to keep the brethren from going back to Judaism, and Paul, in the first chapter, sixteenth verse, states that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation unto all that believe it, and none of his arguments come in conflict with that statement. I am sure that Paul nowhere in the Roman letter contradicts the statement: "I am not ashamed of the

gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Every quotation made and every argument offered is in support of that fact.

Again, he says that "Christ became a surety of a better testament." That is so. The world is saved by Christ. He is man's only Redeemer, and the foundation for that redemption was laid by his death on the cross. I tried to get my opponent to tell last night *when* the Lord gives eternal life. His argument on this point will not sustain his contention unless God gave it to the alien at the cross. I believe that Jesus Christ died to save us, and I believe the plan of salvation was finished when Jesus Christ was suspended on the cross and said, "It is finished;" he had reference to his plan of redemption, and this plan was for the salvation of the world. Paul says: "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." (Rom. 5: 9.) Here is Christ on the cross laying the foundation of man's redemption, and when we obey the gospel he is applying it to us.

The foundation of man's redemption was indeed laid on the cross; and if man obeys the gospel, he will be saved. But the gentleman's passages will not connect with his proposition, for he reads something that took place on the cross, and tries to make it prove something that happens right now. I am sure *that will not do*. He must do better than that.

I now call attention to a statement made by Paul: "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.) *We are*

not justified by the deeds of the law. The law of Moses has been abolished, and no man is justified by the deeds of that law. But that does not prove that Paul was wrong when he said that the gospel was the power of God unto salvation. If you are saved without the gospel, you are saved without God's power, for the gospel is the power of God unto salvation. Listen to Paul: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is [not *one* of the powers, but] *the* power of God unto salvation." That is what we are talking about—salvation from sin. We are not talking about Christ dying on the cross and laying the foundation for our salvation, but about salvation from sin now, and Paul never said anything in all of his writing that would conflict with the statement that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation. In the Roman letter he proves this proposition, and therefore it is unnecessary to go back to the law of Moses in order to be saved.

Brother Cayce asks me if I believe what the Lord said to Joseph: "He shall save his people from their sins." (Matt. 1: 21.) Of course I do, and he knew it. Furthermore, I understand it, too. I do not have to believe it without *understanding* it. He says if he just saves *his* people from their sins, he does not save anybody else. That does not follow. It says that his name shall be "JESUS: for he shall save his people from [not in] their sins;" and I believe that Christ is the Savior of his people, and sinful men and women can become his people by obedience to the gospel. I told you last night that it is like a mother whose child has a dangerous knife in his hand, and instead of trying to force the knife from his grasp and probably cutting him, she holds up a beautiful apple, and in his eager-

ness to get the apple, the child drops the knife. So Jesus offers us a beautiful life of purity, and the sinner drops his sin and wickedness, and Christ saves him from them. [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE'S FOURTH ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

First, I wish to notice some things that were said in the speech to which you have just listened. Much of that speech is irrelevant. Much that has been said is irrelevant, not to the proposition at all. But the gentleman said that I said nobody knows where the garden of Eden is. He misunderstood me again, for I never said that. But he says the sinner must come back into favor with God. He has been arguing this from the standpoint that the man heard a lie, believed a lie, and obeyed a lie. I call your attention to the fact here that it was not Adam that was deceived, but "the woman being deceived was in the transgression." It was the woman that heard the falsehood from Satan; she was deceived. But the man was here in the garden where the tree of life was. He went three steps away—heard a lie, believed a lie, and obeyed a lie—has gone three steps away from God now. So he must come back three steps. The man was in the garden when he disobeyed God's law (heard a lie, believed a lie, and obeyed a lie); so, if he retraces his steps, it lands him right back in the garden of Eden where he started from. I said the platform was too short, because it will not land him in heaven. It lands him back where he started, granting his own contention. That is what I said, and I say it again. I believe any man with one eye can see that. If I go three steps away from this pulpit, and take three steps back, where will I land?

Right back in the pulpit where I started. Any man with one eye can see that. But he says: "I am following you." He is a long way behind. So far, I have introduced thirty-six passages in support of my proposition. Out of the thirty-six, he has pretended to notice nineteen. That is all. Seventeen behind. He will never catch up. Do you want to know which ones they are? I can call them out to you. I called out several last night.

He says he was replying to me when he quoted James 2: 10. That was Ezek. 18 that he quoted when he was replying to me. I had quoted James 2: 10 to show you that if a man transgresses any one point of the law, he is guilty of the whole; it makes no difference who he is, if he transgresses one point of the law, he is guilty of the whole thing.

And I have shown you that a man does not love his neighbor as himself. Hence he transgresses in that point of the law, and therefore he is guilty of the whole law; and if he cannot get to heaven unless he obeys, then he must actually render perfect, perpetual obedience to the law all of his life; but if he transgresses one point, he is guilty of the whole law. Hence sinners cannot be saved that way.

But he says a man gets in such a position that he cannot obey God. The unregenerate sinner is in that position, the man on this side of the line—there he is in a position that he cannot obey God, or render spiritual service. You remember that I called attention last night in my opening speech to this. I said the alien, unregenerate sinner cannot do good works, but I called attention to the fact that this referred to spiritual works only, that moral works were not considered, and that the natural man can do moral works; but will a man go to heaven for performing moral works? Morality is one thing and spirituality

is another. The man in this condition cannot render spiritual service to God; and as he cannot render this service, then he cannot be saved on conditions. My proposition stands.

He says that I said that God had made his promise good—that is, “the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life.” I quoted 1 John 5: 11, 12. I believe this is where it says: “He that hath the Son hath life.” Elder Srygley says *he* does not have it. And John says: “He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” Hence, if Elder Srygley does not have the life now, he does not have Christ. Now he admits that he does not have Christ.

He says no man destitute of natural life can hope for it. All right. As it is in nature, so in grace. The man, then, who hopes for natural life, who hopes to live the natural life, is the man that possesses natural life; so the man who hopes to live eternally with God in heaven is the man who has the spiritual life, or the eternal life, and the hope springs from that life. The hope is an evidence that he does possess the life.

He refers again to figurative death. He says that I might figure all through the Bible, and he might speak of me figuratively as a mule, though he would not have you to understand that he would. No, good fellow, he would not do anything like that. He is mighty good, now, isn't he? Well, you know when you whip a child right good he is going to promise to be good. He promises to be good.

But right in that text the apostle says: “You hath he quickened, who were dead.” If that does not mean that they were dead, or does mean, as Elder Srygley says, they were *figuratively* dead, then they were not actually quickened, but figuratively quick-

ened. "You hath he *figuratively* quickened who were *figuratively* dead in trespasses and sins"—the whole thing was a figure if the death was a figure, because it is the same thing that he is talking about—"wherein in time past you *figuratively* walked according to the course of this *figurative* world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now *figuratively* worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all *figuratively* had our conversation in times past, in the lusts of our flesh, *figuratively* fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature *figuratively* the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great *figurative* love wherewith he *figuratively* loved us, even when we were *figuratively* dead in sins, hath *figuratively* quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are *figuratively* saved;) and hath *figuratively* raised us up together," and so on. If they were only figuratively dead, then they were only figuratively the children of wrath. But he did quicken us, because of his love, even when we were dead in sins, and "hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ," and so on. But it is all a figure in that connection, if what he says is a figure.

He says he doesn't believe that I know—that Cayce knows—how God dwells in a man. He does not know, and doesn't believe Cayce knows. But he is a good boy—yes, bless his little soul, he wouldn't insinuate that anybody is ignorant; no, he would not. We will pass that as being just a little too small to notice further at this time.

He says: "Who is in the Spirit?" Who is it in the Spirit? Let's see who it is. This man on that side of the line is in the flesh, not in the Spirit. The man on this side of the line is in the Spirit, not in

the flesh, but in the Spirit. Who is it? "If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you," then you are not in the flesh. That man who is in the flesh is the man in whom the Spirit of God does not dwell. If Paul was in the flesh, the Spirit of God was not dwelling in him. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ [on that side of the line], he is none of his." He is not a child of God. Will he say Paul did not have the Spirit dwelling in him? Will he say Paul did not have the Spirit of God? In that statement the apostle affirms the negative. Every question has two sides. The other side of this question would necessarily be: "If any man have the Spirit of Christ, he is one of his." So those on this side of the line can please God; on the other side, in the flesh, destitute of the Spirit, they cannot please God. What can he do to become in possession of the Spirit and get on the other side of the line? *What can he do, Elder Srygley, to possess the Spirit and get on the other side of the line?*

1 Cor. 15: 22 again: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." I call your attention to the fact that he introduced that verse to prove that what you lost in Adam you gained in Christ, and hence all may live in Christ. But the next verse says: "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." The apostle is here setting forth the doctrine of the resurrection of God's people in the twenty-second verse, and afterwards, in the next verse, he gives the order in which this will come to pass. That is all that you can put into that text. No more can be put into it to save your life.

He says again, you receive the kingdom of God as a little child receives a gift from its mother, and he says, also, that the little child does not receive the

kingdom. If the little child does not receive the kingdom, I will ask him: Does the little child enter the kingdom of heaven and immortal glory? "Who-soever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." That is the plain statement of the text.

He says I said he didn't read Acts 16: 31. What I said with reference to that was that he didn't read the latter clause of that text. If he did, I didn't hear it. I will hand you this question—let me read it: "Did you quote the entire verse, Acts 16: 31?" The part he quoted was: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." In my reply I called attention to the fact that the latter clause of the verse was omitted. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." That is the way the verse reads.

Matt. 19: 16-26. Did you notice that he didn't read down to the twenty-sixth verse, or notice down to the twenty-sixth verse? "When his disciples heard it"—heard what Jesus had said, that "it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God"—"when his disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who then can be saved? But Jesus beheld them, and said unto them, With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible." As it is impossible with men to be saved, then it is impossible for men to be saved by performing conditions.

Titus 3: 3-7. He noticed verse 5, and says it does not forbid a man's obeying God. Who said it did? Who says it did forbid a man from obeying God? But the apostle is telling us there, in the third and fourth verses, what these people were doing all the time prior to the time that they were saved. What

were they doing? "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." This is what these people were doing before they were saved with an eternal salvation, or before they were given eternal life. And so, as this is what they were doing, if they were saved by performing conditions, these are the conditions, for the apostle emphatically tells what they were doing; and as they were not saved by doing these things, then they are not saved by performing conditions, for here is what they were doing.

He says that in Rom. 4: 10 the apostle is talking about the abrogated law, but in Rom. 3: 20 he says: "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." The apostle here emphatically declares that no man can be justified by the law, and in Gal. 2: 21 he says: "For if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." This teaches that if a man is saved by performing conditions, he could be saved just as well without the death of Christ as with it; hence, if that is the way sinners are saved, Christ is dead in vain. Then if he did not die in vain, sinners are not saved by performing conditions.

He says when Christ said, "It is finished," he referred to his part of the work. What is his part? To perform the work of salvation and redemption. That is Christ's work, and our part is that we receive it, and that is all. He is the donor, and we are the beneficiaries; and so Christ's work is to do the work of saving, the work of redemption.

He says he believes Jesus "shall save his people from their sins," but he "doesn't believe he saves them in their sins, but from their sins." How does Jesus save them from their sins? They are down

here in their sins, and Jesus takes them away from and out of their sins. That is the way he saves them from their sins.

I want to call your attention to one more passage here which he notices. Titus 1: 2—Paul says: “In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began.” Brother Srygley says this is before the present age, or present dispensation. It literally means: “In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the ages of time began.” God promised eternal life before the ages of time; before the foundations of the earth were laid, before the dust of the highest hills was formed, God made the promise of eternal life. Now he has fulfilled it. He keeps the promise, and bestows eternal life according to the promise.

I proceed now with my affirmative arguments.

I was on my ninth argument, showing that the salvation of the sinner did not depend upon works performed by him, because Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, and accomplished the work of redemption, and was reading Matt. 18: 11-14.

I now call attention to Luke 19: 10: “For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.” It is not that the sinner seeks him, but he is the one that does the seeking and saving. He seeks and saves—both. He does both the seeking and the saving.

1 Tim. 1: 15: “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief.”

John 17: 1-4: “These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as

thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." What is life eternal? "That they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." Then they must have eternal life in order that they know God and Jesus Christ, whom he has sent. Brother Srygley says nobody has eternal life here. Hence nobody knows God, and nobody knows Jesus Christ, whom he has sent.

John 19: 28-30: "After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar: and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost."

When he came into the world, the angel said: "He shall save his people from their sins." John 17: 4: "I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do." Jesus says: "*I have finished the work.*" He has finished the work of redemption. It is complete. On the cross he said, "It is finished," and bowed his head and gave up the ghost. Hence the work of redemption is complete, and needs no aid on the part of the sinner.

My next argument is that eternal life is given to sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of that life is represented in the Scriptures as a translation.

Col. 1: 12, 13: "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who hath delivered

us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." Here we have it that becoming in possession of eternal life is a translation. I will ask the Elder to tell us when those who were gathered together to translate this Book from the Greek into English, by the authority of King James, did the language have to perform conditions in order to be translated? What conditions did the Book perform in order that it be translated? Now, as becoming in possession of eternal life is represented as a translation, and that which is translated is passive, then the sinner is passive in being taken out of a state of sin or death into life.

My next argument is that eternal life is given to dead sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of eternal life is represented in the Scriptures as a birth. That which is born is passive.

John 1: 11-13: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Notice that believing in this text is in the present tense. "Were born" is in the perfect tense, denoting something that has taken place in the long ago. NOW believing, and WERE BORN.

Becoming in possession of eternal life is represented here as a birth. I will ask the Elder to tell us: What did you do to be born into this natural realm? What did you do? And as becoming in possession of eternal life is represented as a birth, and as we know that that which is born into the natural realm is passive in the birth, then it must be true that the character born into the spiritual realm, or

spiritual world, is passive in that birth, for the natural birth is used as a figure to represent that birth.

John 3: 1-9: "There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Becoming in possession of eternal life is represented here as a birth. And the Saviour says a man must be born again, or born from above, in order that he see the kingdom. Then, if one must be born again in order to see the kingdom, it certainly follows that he cannot see the things that are in the kingdom and that pertain to it unless he is first born again. The gospel is something that pertains to the kingdom, and belongs to it. Hence, one cannot see or understand the gospel unless he is born into the kingdom. Verse 4 shows that Nicodemus did not understand this. He marveled at it. But "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit. Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be?"

What does the Saviour teach in this? He teaches that in being born of the earthly parentage you partake of the nature of the earthly parentage, and in

being born of the heavenly parentage you partake of the nature of that parentage. As Jesus represented this as a birth, it follows that it must be without conditions on the part of the sinner, or else inspiration made a mistake when it is said: "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." The Elder makes sport of the idea that you cannot tell everything about it, and you "know nothing" about it. Isn't that what the Savior says? "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit. Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be?" Do you see the company he is in?

1 Pet. 1: 22-24: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away." Who is it that can obey the truth through the Spirit? Is it a man who is destitute of the Spirit? No, sir. He must possess the Spirit, or be born again, in order that he obey the truth through the Spirit. "Being born again," or, as a literal translation would have it, "having been born again," "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever;" and this word is the *Logos* word, the very same *Word* that John says was made flesh and dwelt among us.

1 Pet. 1: 2-5: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the

Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled [the inheritance cannot be defiled], and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you [it is kept in a secure place for you], who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." Hence it is by the work of the Lord Jesus Christ that one is born again; and being brought into possession of the life, and living in heaven, is represented as a birth, being begotten again, being born from above, and hence it must be without conditions on the part of the sinner.

Eternal life is given to dead sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of eternal life is represented in the Scriptures as a resurrection. That which is resurrected is passive.

Eph. 2: 1-6. We have already quoted that numbers of times, but the apostle says: "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." I demand that he tell us what the word "quickened" in that text means, if it does not mean to give life. "You hath he quickened," giving life to those characters that were dead; and as he quickened or gave life to those that were dead, he raised them up out of a state of death into a state of life.

John 5: 25-29: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." How is it that he raises the dead from

a state of death in sin? By speaking to them. "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

How are we raised? How are the dead raised from their graves? By Jesus speaking to them. They will hear his voice. How is a dead sinner raised from a state of death in sin? The very same way; by the very same power that the dead are raised out of the graves. That is the way it is done. And as the character who is in the grave does not have to perform conditions in order to be raised up, neither does the character who is dead in sin have to perform conditions in order to be raised up out of that state.

John 5: 21. "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." In the very same way, through the very same process, the Son quickens every one that will drop his sins and—quit them? No, sir. That is not what he said. "Even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." Will the Elder tell us that the Father will raise the dead by having them perform conditions? Did Jesus have Lazarus to perform conditions in order that he might be raised out of the grave? So, just like that, the Son quickens whom he will, in the same way, by the same power, through the same process.

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."

The Elder says I don't possess much spirit or much flesh. I am very "small potatoes," but he is a great, big, double-barreled shotgun. He reminds me— [*Time expired.*]

MR. SHEPHERD.—I wish to call attention to three rules that have been violated by both speakers, and inasmuch as, in the beginning of this discussion, we agreed to stand together, I think that we should enforce the rules, and I want to refresh the minds of the speakers with reference to them before we proceed further. Rule four says: "Personal reflections on the adversary should in no instance be indulged." Both speakers have been guilty of violating that. The fifth rule says: "No one has a right to accuse his adversary of indirect motives." Brother Srygley was guilty of saying that Brother Cayce was trying to hide things and keep him from seeing things, but that he was going to follow him. Yes, I should say that both have been guilty of this. I have noticed it from the beginning, and we had better stop it at once. The seventh rule is: "As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced on either side should be examined with fairness and candor." This rule has been violated time and again. You should remember, gentlemen, that ridicule is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy, and should in no wise be indulged. By the very inflection of the voice, both of you have been guilty of violating this rule. Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose that, as agreed last night, this be ruled out on both sides.

MR. DAILY.—I agree with the Moderator on the other side in what he says. I am in favor of observing the rules strictly, and seeing that these dis-

putants observe the rules. I am in favor of that. Now if our friend on the other side will be careful to not break these rules, I will see that Brother Cayce does not; and if, on the other side, rules are broken, I will try to see that Brother Cayce does not, for I do not want Brother Cayce to break the rules.

MR. SRYGLEY.—You are at perfect liberty to stop me at any time. I do not wish to break any rules in this debate. I desire you to stop me at any time I break any rules, tell me anything I do wrong. I want to get at the truth of these matters, and nothing else; but, of course, in the heat of controversy we are likely to do things that we ought not. I stand corrected, gentlemen; I stand corrected.

MR. CAYCE.—Permit me to say a word. If I am not mistaken, Elder Srygley began this, and all I have to say is, if he will observe the rules and stop casting reflections and insinuations, I will not do it. But just as certain as it continues on that side, I shall feed him out of the same spoon—that is what I will do, sure. When Brother Srygley stops it, why, I am stopped; otherwise, I am not.

MR. SHEPHERD.—I propose that Brother Srygley shall stop it. That is what I meant—not only that Brother Srygley shall stop it, but that both shall. I understand your moderator as ruling in that way, and so I am with him.

MR. DAILY.—We all desire to abide by the rules.

MR. SRYGLEY'S FOURTH REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My opponent said the woman was deceived, and therefore was in the transgression, and that if man was put back in God's favor by believing the truth and obeying the truth, it did not put him in heaven. *That is my contention.* It puts him back in favor with God while living here. The Holy Spirit says to all such: "Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." (2 Pet. 1: 5-10.) I say that puts him in the kingdom of Christ, or in God's favor, and continuance in these graces to the end will put him in the everlasting kingdom.

He says that he has introduced thirty-six passages, and that I have noticed only nineteen of them. He introduced these passages very rapidly, and made no argument on many of them. They do not prove his position, and yet he thinks I must notice every one of them! Now if he introduces thirty-six

passages, and I notice *nineteen of the strongest*, and show that they *do not* support his contention, why should I notice the other seventeen? If the nineteen strongest passages do not support his contention, and the other seventeen are like them, his proposition is not proved.

If a man does not receive eternal life *actually* in this life, but receives it actually in the world to come, his proposition is not true if he introduced one hundred passages to prove it. The proposition is that God gives eternal life to the alien sinner without conditions on his part, a thing that cannot be true if he does not actually give it to any one in this world.

He says that he quoted James 2: 10 to show that a man is guilty of all if he breaks one commandment. That is what I quoted it for. But it was very wrong for me to quote it, because it was not for *alien* sinners; but then it was not wrong for him to quote it for the same purpose! I was following him, and for that reason I quoted it. I admit that if a man breaks one commandment, he is guilty of all, just as a mule that jumps over one panel of the fence is out of the field, the same as if he had jumped over every panel of it. But he says we will have to keep the law perfectly in order to be saved. John says: "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (1 John 2: 1, 2.) I am very thankful that God says this, and so far as I am concerned, I have never seen the day that I did not need to pray, "Forgive me my sins, as I forgive those that trespass against me;" and I expect to be saved in heaven because of the fact that I am continually obeying the

law of pardon that God has given to erring Christians.

Cayce says the man out of the church cannot do spiritual works. He does some things that are good—the very things God requires his saints to do; I believe they are indeed such things as saints are required to do. Alien sinners sometimes love their families; they are faithful to their children; they love them; they are good and kind to the poor. I say these things are good, and when they are required of God's children, I believe, too, that they are spiritual or good works. But he says there is no good in alien sinners. My friends, there is where he is mistaken. I believe there is good in many of my neighbors that have never obeyed the gospel. He quoted: "Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips." (Rom. 3:13.) Paul quotes this from the fifty-third Psalm, which psalm begins with the statement: "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." I believe a man can deny his Maker and go away into wickedness until he reaches that place that the fear of God is not before his eyes; but I say, while this is true, there is good in many people that are in the service of Satan. God is the Maker of the human family. Man was made in God's own image, and I do not believe that God's own image has nothing good in it.

Paul said that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." (Acts 17:26.) Man, therefore, sprang from a noble parentage, he came from the hand of God, and when you trace his ancestry back to the beginning you find that God says: "Which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God." (Luke 3:38.) I insist that notwithstanding all that the preachers

have said about total hereditary depravity, neither one of which words is in God's book, that man is not without some good in him, and that every invitation of the gospel is but an invitation to the former child of God, a child by creation, to come back to him. He belongs to God by virtue of his creation. The apostle teaches this, and God is inviting him to come, notwithstanding the fact that my friend indicates that he *cannot* come. Jesus says: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." (Matt. 11: 28.) Every invitation of the gospel of Christ is but an invitation for sad, sorrowful humanity to come back to the loving arms of Jesus. I insist, therefore, that the gospel of Christ is better than sin, and that God offers it to us to enable us to throw down our sins, that we may be saved from them, by the beauty of the gospel and the beauty of holiness, by showing us something better and getting us to throw down our sins and accept Christ, that we may be saved eternally in heaven.

"This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." (1 John 5: 11.) Cayce says that if I have not already obtained eternal life, I have not Christ. I have it in the same sense that Joshua had Jericho, *in promise*, and I will have it in *actual possession* if I am faithful till I die, just as a fifteen-year-old girl, who will receive a million when she is twenty-one, is said to have a million dollars. So if I am faithful until death and it can be truly said of me that I died in the triumphs of the faith of the gospel, then I will have it actually; but if I make shipwreck of my faith, even though I have eternal life in prospect, I will never receive it actually. This is the teaching of the word of God.

He has been trying to prove that in the ages past

eternal life was a hope, but now since Christ came we *actually have it*. Let me read: "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began" (Titus 1: 2)—before the beginning of the ages. Well, the promise, says my opponent, was made before the world began, and that is true. Their hope of eternal life was based upon a promise previously made, but still that does not prove that Paul was wrong when he said "in hope of eternal life." Their eternal life was still a *hope*, and not an actual blessing, and these people were living in the hope of everlasting life. Paul says, in so many words, that a man cannot hope for the thing he already has. (Rom. 8: 25.) He says we have natural life, and are hoping for that. I am hoping it may be continued till I get through with him, but I am not hoping for life. I have it, and insist that a man cannot hope for a thing he already has, because Paul said he cannot, and I believe Paul.

He says when you whip a child it will make him mighty nice. If I got a whipping the last two nights, it was so light I did not know it. I declare I did not know it, and I never mind a whipping when I cannot tell that I get it. It made less impression on me than anything I ever got in my life.

Because I said the word "death" was used figuratively in Eph. 2: 1, my opponent makes much ado, saying the whole chapter is a figure. Well, the walking is figurative, meaning the whole course of life, but it does not follow from this that the whole chapter is figurative. I ask: Who are in the Spirit? He says if Paul was in the flesh, he was not in the Spirit. Well, Paul was living in the flesh, but he was walking after the Spirit. I know this, because the passage says so. Paul also says: "I keep under my body, . . . lest that by any means, when I have preached to oth-

ers, I myself should be a castaway." (1 Cor. 9: 27.) If he could not go back and follow the flesh at all, why was Paul so careful to keep his body under? Most certainly he was *living* in the flesh, but *walking* after the Spirit. He asks: "What can a man do to possess the Spirit on that side of the line?" Here reference is made to his chart. I believe that a man governed by the word of God, that reads it, and has it dwelling in his heart richly, and is faithful to it, will have the Spirit of Christ in the highest degree. That is the way it is. In other words, he who obeys Christ has the Spirit. I have said that a little child does not receive the kingdom. The kingdom here refers to the kingdom or church on earth, and to receive this means to become a citizen or member of it. Infants are not subjects of the kingdom, therefore do not *receive* it. Hence, if adults, as he calls them, have to receive the kingdom to be saved, then his proposition is *not true* that a man is saved *without* conditions. That is the way the matter stands in God's book, and my opponent is unable to refute it.

Again, he says it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for the rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. The disciple says: "Who then can be saved?" The Savior said: "With men it is impossible." Jesus teaches that nobody could be saved except God saves him; they could not be saved while trusting in riches. My brother has that wrong. Why doesn't he turn to the parallel passage and read: "And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! It is easier for a

camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? And Jesus looking upon them saith, With men it is impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible." (Mark 10: 23-27.) I tell you, gentlemen, if you trust in riches, you cannot enter the kingdom of God. But if you put your trust in God, and *obey* him, you can, for Paul says: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (Heb. 5: 8, 9.) The love of money is the root of all evil, and if you put your trust in riches, you cannot be saved; but if you come to Jesus, and put your trust in him, and *obey* him, and live according to his teaching, you can go to that eternal home in glory. Riches will leave you, your money will perish; but in the gospel we are taught to throw down these perishable things that amount to nothing and take hold of something better, as the little child who has the dangerous knife is offered a beautiful apple by his mother, and the child drops the knife to grasp the apple. That is the way God comes to us with the gospel. We throw down our sins and take hold of something better, which is offered us through the love of Jesus Christ; and if we live according to his teachings, then when death comes we shall go home to live with him forever.

My opponent refers to Rom. 3: 20: "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." The apostle was arguing against these brethren going back into Judaism all through the Roman letter, and in the Galatian letter he was doing the same

thing. There was nothing in that argument to conflict with the statement in Rom. 1: 16, where he says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." If it is not God's power to save, I have a right to be ashamed of it, as every one else has; but it *will* save. The gospel of Jesus Christ does not depend on the deeds of the law of Moses, and therefore it is not necessary to go back to the old law. Paul said nothing that conflicts with the statement in Rom. 1: 16 in any place. My friend is mistaken when he thinks he did. Jesus takes our sins away from us, saves us from our sins by giving us the privilege of repenting and turning away from them. God grants to the people the privilege of repenting, repenting unto life—that is, that they may turn away from their sins. I never felt stronger in my life than when I stand upon the words of the eternal God. I am not afraid of any of these contentions, because there is nothing in them to drive me away from the gospel of Christ. They cannot take that from me. As long as I can speak I will raise my voice against the man that says anything against the gospel of Christ as the means that God has given for the salvation of the world. As long as I have life, as long as I can talk, I will proclaim the gospel as the means of saving the human family, for Paul says it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes it. I believe the gospel, and I believe it is the means of saving man. If there is nothing for one to do, what is the use of worrying about preaching it?

He says again, eternal life is a hope, and the man who does not already have eternal life cannot hope for it. I have eternal life just as it was promised to me—in *prospect*. He gave it to me just as he told

Joshua he had given him Jericho, yet the walls did not fall down for over a week after that.

Now, my friends, God can give a man a thing in promise. That is the way he has given us eternal life.

He says Christ said on the cross: "It is finished." His part of the work was finished. When he dropped his head and it fell on his bosom, his work was finished, and your time and mine began there, and God does not save us without effort on our part. Christ did finish the work of redemption, and laid the foundation so man could be saved by the gospel. He does not come and break right in upon his own image and force eternal life on anybody against his will.

He quotes John 3: 3-9, and argues that the Savior says, "Except a man be born again, he cannot *see* the kingdom of God," and as the gospel *can be seen*, it can, therefore, have nothing to do with being born again. I suggest that "*see*" here does not mean to see literally, to behold with your eyes. The Savior says: "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God." (Matt. 5: 8.) Does that mean behold him? No. Then what does it mean? It means to enjoy God; that is what "*see*" means in the third chapter of John, when Christ said: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." He means that he cannot enjoy the privileges and blessings of the kingdom.

That being true, we had better ascertain what it is to be born of the water and of the Spirit, if no man can enjoy the pleasures and blessings of the kingdom without it. What is it? It is a figure of speech. What is it to be born again? I always explain a figure by a fact, something that is plain. The commission, as given by Jesus after his resurrection from the dead, is very plain to me. He says: "Go

ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark 16: 15, 16.)

But the Savior said: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3: 5.) But these people were saved when they believed and were baptized; but being in the kingdom is equivalent to being saved. Paul says: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." (Col. 1: 14.) Here it says we have forgiveness of sins *in him*. Then the man who is in the kingdom is in a place of safety, has redemption—saved from his past sins. But Christ said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But he says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Then to believe and be baptized is equivalent to being born again. A man says to me: "Give me the book you have in your hand." I say: "No, I cannot unless you give me two silver dollars." Then he gives me something wrapped in paper which the audience cannot see, and after I examine it, I say: "All right, the book is yours." What was it that was in the paper? You know, if I told the truth, it was two silver dollars." The Savior said: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Now we will admit that that is wrapped up in a figure, but the Savior says again: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." That is a plain statement without a figure; therefore believing and being baptized is equivalent to being born of water and the Spirit. If not, why not?

Now I call attention to what he said about being "born from above." The Savior said: "The wind

bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." (John 3: 8.) This does not say one word about *feeling* the wind, not a word about the *feelings* you have. An old brother used to say that if I got the meaning out of a text, that was *exposition*; but if I put the meaning into the text, that was *imposition*. If you put feeling into this text, that is imposition, for there is no feeling in it. It is *hearing* the wind; not one word about feeling it. If I could not hear the wind, I would know my hearing was bad. The Savior said: "Thou *heareth* the sound thereof." But did you ever hear the Spirit?

Paul says: "Now the Spirit *speaketh* expressly." (1 Tim. 4: 1.) Did you ever hear the Spirit speak? Paul says he speaks expressly. The inspired psalmist said: "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart" (Ps. 95: 7, 8); and the apostle Paul, quoting that language, said: "As the Holy Ghost saith, To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." (Heb. 3: 7, 8.) How did it say it? It said it through the psalmist. If the Holy Spirit spoke through the writings of David, then when the apostles spoke or wrote by inspiration, was that not the Holy Spirit speaking through them, and can we not hear the Spirit speaking when we read the statement in the inspired record?

But Brother Cayce says there are some folks that are so bad they cannot hear. If they are, they are so bad they cannot be saved. If they are not saved by the gospel, they are not saved by God's power, for the gospel is the power of God unto salvation unto all that believe it.

He says those that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall

live. If those actually dead can hear the voice of the Son of God, why cannot those who are dead in sin hear it? It looks to me like every passage he gets hold of proves the opposite of his contention. But the remainder of the verse says: "They that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." My brethren, the matter hinges, then, in the resurrection, upon what we have done. He says they hear the voice of the Son of God; and when the man is in his grave, he lies right there dead until he hears the voice of the Son of God, and therefore the alien sinner must lie right still until he hears the voice of the Son of God—not the words of this Book, but his voice—they must hear his voice. I have been in old Baptist meetings when they said they heard something, but I could not hear anything, for the reason there was nothing to hear.

I want to ask this question: Why is the word of God any more reliable if the Lord should speak it himself to-night in our presence than if he should write it? Is not writing as reliable as speech? Sometimes I think if God should cleave these blue heavens some day and take me right up, and say, "You are saved," it could be no more reliable than to read it from this Bible. I tell you the word of God in Nashville is as true as it is in heaven. God's word says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and I believe it in Nashville to-day as much as I could believe it in heaven if I were there. As much as I love life, it would be better for me to die in this pulpit than to doubt it. I do not doubt it. Paul said, too, that my Master has become the author of eternal salvation unto all that *obey* him.

In the second chapter of Hebrews there is more about this salvation, and as we have passed over all

the gentleman's arguments, I turn to this passage and read, beginning with the first verse: "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?" (Heb. 2: 1-4.) Who *heard* him? The apostles *heard him*. Where? Near Jerusalem. What did he say? He gave them the commission. He *spoke* it to them. He was the first to speak it. "Which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord." He was the author of eternal salvation to all that obey him. As he was the author of this salvation, he was, therefore, the one who first spoke it, and these apostles heard it. I read more: "God also bearing them witness." Who? The apostles. "Both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will." The apostles were sent out with the great commission, and they had power to perform miracles, to confirm their word, and when they preached it was confirmed by miracles, and they told to the world the conditions upon which Jesus Christ would save the world. How simple is the plan of God! There is nothing that Paul says that anywhere conflicts with the statement: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE.—Brother Srygley violated the rules about three times in the beginning; and unless

Brother Srygley is held down to the rules, I must have the privilege of going where he does.

MR. SRYGLEY.—I am following you.

MR. CAYCE.—Not in that respect.

MR. SRYGLEY.—You were the first man that violated the rules by charging me with falsehood, and no apology has ever been made for it. You are the first man that violated them.

MR. SHEPHERD.—I insist that the rules be observed, and I believe that it is perfectly right for both to observe them. I further believe that one man's doing wrong does not justify another in so doing. I have not indorsed Brother Srygley's violating the rules. I want that distinctly understood. I have endeavored to get Brother Srygley to strictly observe them, and I am sorry that he has failed to do it. I think one reason for this is due to the fact that in former discussions the rules were not strictly observed, and he does it by an oversight. But I must say, Brother Cayce, that I insist on his obedience to the rules.

MR. SRYGLEY.—Let Brother Cayce state his three points, what they are, and I will apologize if I have violated the rules.

MR. CAYCE.—I think it was about the third time when Brother Shepherd spoke to you; but I will just say this, that I will promise that my speech to-morrow night will be without breaking any of the rules, that is all.

MR. SHEPHERD.—I insist that Brother Srygley shall observe the rules regardless of what his opponent does.

MR. CAYCE'S FIFTH ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you again in the affirmative of the proposition which you have heard read: "God gives eternal life to an alien sinner without a condition upon his (the sinner's) part, and the Scriptures so teach."

I wish first to notice the things that are relevant to the proposition and to the question in discussion that were said in the last speech to which you listened on last night.

First, I wish to ask Elder Srygley a question, for fear I did not understand correctly a statement which I think he made, and that question is: Did you, or did you not, say that one cannot do spiritual works outside of the church? Please hand this written question to the Elder.

I asked him a question last night, put to him in writing, which he has failed, to the present, to answer, and that question was: Did you quote the last clause, the latter clause, in Acts 16: 31, when you first introduced that text?

He said last night that we sprang from a noble parentage, referring to Adam, arguing that there is something good about the alien or unregenerate sinner, and says that we sprang from a noble parentage. All of us are Adam multiplied; that is all we are—Adam multiplied—and the very same life which we live to-day is the life which Adam lived in the garden of Eden. The life which Adam lived became poisoned and contaminated with sin when Adam vio-

lated or transgressed God's holy law; and as that life, that Adamic life, became poisoned and contaminated with sin in that transgression, and we are simply Adam multiplied, it follows that the life which we live to-day is a life which is poisoned and contaminated with sin. We might illustrate that this way: Suppose the Mississippi River rises here; it flows here along the bed of the stream, and empties into the Gulf. If you poison the fountain head of that stream, the water flowing down the stream will be the same poisoned water when it reaches the city of St. Louis; when it reaches Memphis, it is the same poisoned water; when it reaches Vicksburg, Miss., it is all the same poisoned water; when it reaches the mouth of the stream and empties into the Gulf, it is still the same poisoned water. How may that water be purified and made fit for use? There is but one way, and that is, a higher power, a sovereign power, comes to the stream, stoops down, dips the water up out of the stream, carries it through a purifying process, which removes the poison, and thus makes the water fit for use. This is the only way it can be done.

So the life we live to-day became poisoned and contaminated with sin at the fountain head when Adam violated God's holy and righteous law; it was the same poisoned life in Abraham's day; the same poisoned life in the apostles' day; it is the same poisoned life in our day, and will be the same poisoned life at the final wind up or consummation of all things. How may those who are living that life be purified and made fit to live with God in heaven? There is but one way in which that can be done. That is, a higher power or sovereign power lifts us up out of the stream, carries us through a purifying process, which takes away the poison of sin and

makes us fit to live with God in heaven and to render service to him. That is the only way that this can be done. But he says: "God says drop your sins, and come away from them, and I will save you, just as the mother holds up an apple to the child, telling it to drop the knife." According to this illustration it would follow that God does not save a man from his sins, but saves him after he has dropped his sins and gone away from them. That is his illustration exactly. Salvation is after dropping the sins is his argument—that is, that God saves you after you leave your sins. Hence God does not save you from your sins.

We might illustrate his position this way: A man falls into a well, and you come to the top of the well and say to the man: "If you will climb out where I am, then I will save you out of the well." That is the illustration of his position exactly. Then the man on the top would not be the savior of the man after the man has climbed out of the well. In order that the man on top be the savior of the man who is in the well, the man must reach down into the well where the man is and lift him out of the well. If the man climbs out of the well, then it is too late to save him out of the well. So, then, when a man drops his sins and leaves them and forsakes them and quits them, it is too late for Jesus to save him from his sins. He saved himself from his sins by coming away from them. You see that would leave Jesus out of the work of salvation.

Again, he says he has eternal life in prospect only, and will have it in fact if obedient unto death. I will ask the gentleman to please harmonize that statement with Paul's statement to Timothy (2 Tim. 1: 9): "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but accord-

ing to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Here Paul emphatically says that God HATH saved us, not according to our works. But he says that he will have eternal life in the end if he lives obedient unto the end. I want him to harmonize these two statements.

He says Paul was living in the flesh. But he was not in the flesh in the sense of Rom. 8: 8, 9, for he had the Spirit of God dwelling in him. The character who is in the flesh in the sense of that text is one who is destitute of the Spirit of God. In Rom. 7: 5 he says: "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death." This shows that he was in the flesh in the sense of Rom. 8: 8, 9, before regeneration, and in the Spirit after regeneration, or after he was brought across the line. Having the Spirit of God dwelling in him brought him across the line; and so he was in that condition, then, that the apostle calls "in the Spirit," and not in the flesh. Then he could please God. I ask the gentleman again: What can the sinner do on that side of the line, in the flesh, in order to cross the line? That question has been asked time and again, and to this good hour it remains unanswered. In order that he answer the argument, and thus overthrow my proposition, he must show what the sinner in the flesh, in the sense of this text, can do in order to cross the line or get on the other side. While he is on that side of the line he cannot please God.

He says a little child does not receive the kingdom, as receiving is doing something. Brother Srygley, what did you do in receiving natural life? Brother Srygley, what did you do in receiving the name "Srygley?" Brother Srygley, did you receive the

name "Srygley" while you were an infant? Now do not fail to answer these questions, if you please. "Receiving is doing something." A little child cannot receive the kingdom because he cannot do anything! Then Brother Srygley must not have received the name Srygley while he was an infant. He must have received that name after he was grown up. Now please tell us: Did you receive the name "Srygley" while you were an infant or after you were grown up? Brother Srygley, what did you do in receiving natural life?

In Matt. 19: 26 the Savior says, with reference to salvation: "With men this is impossible." Please harmonize that statement with your contention that salvation is left optionary with the sinner. "With men this is impossible," but Brother Srygley's contention is, during the whole discussion, that salvation is left optional with the sinner. I want him to harmonize these two things.

He says that in Rom. 3: 20 and in Gal. 2: 16-21 the apostle is warning the brethren from going back into Judaism. Notice Gal. 2: 21: "For if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." If righteousness comes by the law, there was no necessity for the death of Christ. If sinners are saved by performing conditions, or by doing good works, they could be saved just as well that way without the death of Christ as with it; and, hence, if that is the way of salvation, the death of Christ was in vain: he absolutely accomplished nothing by his death; but as the death of Christ was not in vain, it must necessarily follow that sinners are not saved by performing conditions, or by complying with conditions. As they are not saved that way, and as some sinners are saved, they are saved without conditions; and, hence, my proposition is true.

He says John 3: 5 is a figure, and he explains a figure by a fact. The correct idea is that a fact is explained by a figure, or illustration. This is the correct idea. All his reference is no answer to my argument. The argument was that becoming in possession of eternal life is set forth in God's word as a birth, and that as the term "birth" is the figure of speech used to represent becoming in possession of eternal life, and as one is passive in being born, so one must, therefore, be passive in becoming in possession of eternal life. That is the argument. Is it answered? No, sir. He has not answered the argument at all.

He says being in the kingdom is equivalent to being saved. Brother Srygley, here is another question written down, for fear you might forget it: "Must one be a member of the same church you are, in order to be in a saved state?" Now please do not fail to answer that question, because if we people are not in a saved state, the Primitive Baptists, we want to know what is necessary in order that we be in a saved state. If the people here, Missionary Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others, are not in a saved state, we want to know what is necessary for us to do in order that we be in a saved state. Is it necessary that we all be members of the church that you are a member of in order that we be in a saved state? Now don't forget to tell us.

He says some are so bad they cannot hear, and if so, they are so bad they cannot be saved. I will ask Brother Srygley to please harmonize that statement with the statement of the Savior in Matt. 19: 26: "With God all things are possible." "Some men are so bad they cannot hear, and if so, they are so bad they cannot be saved;" but the Son of God says:

“With God all things are possible!” I want him to harmonize these statements.

In referring to John 5: 25 to 29, he only noticed verses 28 and 29. These verses say: “Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” That was introduced, in the first place, to show you that the resurrection spoken of in verse 25, upon which the argument was based, was not the resurrection of the dead bodies from the graves. Verse 25 says: “The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live.” Verse 29 shows that this was not the resurrection from the graves; but Elder Srygley makes the turn on the point, you know, that “they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” They must do good in order to this. That is his contention. The Savior says a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. So if these bring forth good fruit, and are resurrected unto life, it was because they had been made good. That is the reason why they brought forth good fruit. But the resurrection itself was unconditional. This does not depend upon good works. Why? Because those that had done bad works were resurrected, as well as those that had done the good works. Becoming in possession of eternal life is represented as a resurrection in verse 25, and hence it is unconditional.

He refers to Heb. 2: 1-4. In Heb. 2: 1-4 Paul was writing to the saints, showing that if they neglected to render service they would be punished as the Israelites were under the law. The text has

nothing in it at all concerning the alien sinner receiving life; not a single word about alien sinners receiving life.

Now I think I have noticed everything in his speech that is at all relative to the proposition.

I now resume my affirmative arguments. Last night when my speech closed I was on my twelfth argument: "Eternal life is given to dead sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of eternal life is represented as a resurrection, and that which is resurrected is passive." I quoted Eph. 2: 1-6, part of which has been quoted several times, quoting now, however, verses 5 and 6 in this, which had not previously been used; also John 5: 25-29, which I have just called attention to; again, John 5: 21: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." Just as the Father will raise the dead in the resurrection morning, just that way, in the very same manner, by the very same power, and through the same process, the Son quickens whom he will. The Son raises the sinner out of a state of death in sin into a state of life in Christ by the very same power, in the very same manner, in the very same way, and through the very same process that God will raise the dead in the resurrection morning. Will Brother Srygley contend that in the resurrection morning God will send him, or some other man, or some other preacher, out to the graveyard, the burying ground, to raise the dead from their graves, and that the dead in their graves must perform certain conditions in order to be raised out of their graves? I think not. Surely not. Then, as he will not contend that, and as the Savior says *even* "as the Father raises the dead and quickens them, even so"—it is *just like that*—"the Son quickeneth

whom he will." Then God does not use him or some other man in order to raise the dead sinner into a state of life. Neither does the dead sinner have conditions to perform in order to be raised up into eternal life, if the Savior was correct and inspiration was correct in using the resurrection to represent the character becoming in possession of eternal life. He sets it forth as a resurrection; then it must be that, as one is passive in being raised from the dead, the sinner is passive in becoming in possession of eternal life, and hence it is, therefore, unconditional on his part.

John 6: 63-65: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." Brother Srygley, you know, says that Brother Cayce has not got much flesh. That is true. I only weigh about one hundred and ten pounds; but whether I am small, weighing one hundred and ten pounds, or whether as large a man as Elder Srygley, or even twice as large as he is, the Savior says that in this work the flesh profits nothing. "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." When the Son of God speaks, that gives life, and anything short of that fails to give life to the dead. "But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him. And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father." "No man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father." How is it given to him of the Father? He is quickened into divine life by the Spirit of God. That is the way it is done.

Eternal life is given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of eternal life is set forth in the Scriptures as a cre-

ation. It is a creative work. As it is a creative work, it requires creative power, and in creation that which is created is passive, and does not render obedience in order to the creation.

I call attention to Gen. 1: 3-5, where God created the light. What did the light do in order to be created? Verses 6-8—God created the firmament. What did the firmament do in order to be created? Verses 9 and 10—God created the dry land. What did the dry land do in order to be created? Verses 11-13—the vegetable kingdom brought into being. What did the vegetation do in order to be created? Verses 14-18—the sun, the moon, and the stars brought into being, created by the divine power of Almighty God. What did the sun do, that rules the light by day, in order to its creation? What did the moon do in order to its creation? What did the stars do in order to their creation? I will ask the Elder to tell us, please: Did the sun, the moon, and the stars have to be good in order that they be created? I want the gentleman to please note that and pay some attention to it. Verses 19-23—fishes and fowls created. I will ask the gentleman, What did the fishes and fowls do in order to be created? Verses 24 and 25—the beasts of the field and of the forest created. What did the beasts do in order to their creation? Verses 26-28 is the man. What did the man do in order to be created, or brought into being? God formed the man of the dust of the ground, but before God breathed into his nostrils he was not a living character. What did he do in order that he might obtain life? What did he do in order to life? Not one thing. God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. Then verses 29-31—God gave to man dominion over all the works of his creation, and pronounced all the works of his

creation good. Now here we have the creation of all in the realm of nature, the world in all of its fullness, and all these were absolutely passive in being brought into existence.

Now is becoming in possession of eternal life represented as a creation? Is that true? Let us see. 2 Cor. 5: 17: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." There is a new *creature*, a *new creation*, hence a creative work, that puts the sinner into Christ.

Eph. 2: 10: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." The creation in Christ brings the sinner to the place where he should render good works, and where the good works are required of him; good works are required of him after the work of creation in Christ Jesus, and not required in order to be created in Christ; but created in Christ Jesus *unto* good works. Being placed in Christ, then, is represented as a creative work; and as it is a creative work, it requires creative power; and as it is a creative work and requires creative power—a creative work requiring creative power—it follows that that which is created is passive in the work.

Ps. 104: 30, 31. How is this creation performed? How is this work done? "Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth. The glory of the Lord shall endure forever: the Lord shall rejoice in his works." How is this creation done? "The Lord sends forth his spirit, they are created." That is the way the Lord does this work.

My next argument is: Eternal life is given to dead sinners without conditions on their part, because the family of God (the people of God as a body) is rep-

resented as a building. Hence the sinner is passive in the preparation.

Ps. 127 : 1 : "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." Notice. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it," showing these are represented as a building—the whole family of God is represented as a building.

Eph. 2: 19-22: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; 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."

1 Pet. 2: 5: "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

Notice in the last text quoted that he says that you "are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices," and hence you are builded first, and then required to offer up the spiritual sacrifices; but you notice from these passages that the people of God, those who are finally saved, are represented as a building. We know that the material in this building (referring to the house where the discussion was) did not have to perform conditions in order to be brought into the building, but that the material was altogether passive, in the forest and in the quarries of nature, altogether passive in being prepared and brought into the building; and so the people of God, the family of God, those who are finally saved, are represented as a

building, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets; it necessarily follows, else the figure is wrong, that the character is passive in being brought into the building, and hence they are saved without conditions on their part.

My fifteenth argument is that eternal life is given to dead sinners without conditions on their part, because they are without strength, and are therefore unable to perform conditions. Rom. 5:6: "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly." Let this represent the ungodly, this book here. Then the apostle teaches in this that the ungodly are without strength. Now, then, you may place as many conditions down here as you please between the ungodly sinner and Christ over here, and require him to perform these conditions in order that he be saved, in order that he come to Christ and be placed in a saved condition. As he has no strength, as he is without strength, you make salvation impossible to that man; for the ungodly are without strength, and it requires some kind of strength to perform conditions. It requires mental strength to believe a proposition, and the ungodly are without strength, without spiritual strength, without spiritual mental strength, for he has only the carnal mind, and is destitute of the mind of Christ. The character in an unsaved state has the carnal mind, and hence he is without spiritual understanding, and therefore without spiritual strength, and unable to perform the conditions.

My sixteenth argument is that eternal life is given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of eternal life (regeneration) is set forth in the Scriptures as a circumcision of heart, and it must, therefore, be without conditions.

Rom. 2: 28, 29: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."

Here we have it that becoming in possession of eternal life is represented as a circumcision, a circumcision of the heart; and as it is a circumcision of the heart, and in the spirit, and not in the letter, it must be that this is an inward work; and as it is an inward work, it must be that the character is passive in that work, and it is, therefore, without conditions on his part. [*Time expired.*]

MR. SHEPHERD.—Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that we should desire, it is to know the truth in regard to the things with which we have to do. The question was asked of Brother Srygley last night as to whether or not he read the whole of Acts 16: 31, and inasmuch as we have a stenographer who is taking down the discussion for publication, I suggest that we have her to transcribe exactly what Brother Srygley said on that subject, and produce it here to-morrow evening, that we may settle the question by the record. Do you accept that?

MR. DAILY.—I do, with the understanding that it be transcribed from what he first said—from his first quotation, his first reference to it.

MR. CAYCE.—I will just state this, brethren moderators, that if you and Brother Srygley will say, and let it go in the record, that Brother Srygley quoted the entire verse, his first quotation, we will let it pass right there.

MR. SRYGLEY.—I say I read all of it and that it is in the record.

MR. SHEPHERD.—I make the same statement in reference to it.

MR. CAYCE.—If he quoted the entire text, the entire verse, thirty-first verse, then I failed to catch it in your speech, the latter clause.

MR. SRYGLEY.—That was what I did when you said I told a falsehood, either ignorantly or willfully. Is it a falsehood if it is ignorant?

MR. CAYCE.—No.

MR. SRYGLEY.—Then withdraw that charge.

MR. CAYCE.—All right.

MR. SRYGLEY.—I am like Cæsar's wife. I am above suspicion when it comes to telling a lie.

MR. CAYCE.—I am glad you are.

MR. SRYGLEY.—Thank you. I make many mistakes, though.

MR. SRYGLEY'S FIFTH REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I desire to call your attention to some things that I would like for the gentleman to notice in his next speech. Of course it is my desire to follow his speeches as nearly as possible; but after listening to him for two whole evenings and now one-half of the third, and no explanation has been made, I feel that I have the right to insist that he make these explanations in his next speech, which is his last on this proposition.

But before I read to you these things I wish to remind him that I asked him in the beginning of this discussion what kind of sinners were those that are not saved, to whom God does *not* give eternal life? He has not noticed that question up till now. I would like to know what *kind* of sinners these are to whom the Lord will not give eternal life. Will he tell us why the Lord *will not* give eternal life to *all* sinners unconditionally, if he gives it to one? The apostle Peter said, "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons" (Acts 10: 34); and that being true, if there are some sinners that he saves *without* conditions, and others that he passes by, I want to know why he does it, and I want to know if Jesus Christ did not die for those that are not saved, and if he did not, *why not*.

Brother Cayce quoted, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life" (John 5: 40), to prove his doctrine, as though it were: "ye cannot." The language clearly refutes the doctrine, because the lan-

guage is, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life," not, "Ye cannot." I insist that this, "Ye will not," is the difficulty, and the *whole* difficulty. The reason that sinners, those that are passed by, are not saved by our Redeemer is because "*they will not,*" not because they "cannot come." The language implies they *could* if they *would*, and this is in harmony with the facts and with the teaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

But again, he says "receive Christ." Brother Cayce's doctrine has a man in possession of eternal life who has not believed God, and the Savior said: "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." Well, how do we receive an ambassador? Turn to Acts 2: 41, and there the statement is made that "they that gladly received his word were baptized," and any man who will not receive the word of the gospel will not receive God or Christ. A man has to receive the kingdom. That is true, and I insist that in so doing he receives God, Christ, and the apostles. He receives the apostles by receiving *their word*, and therefore the man that turns from the words of the apostles and refuses to receive them does not receive the kingdom, God, or Christ. Jesus said: "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." (Matt. 10: 40.)

But again, Brother Cayce says that man cannot get back to the tree of life by complying with any conditions. It is said: "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.) If conditions are not expressed here, I am at a loss to know how to form a sentence that would.

But again, Cayce says that the Word by which we

are begotten is Christ, which became flesh and dwelt among us. Yet Peter says, "This is the word which by the gospel was preached unto you" (1 Pet. 1: 25); and James says: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth" (James 1: 18). I insist that the word of truth and the word that is preached to them through the gospel is simply the word of the gospel of Christ, and the American Revised Version puts it exactly that way. It says: "And this is the word of good tidings which was preached unto you."

But again, he says "hath eternal life." I have shown all through this controversy that a man has eternal life only in prospect, and for that reason I insist that he can never prove his proposition if he reads three hundred passages instead of fifty.

Here Cayce says that the sinner gets eternal life without any conditions on his part. Well, the sinner cannot be begotten without believing, and John says: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is *begotten* of God." (1 John 5: 1.) The sinner cannot have eternal life till he believes. No man can be a son before he is begotten; and if he is not a son before he is begotten, he has not eternal life until after he believes.

Again: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John 1: 11, 12.) I insist that from this passage it is clear that the believer had power to become a son of God, and according to this was not a son at all till he complied with the condition of sonship.

MR. CAYCE.—Did you read down to verse 12?

MR. SRYGLEY.—Keep your ears open. That is what you told me when I asked you where you were reading. But excuse me; and for your satisfaction I will

read the eleventh and twelfth verses both. "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." "Which were born" before John wrote this. There is no difficulty about the past tense here, because it was all past when John wrote this. Do you want me to read some more? It was all past when John wrote it.

Cayce says that the sinner does not seek Christ; that Christ seeks the sinner, does all the seeking. Well, the Savior said: "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." (Matt. 7: 7.) My friend here says Christ does all the seeking. What was the Savior talking about here when he says: "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find?" Does the Savior do the asking as well as the seeking? Was Christ talking to himself and commanding himself to ask and to seek?

But again: "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near." (Isa. 55: 6.) Still Brother Cayce says Christ does all the seeking.

I insist that the gentleman is wrong when he takes the position that Christ does all the seeking and that man has nothing to do with seeking God or receiving him.

Eternal life is in the future, for Paul says: "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." (Rom. 2: 7.) God *will* give to them eternal life, though my friend here says he has it already. But Paul says we are to "*seek*" for it by a patient continuance in well-doing. He has the whole thing

wrong, and therefore he cannot sustain his proposition. I call your attention to the fact that God said to Joshua, "I have given into thine hand Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valor" (Josh 6: 2); and still it was more than a week before they took possession of the city. They had to *believe* God and *obey* him before they got it. They had to march around the city thirteen times, and blow a loud blast on the trumpets, and shout, before the wall fell down and before the people of Israel captured the city, and still God says: "I have given into thine hand Jericho." I call your attention to this to show that the Bible uses the present tense often when the thing mentioned is in the future. Hence, when the Bible says, "He that *believeth* . . . hath everlasting life," it is exactly in the same sense that these people had the city of Jericho. He has it as a hope. He does not have it actually, but he has it in prospect, and he has to *obey* God or continue in well-doing in order to get it actually.

Again, if it is true that God gives eternal life to the sinner right now, why did Paul say: "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life?" (1 Tim. 6: 12.) How could one lay *hold on* it if he already had it? And the Savior declared that in the world *to come* we would receive eternal life, for he said: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. 25: 46.) And Paul stated: "In *hope* of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." (Titus 1: 2.) They had it as a hope, not in actual possession.

Again, Cayce says that Christ redeems us now. He also says that the stream was poisoned all the way down, and the sinner was dead, died in Adam, and never has been in God's favor, but still he says

the Savior redeems us. The meaning of the word "redeem" forever ruins his position, for it means to buy back. I insist that the meaning of the word "redeem"—and it is one of the words he uses in his argument—forever contradicts his position. His position is that man was never in God's favor—that he was always a sinner—since Adam sinned; that he had no spiritual life, no hope, and no chance until Christ came to redeem him, and the very word he used, "redeem," means to buy back. Did you ever know of a piece of land bought without the right of redemption? What did that mean? It meant without the privilege of the former owner buying it back. That is all that it means, and I insist that the word "redemption" itself means bought back; and if my friend is right in his contention that the sinner has always been away from God since Adam sinned, and that Adam died spiritually, and all the race died with Adam, and that every little child that is born into the world is dead, and has no hope or prospect of everlasting life—if this is true, why does he use the word "redemption," which means to buy back? And use it now, with reference to people that live now? I could see how he might buy Adam back, but how could he buy you back, if you had never been in God's favor?

Again, with reference to Jesus being "the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." My friend says the negative of a proposition is always true. If so, Jesus is *not* the author of eternal salvation to those that *do not obey* him, for "he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (Heb. 5: 9.) Is that passage true? Does the apostle mean that we already have eternal salvation, or that we get it unconditionally, or does he mean that it is on the condition that we obey him?

To ask that question is to answer it. He is the author of eternal salvation only to those that obey him.

But he makes eternal life and the Spirit of Christ the same. That is a mistake. He said last night that a man that did not have eternal life did not have the Spirit of Christ. He is wrong. We have the Spirit of Christ in actual possession—that is, we have it if we obey him and are living according to his teaching. All who do that have the Spirit of Christ dwelling in them. (Acts 5: 32.) But eternal life is in prospect, in the future, not in this life at all in actual possession, and therefore the gentleman is mistaken when he says to have Christ is the same as to have eternal life. That is just one of his blunders, that is all.

But again, there is always an element suitable to life. And the life is always found in the element that suits it. The fish has life suitable to the water, and therefore it lives in the water, could not live out of it; and the bird has life suitable to the air, and therefore it lives in the air, and could not live out of it; and we have natural life dwelling or living in this natural body, and a natural kingdom suitable to this natural life in which this life may be enjoyed and developed; and there is an eternal kingdom and an eternal body, and man does not come in possession actually of eternal life till he gets into the eternal kingdom and in possession of the eternal body. Why, the idea! Could we have natural life out of the natural body, and live naturally without the natural body? No, sir. Can we have eternal life without the eternal body and before we get into the eternal kingdom? Could my natural life be perpetuated and developed without a natural kingdom? No. Could eternal life be perpetuated and developed without an

eternal kingdom? No. He is wrong in every particular, and every passage he reads in this controversy is against his proposition, because his position is *not true*.

But with reference to his chart, I notice that he says on this side [pointing to the chart] they have life, and on that side is death, and he has asked me two or three times how a man comes from one side to the other. That is a very practical question, and therefore I will let the apostle answer it. Paul says: "Ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6:17.) Do you see that? Can you not understand that? My friend says on this side we are in bondage; on that side we are free. Paul says we are made free by *obeying* from the heart that form of doctrine. Therefore it follows that we pass from one side to the other by obeying from the heart the form of doctrine. You see how easy it is explained. I say that man becomes the servant of righteousness when he is made free from sin, and he is made free from sin, according to this passage, when he has obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered to him. There is no difficulty about the matter.

There is another fact or two to which I might call your attention before I notice this speech. I read where Paul says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." (Rom. 1:16.) Why, my friends, if it is not the power of God to save, I would have a right to be ashamed of it, and it would be a strange thing that God would send out these apostles to be killed for preaching the gospel that had no power to

save anybody, if man is saved independent of it and it has nothing to do with salvation!

I believe he asked me a question about receiving life, receiving it as a gift. Eternal life is the gift of God; but I suggest that with responsible people sometimes there are two sides even to a gift. I had a friend who was elected to the Legislature, and within a few days after his election he received a pass over every railroad that goes into the capital of his State, a pass without money and without price. They were sent to him in the mail. He deliberately sent them back to the railroad companies in registered letters, so that he would have a receipt for them. Here was a gift proffered, but it was not accepted, and it was not a gift until it was accepted. If the sinner has to accept the gift of eternal life, that is a condition, and his proposition falls. "God gives eternal life." Suppose he does, man must accept it on the conditions offered.

But he says: "Brother Srygley, somebody gave you a name, and you have that without conditions." Well, I do not know that I was given a name. It was imposed upon me without my knowledge or consent. There was no gift about it. I was named "Srygley" several years before I knew it. Is that the way the gentleman has eternal life? Was it imposed on him without his knowledge or consent? Maybe so, as he sings: "'Tis a point I long to know."

Suppose we look at that this way. A man offers to give me a pass on the railroad. As was done in the case of my friend, I say: "No, sir; I am paying my way." Here is a gift offered, but not received, and therefore it is not a gift. And I insist if God offers you salvation in the gospel, and you reject it on the terms he offers it, then it is not a gift to you, and will never be a gift to you until you are willing

to receive it on the terms he offers it. His proposition cannot be supported from any true standpoint.

Again: "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." (2 Cor. 5: 11.) If God gives eternal life without conditions, why *persuade* anybody? Is there any terror of the Lord that one can escape? And if they are going to be saved anyhow, why persuade them? It is not necessary to persuade those to whom the Lord has given eternal life, and it is not necessary to persuade the other class. Then why persuade either?

"Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." (Luke 11: 28.) This passage has no meaning if my friend's proposition is true. "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that *obey* him." (Heb. 5: 9.) This passage certainly makes eternal salvation conditional; then my opponent's contention must be false.

"The world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." (1 John 2: 17.) If my friend's position is true, those that God gives eternal life to will abide forever whether they do the will of God or not.

"If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be." (John 12: 26.) Where Jesus is, there will the sinner be, if God gives him eternal life unconditionally.

"Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." (Isa. 55: 7.) Why, he will pardon him whether he does it or not! If Brother Cayce is right, whether any sinner forsakes his ways or any unrighteous man forsakes his thoughts, God will break down his own image and

force salvation on him whether he wishes it or not. That is a strange kind of gift, where God walks into the human heart and gives him eternal life, even though he *does not* desire it.

“The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” (Ezek. 18: 20.) But, says Brother Cayce, that cannot be, for God will give him eternal life, it does not matter how wicked he is. If he wants him to have it, he will give it to him; he will break down his own image and walk in and take sin out of his heart, whether he desires it or not, and give him eternal life *against his will*.

“Shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live?” (Heb. 12: 9.) My friends, this is not necessary if his contention is true. If a man receives eternal life as a gift from God *without* conditions, therefore God forces it upon him without asking him any question. We will live anyway if God gives us eternal life without condition.

“If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” (1 John 1: 9.) My friend’s position says he will cleanse us anyhow, whether we confess him or not. My friend’s position is that God will break in on the sinner’s heart and give him salvation, whether he wants it or not, and will take the old heart out of him and give him a new one, one that he *does not desire*.

Again: “Who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved.” (Acts 11: 14.) But Brother Cayce has found somebody that could not hear the word, and he supposed the reason he could not hear it was because Adam sinned, and therefore no one could hear the words. It was no

use to tell him words whereby he and his house could be saved.

“Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.” (Acts 16: 31.) If a man will be saved, and salvation will be forced upon him whether he wants it or not, why say, “*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house?” The answer of Paul and Silas to the jailer evidently makes *believing* on the Lord Jesus Christ a condition of salvation, and then his proposition is not true.

“Not the hearers of the law, but the doers of the law shall be justified.” (Rom. 2: 13.) This passage clearly makes *hearing* and *doing* the law both necessary to justification, and therefore Cayce’s proposition is false.

Paul said: “Be ye reconciled to God.” (2 Cor. 5: 20.) God, my friends, proposes to reconcile the sinner by the death of his Son. Brother Cayce admits that fact. And the simple story of Jesus and his love ought to be enough to turn every man from sin to-day. As I said the other night, I do not remember the day when I was not in love with a righteous life. In all of my waywardness I loved good men, and I rejoiced, too, in their righteousness, even in my sins and wickedness; but while this is true, I insist that the love of Jesus, as told in the word of God, is the story that won my heart from sin and God came to me as a mother when her child has the dangerous knife. She does not jerk it out of his hand, and cut his hand while doing so, and destroy his will, but she holds up a beautiful apple, and says: “Throw it down, little one; throw down the ugly knife and take the beautiful apple.” The child drops the knife and takes hold of the beautiful apple, and thus its will power is developed instead of destroyed,

and it rejoices in the better way; and so it is with the gospel. Christ comes to us with the gospel and offers us a blessing instead of that which will ruin us, and says, "Throw down your sins, your wickedness, and take hold of the better life;" and we drop it and *lay hold of* salvation by obedience to the gospel of the Son of God, and by living faithful in the service of the Lord we will be saved in that world where sin is a stranger, and where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest. "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him." (Heb. 7: 25.) According to Brother Cayce's proposition, he will save some whether they come to God by him or not. And they that come to God by Christ *come by obeying* Christ.

"What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" (1 Pet. 4: 17.) Paul answers the question by saying: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." (2 Thess. 1: 9.) Peter says: "What shall the end be?" And Paul answers: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." This passage shows that disobedience brings everlasting destruction. Therefore Cayce's proposition cannot be true.

Again: "What must I do to be saved?" (Acts 16: 30.) "Nothing, sir," if his position is true. Paul and Silas surely would have said this if his proposition were true. But the brother says the jailer had an awakened conscience. So he had, but that does not prove that he was saved. Paul and Silas answered his question like they knew he was not saved; and if he was saved, they did not know it, did they? He says: "Sirs, what must I *do* to be saved?" If Paul and Silas had known what my friend says he knows,

by this proposition they would have said: "*Do? Do nothing.* God will save you when he wants to, and you cannot help it. He will force it upon you."

"Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." (Matt. 11: 28.) If God gives eternal life without conditions, they could have rest as well by staying away as coming to Christ. "The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." (Rev. 22: 17.) The blessing here is on condition that we come, and therefore Brother Cayce's proposition cannot be true.

Richard Baxter once said: "If the Lord should appear and write in shining letters across the horizon that 'Baxter will be saved,' I would draw back in fear that it was not *Richard Baxter*; but if he should write again in shining letters on the sky that 'Richard Baxter will be saved,' I still would draw back in fear, lest in some unknown part of the earth there was another *Richard Baxter* and he meant him; but when he said, '*Whosoever will*,' I know it includes Richard Baxter if *he will*." And I know it includes you, it includes us all, if we will, and I know you can be saved, if you will. I never felt more happy and triumphant in the truth in my life than when I am telling sinners of the opportunity in the gospel to be saved. The story of Jesus and his love, in which he offers us salvation on such easy and simple terms, is the sweetest story there is for man. I am glad of the opportunity to-night to tell my friends that there is hope for them if they will but render obedience to the truth. [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE'S SIXTH ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I am before you to make the last speech in the affirmative of the proposition: "God gives eternal life to the alien sinner without conditions on his part."

The first thing I wish to do is to call your attention to the reading of Rule VII. in "Hedge's Logic:" "As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced on either side should be examined with fairness and candor." Especially do I wish to call your attention to the first part of that rule: "As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced on either side should be examined with fairness and candor." I call your attention to the fact that in my last speech I introduced eleven proof texts in support of my proposition, not one of which was noticed in the gentleman's speech, not a single one. I call your attention to the fact that since I have been in the affirmative I have introduced fifty-seven proof texts in support of my proposition, only twenty-six of which the gentleman has even passingly noticed; thirty-one are untouched—not even referred to. That is the way the gentleman answers arguments with fairness and candor, to say nothing about his sarcasm in the last speech. That is the way the gentleman answers; that is the way he observes the rules.

According to strict rules, it devolves upon the negative to examine the proof and to examine the argu-

ments that are introduced by the affirmative, even if it takes all his time; and instead of doing that the gentleman has used every moment of the last speech in reading some passage of scripture, and then arguing or saying that if this is so, then so and so cannot be true. That is about the way of his argument. Now this would answer everything that was said in that speech, but I shall not pass it that way.

I call your attention to the fact that I asked the gentleman two questions in writing in my other speech, which he has not pretended to answer. One question was: "Did you, or did you not, say that one cannot do spiritual work outside of the church?" The other was: "Must one be a member of the same church you are, in order to be in a saved state?" You remember that I said that if we Old Baptists are not in a saved state, we want to know what is necessary that we be in a saved state. If the other people here are not in a saved state, you want to know what is necessary in order that you be in a saved state. I demand that the gentleman tell us: Is it necessary for all of us to be a member of the church that you are, in order that we be in a saved state? Will he answer in his next speech? I challenge him now to answer it in his next speech, the last speech on the proposition, even when I have no time on this proposition to notice it. I challenge you to answer in your last speech: "Did you, or did you not, say that one cannot do spiritual works outside of the church?" I challenge you to answer it in your last speech on this proposition.

The gentleman says that I said that alien sinners are unsaved sinners, and asks what kind are those the Lord will not give eternal life to. I will answer his question by saying that all men, while in an unregenerate state, are alien sinners, and all Adam's

race by nature are alike; and without the intervention of divine mercy and grace, without the work of Christ, as has already been stated, all are lost.

He says I quoted: "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." (John 5: 40.) Yes, and I also quoted down to the forty-fourth verse, inclusive. Let's see. Jesus says in the fortieth verse: "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." Forty-first verse: "I receive not honor from men. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you." Who was it he was talking to when he said, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life?" He was talking to characters who were destitute of the love of God. Let this represent those characters. Suppose I persuade one of them to come to Jesus? What have I done? I have made the Savior out a falsifier when he says: "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." Will one of them the Savior said would not come ever come? I ask the gentleman to answer that, and tell us if one of them will come that the Savior said will not come. And in the forty-fourth verse he says: "How can ye believe?" Listen, here is a question that answers itself: "How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" How can that sinner believe, then, that does not love God? But he says: "The trouble is, they just will not come. It is not because they cannot come." All right. John 6: 44: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." The Son of God, then, says they cannot and they will not come. I ask you, Will they come?

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. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and

whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things." To the ungodly, unregenerate sinners out yonder? No, sir—"testify unto you these things *in the churches*"—and hence not to the ungodly or the unregenerate sinner. He has the wrong text.

1 John 5: 1. He says they must believe in order that they become children of God or be born of God. 1 John 5: 1, in the King James translation, says: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." In the original it says, "Whosoever believeth [or every one that believes] that Jesus is the Christ has been begotten of God," and the Greek word *gegennatai* may be correctly translated "has been begotten" or "has been born of God." Evidently, then, a believer is one who has been born of God; and hence belief follows after, and is not in order to, regeneration.

John 1: 11, 12: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born." Then he says that all this is in the past tense. Notice, please, that *believe* is in the present tense. Then, to them that *are now believing* on his name, to them gave he power, or authority, to become children of God, which WERE BORN, in the perfect tense. "Were born" is in the perfect tense. It denotes something that was completed in the long ago. "Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh." Elder Srygley says that the sinner must become willing; that God does not force eternal life upon you whether you are willing or not; but the Savior says: "Not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." It is of the sovereign will

and work of Almighty God that brings about the work of giving eternal life to the dead sinner.

“Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness.” The Saviour was talking, not to alien sinners, but to his disciples.

“Seek ye the Lord while he may be found.” The prophet was talking to Israelites, not to the Amorites, the Jebusites, the Hittites, the Hivites, nor any other “ites” only Israelites. He must find a text showing something that the Hivite or Hittite or Jebusite or some other “ite” around there must do in order to become an Israelite, in order to disprove my proposition. He must find where the alien sinner is commanded to do something in order to be born again, but he has not found that.

“Seek, and ye shall find.” The Savior was talking to his disciples in the Sermon on the Mount, not to unregenerate sinners or the multitude. He had gone away from the multitude, as you will see by reading the first verse of Matt. 5.

1 Timothy: “Lay hold on eternal life.” Can he lay hold on what is not his and what he cannot possess while here? Why, if he cannot possess eternal life here, how can he lay hold of it? I would like to know how he can do that. I would like to know how he can lay hold on it if he cannot possess it here, and can only possess it hereafter. How, then, can he lay hold on it? Then, granting his own contention, that one cannot possess eternal life here, and never can until hereafter, how, then, can he lay hold of it while he is here?

He notices the stream, and he says to “redeem” means to buy back, and that my position is that man has never been in God’s favor. My position is that God gave somebody to his Son, and that they were his, therefore, by gift; and when he poured out his

blood on Calvary's hill, they were his by purchase or by redemption. But he illustrates by buying back a piece of land. Let me illustrate. Suppose you have some cattle that stray off, and that go over yonder somewhere in some remote corner of the county. You will find where they are, and you go over there and pay the purchase or the redemption price. I will ask you: Is there a man in the house who would leave it optional with the cattle as to whether they come home? *Is there? Is there?* What do you say? If there is one here that would leave it optional with the cattle as to whether they come home, stand on your feet, rise up! I want to see the color of your hair. You think more of your cattle than that, don't you? According to Elder Srygley's position, Jesus Christ came down here in this world and redeemed by pouring out his life's blood, and then thinks less of those he redeemed with his life's blood than you think of your cattle that cost you only a few dollars! Jesus leaves it optional with them as to whether they come home to glory or not! Will he do that? No, sir! He will find them and take them home to glory.

Do I believe they are taken home to heaven against their will? No, sir; God gives them a will, if you please, and that will springs from the divine life which God implants within the soul, and they long to see his face, and want to live with him in heaven, and want to be free from sin, and want to be saved; and every one that ever has, does now, or ever will really and truly desire to meet God in peace, heaven will be their home by and by. Do you believe that, Brother Srygley?

He says: "Wrong about a man not having the Spirit of Christ not having eternal life." He says I am wrong about that. All right. 1 John 5: 12

says: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." If I am wrong about it, John was, too. That was what John said about it, just exactly.

Life is suitable to element. Fish has life suited to its element, and we have a natural life suited to our element, and the Spirit, he says, cannot live without the body. I don't know whether he meant that or not. If he meant to say that, then he must be a "soul sleeper." If the spirit cannot live without the body, then when the body dies, the spirit or soul dies, and all there is about the man dies. If that is his position, he must be a "soul sleeper." The regenerated man, in spirit, is in possession of eternal life. In the work of regeneration God bestows that and gives that. The body, in the resurrection, will be immortalized and purified and fitted to live in heaven. In the work of regeneration the soul is prepared for that.

Then he used a slang expression that I will not call your attention to.

Then he refers to Rom. 6: 17, 18: "God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." I will read the original to you: "But thanks be to God, that ye were bondmen of sin, but ye obeyed from the heart a form of teaching to which ye were delivered. And having been set free from sin, ye became bondmen to righteousness." When were they set free from sin? When they were delivered to the form of teaching, and when the heart was made good. Is there any service better than the heart from which it is rendered? No, sir. If the heart is bad when the service is rendered, then the service is bad, for it is

no better than the heart. God will not accept a service like that; but the heart is first made good, and then the service is rendered which God accepts.

Rom. 1: 16: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to—" The man that hasn't any faith? No. That is the way it ought to read to suit his position. That is the way it ought to read to suit him. But it does not say that. It says: "Therein is the righteousness of God revealed *from faith to faith.*" In order that the righteousness of God be revealed in the gospel to a character, he must first be in possession of faith, for it is revealed in the gospel from faith to faith, and hence to those who are already believers; not in order that they be believers, in that sense, but to those already believers, those in possession of faith.

His next argument does not at all touch my proposition. He says the sinner must accept. He says the railroad pass is not a gift until accepted. Yes, it may be a gift, a bestowal, and yet you refuse to accept it. But, does God hand out eternal life like railroad officials hand out railroad passes to the representatives? Say, does he? And if he does, I ask you, if the railroad officials knew that the representative or officer would refuse to accept the pass, would the official offer the pass in the first place? Would it not be foolish for him to do so? Then, does God offer eternal life, not knowing whether the sinner will accept it or not? Or does he offer it, believing that the sinner will accept it, and then gets disappointed or fooled in the matter by the sinner rejecting it? I would like for the gentleman to please notice these things and tell us how it is.

He says he didn't receive the name. I am much inclined to think you did. I am rather inclined to think that you received the name "Srygley" by reason of the fact that you were a child of your father, whose name was "Srygley." That is what I am inclined to think about it—that you received that name in consequence of the fact that you were born of Srygley parentage. That is what I think about it, and I am persuaded that this people think that way, too.

Paul says: "Knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." Yes, Paul persuaded living people to obey the Savior, but he did not persuade dead people to become alive or to be resurrected. He did not persuade unborn people to be born. He did not go around through the country telling dead people what to do to have life, nor unborn people what to do to be born. Paul did not do that. He did persuade living people to render service to God.

"Let the wicked forsake his way." I have already disposed of that.

He says, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die;" but you must remember that the alien sinner is already dead, and hence his text does not disprove my proposition or touch it.

"If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." (1 John 1: 9.) John was writing to children of God, those already saved, not unregenerate sinners.

Acts 16: 31: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." I contend that the language has in it the idea that his house is saved by his believing, just as much as he is saved by his believing.

"We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." This the apostle said to the church at Cor-

inth. He was not writing to alien or unregenerate sinners, persuading them to become children of God.

He says: "I loved the righteous man in my sins." John says: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." He and John do not seem to agree very well. He was in his sins, but he loved the people of God; and John says you know by that that you have "passed from death unto life"—because you love the brethren. So easy for him to contradict the Scriptures! So easy!

"Save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him." We come to God by and through him—by and through Jesus Christ, not by and through the works of the sinner.

"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction," etc. I wonder if God will punish the heathen for not obeying the gospel, when the heathen know nothing about the gospel that Brother Srygley preaches. I want him to answer this, even in his last speech. Does God send the heathen to hell for not believing the gospel that you preach, when they have never heard you preach, and don't know anything about what you preach? I want you to answer that, and tell us upon what principle of justice God damns the heathen in an eternal hell for not believing the gospel, when they have never had an opportunity of believing it, and when they have never heard it. Tell me this.

"Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." He was talking to the living character—not to the alien, dead sinner. The alien sinner is not tired of sin.

"Whosoever will," in Rev. 22. How does that quotation begin? "The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And

let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." The brother argues on that, that it is a universal invitation. It is universal only so far as the character has the will to serve God. Nobody invited, nobody commanded, who is destitute of the will to serve God. Suppose I take natural water and say: "Whosoever will, come and drink." You say: "I am not thirsty. I don't want the water." Then you just be right still; I am not talking to you. He said: "Let him that is athirst come." Do you think it is possible for one to thirst for this natural water in order that he may obtain the natural life? No, sir; the very fact that one does thirst for this natural water is positive proof that he already possesses the natural life, and is thirsting for that which is necessary to sustain the life, and which nourishes and cherishes it. So, if a character hungers and thirsts after righteousness, of course that thirst and hunger springs from the divine or righteous life that God has already implanted in the soul, and that thirst and hunger is for something that nourishes and cherishes that life that God has implanted and gives; and hence this is already a living character, and not the dead character that he is talking about.

I shall now proceed with my affirmative arguments. I was on the sixteenth argument: that eternal life is given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of eternal life (regeneration) is set forth in the Scriptures as a circumcision of heart, and must, therefore, be without conditions. I called your attention to Rom. 2: 28, 29. I now read Phil. 3: 3: "For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." We are the circumcision that do what?

Worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus. Why should they rejoice in Christ Jesus? Because in mercy and compassion he looked upon them when they were in sins, satisfied the demands of divine justice for them, sent forth his spirit into their hearts, and circumcised them in heart. This makes them love God, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. To suit Elder Srygley's position, they would be the circumcision who worship God some other way besides in the spirit, "rejoice in our good works, and have all confidence in the preacher." That is the way it should read to suit him.

Acts 7: 51-54: "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." Now these characters always resist the Holy Ghost. If they who are not circumcised in heart always resist the Holy Ghost, and they must cease doing that in order to be saved, would any be saved? I ask you, if they always resist the Holy Ghost, does it not follow that they must first be overcome by a divine power, and have their ears and hearts circumcised first, before they cease resisting the Holy Ghost? That must, necessarily, be done first.

"Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers: who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it. When they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth." This shows the effect gospel preaching had on those characters.

I wish now to give a little summary. what time I have, of the arguments that I have introduced in

support of the proposition that God gives eternal life to alien sinners without conditions on their part.

My first argument was: God gives eternal life without conditions, because the alien sinner is in the flesh and cannot please God. During this discussion I have asked the gentleman time and again to tell what the alien sinner can do in order to cross this line. Has he undertaken it? No, sir. He has not answered that question. *He has not told us yet what the alien sinner can do in order to cross that line.* On that side of the line the apostle emphatically declares they cannot please God. Whatever the alien sinner does, on this side of the line, it does not please God. On the other side of the line one can please God.

My next argument was: The proposition must be true that God gives eternal life to alien sinners without the works of the sinner, without conditions on their part, because the alien, or unregenerate, sinner is in a state of death. (Gen. 2: 15-17; 3: 4, 5; 5: 12-14; Eph. 2: 1.)

My next argument was that eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because they do not perform good works—moral works not referred to, but spiritual works. You remember I called your attention to that especially, that the alien sinner could not perform spiritual works, having no reference to moral works. I did not say that the alien sinner could not live a moral life. But morality is one thing, and spirituality is another. He cannot render spiritual or gospel service. (Rom. 3: 8-23; Ps. 53: 1-3; Gen. 6: 5, 12, which he has not answered; Eph. 2: 1-3, which is unanswered; Eccles. 7: 20; James 2: 10; Gal. 3: 10, 11.)

My next argument was that eternal life must be

given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because adults and infants are saved the same way; and as infants are not saved by performing conditions, so the adult is saved without performing them. (Mark 10: 13-16; Luke 18: 15-17, which has not been noticed.

Next, eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because they cannot come to the Lord, nor do good works. [*Time expired.*]

MR. SBYGLEY'S SIXTH REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend started out in the beginning of his last speech with considerable complaint, but he did not disappoint me in that, because I was satisfied he could not do very much except complain; and really, when that is all a man can do, why that is all he does. I am satisfied that he felt at the very beginning that he hardly knew where to take hold of this thing, and I believe that every unbiased person who was present could see that he felt that way, and therefore he *had* to complain.

He said again that I broke the seventh rule. Well, I did not mean to do it. He also said that the reason I broke it was because the rule is that truth and not victory should be the object of honorable controversy. Well, my friends, I never felt in my life more in earnest, that I might get before you the *truth*, than I have to-night, and so far as gaining a victory over my opponent—what good would it do me to gain a victory over him? Could there really be anything in it? I do not believe it would be worth the time and effort to gain a victory over him. I have no desire to dominate over him. In fact, I am not doing that. It is simply the *truth* that the gentleman cannot answer, and truth is exactly what I have been after all the time in this controversy. It is not victory. Why, no. I have seen the time when I perhaps might have sought to gain a victory over him, but what good would that do me? I understand very well that soon I must give an account for the manner

in which I conduct myself during this debate, as well as the manner in which I conduct myself at all times, and I say to you that I have but one purpose, in all that I have said, and in all that I shall say in this discussion, and that is to get before my audience the teaching of the word of God on the subject of man's personal redemption.

But further on he said that I did not examine all his passages. You know how rapidly he read them, and it appeared to me that he has the idea that the man who could read the most passages, whether they had any connection with the subject or not, is the best debater. But I believe that I could admit his contention upon all of them, and still his proposition not be true; for if his contention is wrong at this one point, that man does not have eternal life here at all, only in *prospect*, then there are not passages of scripture enough in all the Book to prove that God *gives* eternal life to the *alien* sinner now, for you know that when they get to heaven they will not be alien sinners—they will be "redeemed" "saints." If I am right in my contention that everlasting life is only enjoyed here in *prospect*, then his proposition cannot be true, as I have shown oftentimes in this controversy that we have everlasting life like the young lady fifteen years old has the fortune. The father has willed all his fortune to his daughter. We say she has a fortune. But it is a fortune in *prospect*. She has it as an inheritance, and she does not come into actual possession of it until she is twenty-one; but anybody would say she has a fortune, though she has it only in *prospect*. The same thing is true in "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." How? My friend says in actual possession. I say in *prospect*, and the reason I say in *prospect* is because Paul says it is a hope, and Paul says a man does not

hope for a thing which he already has. The very fact that we have everlasting life as a hope is proof that my friend is wrong in his contention, and therefore his proposition falls to the ground.

He complains that I have not answered his arguments. I did answer them, but I answered them in my own way. I perhaps did not answer them to suit him. I do not know just what would suit him in the matter, but I know one thing—it suits me perfectly; and if it did not suit me exactly, I am doing the best I can. I always do that. I never failed in my life to give any audience the best that I could. I am perfectly satisfied that the gentleman is wrong in his proposition that God gives eternal life to the alien sinner without conditions on the sinner's part—yes, *very wrong*. He does not get it unconditionally, because I have shown you that man must *accept* it, and he must *obey* in accepting eternal life, and many of the passages he has read look back to the cross of Jesus, where the *basis* of man's redemption was laid, and not the time when even man is saved, much less to the time when God actually gives eternal life.

I feel sorry for my friend. His father taught him this error. It was taught to his father and grandfather. But I tell you, this position cannot bear the light. Whenever the light is turned on, people will see that God offers everlasting life, eternal happiness, on the condition that we *obey* him, for my Book says that Christ was made perfect by obedience, and became the author of eternal salvation to all them that *obey* him. I believe *that* with all of my heart. Do you think I quoted that passage for victory over him? I read it that my neighbors may understand how to secure everlasting life, by obeying Jesus; but

I say the opposite is true, that the man who will not obey him will not have everlasting life.

Again, he asked me the question whether a man who is not a member of the church that I am will be saved. He wants me to answer that in this speech, as I did not answer it before. I will not accommodate him, for what has that to do with the subject, "God gives eternal life to the alien sinner, and gives it to him without conditions?" Then he says: "Will anybody be saved but members of the church of which you are a member?" What does that have to do with the proposition? Why does it make any difference what church I am a member of, so far as this proposition is concerned? His effort is to get me off the question, because he would rather I spend my time answering some irrelevant question. I am following him, and I think I will do it to the satisfaction of those seeking the truth. I think he will know he has been followed when the debate is over. He challenges me to answer this. I do not accept that challenge. I am here to examine his proof and show that he does not prove his proposition. I am not here to talk about the church of which I am a member. My friend, that is illogical. I will leave it to his moderator. My opponent knows it is illogical.

Again, he says he did read John 5: 40, and that says, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life;" but he says he did not quit there. I did not say he did. In fact, he never did entirely quit till his time was out. I did not care how far he read. That passage says, "Ye *will not* come to me, that ye might have life," and his contention is that they *cannot*. I said they *will not*, and that is what John said. He says: "Will any of them come while they have not the *will*?" No. Then he says: "If they

lack the will to come, they never come, they cannot." That does not follow—"they will not, and therefore they cannot." They will not, but they *can* if they *will*; and if they do not, they die in their sins. He says they are unwilling, and do not come now because unwilling. How does he know but that they may become willing to-morrow? So far as I am concerned, I will preach the gospel to them and do my part toward persuading them to be willing to come.

If he would show them the beauty of the gospel, the love of God as it is set forth in the gospel, in the right way, they might become willing. But he does *not* do it. There is one thing I have to rejoice over, and that is, there are only a *few* men that believe that Christ need not be preached to sinners. I am glad that the large number of people in this country that believe the gospel at all believe in preaching it to fallen man, telling him of the love of Jesus, that "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.) In showing sinners the way of salvation I rejoice that I can stand shoulder to shoulder with such a number of good men, as good men as God ever breathed the breath of life into.

I will hurry along, then, for I must notice everything that is pertinent. My opponent quotes: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." I believe that. No man can come unless the Father who sent Jesus draw him. But I believe the next verse, too. It says: "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath *heard*, and hath *learned* of the Father, cometh unto me." (John 6:44, 45.) No man can come until he is drawn, and every man that hears and learns of the Father and

wills, comes to Jesus; therefore God draws men by teaching them the gospel.

But again he says it was to the churches that it was said: "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.) I do not see that that relieves him of the situation, for his contention is that God gives eternal life to the alien sinner, and as it is *eternal* he can never lose it. What does the passage mean that says, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life?" There is one thing sure: if you do not keep the commandments, you will not have a right up there. Are you going without a right? I am going the road God lays out.

I showed you that man was in God's favor, but he *heard* a lie, *believed* a lie, and *obeyed* it, and that that separated him from the favor of God. And I argued that a man, to get back into the favor of God, must *hear*, *believe*, and *obey* the truth. The gentleman says: "Where is the tree of life?" I read this passage to show that man does not have a right to the tree of life unless he keeps the commandments. "Blessed are they that do his commandments." Do that, my brethren, keep the commandments, and that gives you the *right* to the tree of life, and you have no right to it without you do that. Keep the commandments of God—yes, "fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man." (Eccles. 12: 13.)

Again, he says that he that believeth on the Son is born or begotton of God. I understand that, but that is a *condition*. He also quotes, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life" (John 5: 40), to prove his doctrine, as though it says "*ye can-*

not." My friends, the language clearly implies they could if they would come, and I say one of the passages at least that he relied upon to prove that man cannot, proves that he *can* come, but *will* not. Now I cannot see why God should damn a man that *cannot*. I can see why God ought to damn a man that *will not*, but I cannot see for the life of me why he should damn a man that *cannot*. Here is a man that *cannot* do a thing, and yet God will damn him forever for not doing what God knows he *cannot* do! I say that we would condemn such a disposition in any father in this city. If the father were to command his son to bring in a stick of wood that was twice as heavy as he could carry, and he knew it, and the little fellow should struggle and struggle until the tears came into his eyes, yet *could not* do it, and the father should say, "I told you to bring in that wood," and smite him in the face for his failure, I would not want to associate with him. I would not believe he had the heart of a human, if he required his child to do what he could not do, and punished him for not doing what *he knew* he could not do. If God sends me to hell for not doing what I cannot do, I will ring it through the fields of perdition as long as I stay there: "*Unjust! Unjust!*" There is no justice in it, for God to send a man to perdition for not doing what he cannot do.

I have some idea of justice. Maybe wickedness is as good as righteousness, but I know one thing: if God decrees that I shall be wicked, and rejoices over the fact that I am punished for it, then I do say I have a wrong conception of right and wrong. I do not know what it is, if that is right. I do not understand this thing at all, if my friend is right, but I am going to doubt seriously his being right. In fact, I am getting where I can speak positively. *He*

is *not right*. Here is his doctrine: He that is not in possession of eternal life has not received God. Jesus says: "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." How do we receive an ambassador? By receiving his word. In the second chapter of Acts it is stated that "they that gladly received his word were baptized." What did they do, then? They received Christ. Why? Because Christ says: "He that receives you receives me." They received God. Why? Because the Book says Christ said: "He that receives me receives him that sent me." My friend says that a man has to receive the kingdom as a little child. That is right, as a little child receives other things, and the way to receive it is by obeying the words of the apostle in a loving, trusting way as a little child. That is plain, is it not? That is coming down to where anybody could see it; it looks to me like my friend himself would be able to see it.

Again, Cayce says that man cannot get back to the tree of life by complying with any condition. I quoted 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 friend says that the word by which we are begotten is "Logos," referring to the Christ, notwithstanding every translation I have ever examined spells the word with a little "w" in this place, using a word that he says means the Son of God, and not even capitalizing it! I admit that "Logos" refers to Christ, but it also refers to the word of Christ. I thought that those who translated it knew something about it, but my friend Cayce says it is "Logos," and it means the Christ, the Word that became flesh and dwelt among us. Still Peter says: "This is the word

which by the gospel is preached unto you." (1 Pet. 1: 25.) It is rendered in the American Revised Version thus: "This is the word of good tidings which was preached unto you." James says: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." (James 1: 18.)

Again, Cayce says the sinner gets eternal life without any condition on his part. The sinner cannot be begotten without *believing*, for John says: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." (1 John 5: 1.) Notice now: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." The sinner cannot have eternal life until he believes, and the man is a sinner before he is begotten. My friend Cayce says that before man got eternal life he was a sinner, and the Book says the believer is begotten. I say the man who argues that way cannot be right, and therefore I can be positive in the matter that the gentleman is mistaken in his entire contention.

Again: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John 1: 11-13.) He said that I said everything in that text was in the past tense. I never said it. You misunderstood me again, friend Cayce. I said the whole transaction was past when John wrote it. Now quote me correctly. John wrote a number of years after they had received Christ, and looking back he said that Christ "came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." Were they the children of God? They had power to *become* such.

Brother Cayce says that "they were born" before they had the power to be sons, before they were sons. I do not think that a man is born before he is a son. He has that wrong. "Which were born." John wrote this a number of years after the whole matter had transpired. They were born when John was talking about it. Paul was born and the apostles were all born, but that does not prove that they were born before they believed, because John says: "Who-soever believeth on the Son is begotten of God." That is the reason I know he is wrong about it.

Again, my opponent says Christ seeks the sinner, the sinner does not seek Christ. He is wrong about that. I read: "*Seek ye first the kingdom of God.*" (Matt. 6: 33.) But Brother Cayce thinks this was to his disciples. Very well. They had to seek the kingdom first, and surely no man can have eternal life till he comes into his kingdom. I believe that Christ is in his kingdom in power and authority, where the promise of eternal life is, just as the king of England is in all his territory by power and authority; but I do not believe that man can have promise of eternal life and not be in his kingdom, and this Book says: "*Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness.*" His righteousness is in the kingdom. "*Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.*"

I quoted: "*Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near.*" (Isa. 55: 6.) But he says these were God's people seeking around for the Lord. Is that the way of the Old Baptists, seeking around after him? He says that was not the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites, but they were God's people. My friend, God's people cannot get

away from God, according to your contention. "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found." This shows that a man might neglect to seek him till it is too late to find him. It is our duty, and the duty of every son of Adam's race, to seek the Lord while he may be found.

Again, eternal life is in the future, for the Book says: "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." (Rom. 2: 7.) That is, God will give them eternal life. If they already have it, as my friend has it here on this blackboard, then I do not see why they are seeking in order to obtain it. I called his attention to this, as you know, but he has not noticed it. I do not blame him for not noticing it, but it stands when he does not do it.

I called your attention to the fact that God said, "I have given into thine hand Jericho" (Josh. 6: 2), and said it was at least seven days before the walls of Jericho fell down. God said, "*I have given it,*" yet he gave Jericho into their hands only in prospect, for God commanded them to march around the wall every day for seven days, and then to blow a loud blast on the trumpets of rams' horns, and the people to shout, and the walls fell down flat, and they went up, every man, and took actual possession of the city; yet God had said more than a week before: "*I have given into thine hand Jericho.*" If God said that about Jericho, and only meant, "I have given it to you in prospect," is it not true that we have eternal life in prospect? If not, why not? That is the way we have it, for I have shown you that we cannot have it while we are living here. We are living our natural life now. Eternal life is in the future.

Cayce admits that Christ is our Redeemer, and re-

deems us; but I called your attention to the fact that "redeem" means to buy back. He says that if a man were to buy cattle and they strayed off, would he leave it to them whether they should be brought back or not? I do not suppose he would. But men are different from cattle. That is the trouble with this doctrine. He makes a man lower than the brute. Men are not cattle—they are men—made in God's image and with the power of choice and the ability to believe and obey God, and therefore are not cattle. That is a mistake, and that doctrine lowers a man equal to the brute. It does not give him any choice at all. It gives him no chance. God never loved him, Jesus never died for him, and he never had a chance, if this doctrine is true. Men might as well be cattle as to be men. The gentleman has this thing wrong, I know.

There is another thing. "He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him," and my friend said that the opposite of the proposition was always true. Therefore he is not the author of eternal salvation to the disobedient, and my friend is wrong when he says God gives eternal life to the alien sinner without conditions, because he does not obtain it *actually* until he gets it in the eternal world.

I called your attention to the fact that we are living now a natural life in the natural body. He says I said the soul could not live without the body. I never said it. He misunderstood me again. I said the man could not have natural life without the natural body, and when the soul leaves the natural body, natural life ends, for the natural life is only enjoyed in the natural body. There is another body that will never be marred by time. These old bodies of ours will wear out, but we shall get immortal bodies, if we are faithful, that will never die. [*Time expired.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION.

MR. SHEPHERD.—We come this evening to the discussion of the second proposition, with Brother Srygley in the lead and Brother Cayce in the negative, and I hope that while this proposition is being discussed we shall have the very best order possible. I want to say this, just by way of bringing before you the situation in which we are: I believe with all my heart that we should manifest fairness in all things. I am just as anxious that Brother Cayce shall have fair dealing as I am that Brother Srygley shall have it. I am endeavoring, as moderator in this debate, to see fair play. Of course Brother Cayce understands, and so also do his people, that my sympathies, so far as the subjects under discussion are concerned, are with Brother Srygley; but when it comes to the enforcement of the rules, I pray God from the depths of my heart that I may manifest no partisan spirit. In all my rulings I endeavor to carry this out; and now, as I take the chair, I want to be more guarded than ever and to manifest that unbiased spirit throughout.

Another thing to which I wish to call attention, and that is, that this discussion is between two men; the respective churches have selected them to represent them in this discussion, and no one else has any right to take any part in it. I suppose we all understand this. Therefore, as the discussion is between two men, let us listen to what they have to say with due respect to the speakers, and weigh what they say

without prejudice, that we may learn the truth about the proposition under discussion.

When Brother Srygley makes his arguments, I want Brother Cayce to examine them carefully, and, if they are illogical and unscriptural, to expose them. Let no one get it into his mind that because Brother Cayce will endeavor to do this that he has anything against Brother Srygley personally. It is understood that the intention is to present the very strongest on each side that can possibly be said, and anything less than this would defeat the purposes of this discussion.

As I have already said, Brother Srygley takes the lead, and in a thirty-minutes' speech will introduce the subject. The proposition for discussion for the next three evenings is: "Faith, repentance, and water baptism are conditions of pardon or salvation to an alien sinner, and the Scriptures so teach."

MR. SRYGLEY'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I trust that we are all grateful to God for his mercies and blessings, and that we have a becoming reverence for his word, as we shall undertake to investigate this evening the conditions upon which he has promised to pardon alien sinners.

The proposition was read in your hearing—viz.: "Faith, repentance, and water baptism are conditions of pardon to an alien sinner." Now, one of the rules of controversy is that the terms in which a proposition is stated shall be defined so carefully that there can be no mistake concerning them. Hence, I use the term "alien," as applied to a sinner, in the sense of a foreigner or stranger to the government of God. An alien sinner, then, is a sinner out of the kingdom of Christ. It is true that, in some particulars, all men are sinners, but those in the kingdom are not *alien* sinners. They are *erring* children. Those out of the kingdom are aliens or foreigners.

I use the word "condition" in the sense of something stipulated or required as a prerequisite to the fulfillment of a promise—any one of the terms upon which an agreement is made.

I use the word "pardon" in the sense of "to remit the penalty," let pass a fault or sin without resentment or blame.

I state here, my friends, that if religion is reasonable, then there must be a reason in every word of it. Reason without design is impossible. "Reason" and

“design” are two names for the same thing. The inference is one system of design, terminating in one result. So the Christian institution is one system of means terminating in one consummation—the glory of its author and the purity and happiness of his intelligent offspring, man. The system of redemption is a system of deliverance from sin; hence its doctrines and promises are a development of a system originating in the goodness of God, guided by his wisdom and power, and each part of this scheme has its own object. Faith is not a substitute for holiness and righteousness, but a *means* to these things. As a means, it is indispensable to every one of them. Prayer, reading, and meditation are means to sanctification. So with all the requirements of the gospel. They are means or conditions upon which God bestows the blessings of pardon to an alien.

But God works after his own pattern. The sun is the means of light. God is the great cause of all light and all blessings; but blot out the sun, and the earth would have no light. So faith, repentance, and baptism are *means* or *conditions* of salvation; while God, the love of God, and the death of Christ are the cause. It is well to make a distinction between the cause and conditions of salvation. Conditions are not to be regarded in the light of cause, but as *conditions strictly*. Still, let no one suppose, because they are conditions, that they are not essential to whatever is made dependent on them. A condition may be as absolutely necessary to whatever is dependent on it as though it were a cause. There is this distinction. The connection between cause and effect is necessary—that is, it exists in the very nature of things; but the connection between a condition and whatever depends on it is not necessary, but arbi-

trary. It exists at the will or by the appointment of him who prescribes it. Hence, conditions have no power to produce or merit to procure that which depends on them. It is always conferred as a gratuity or a favor. Compliance with a condition on the ground that there is merit in it can oblige the Savior to confer no blessing. Though he has prescribed conditions, and they are complied with, still the blessing conferred is a matter of grace or mercy, although bestowed on conditions.

Now, my friends, with these definitions and these statements, I desire to call your attention to-night to the conditions upon which God has offered pardon to fallen man. It is not my purpose to talk to you of the grace of God or the cause of salvation. Sufficient is it for me to say in this connection that the apostle said: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2: 8, 9.) From this passage it occurs to me that there are two sides to the question of man's redemption—a human and a divine side. On God's side of salvation it is *all by grace*, and on the human side of salvation it is *through faith*. All that God does for the salvation of man he does by grace, and all that man does in appropriating to himself the salvation that is so freely and graciously offered to him in the gospel of Christ is to be done through faith; and therefore the statement of the apostle is: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God."

But I desire also to emphasize the fact that the manifestation of that grace is found in the gospel of the Son of God. The apostle Paul said: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and

wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you." (1 Cor. 15: 1, 2.) It appears to me from this passage that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, and, in fact, the apostle Paul so states in these words: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1: 16.) And when the Savior came to the world to save men from sin—when he came to call, not the righteous, but sinners to repentance—when the Master came to this world of ours to save men, he came and proposed to save them through the gospel, and he gave to his chosen apostles, his ambassadors, that gospel; and in that gospel the conditions upon which Jesus Christ, the Savior, would save men are very clearly stated.

I state in this connection that this gospel has been recorded and given to us in plain terms by three different writers. I would not make the impression upon you that there are three different gospels, but these writers are simply different witnesses testifying to the same facts.

Matthew says: "And Jesus came to them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28: 18-20.) In this account of the great commission, we have rather the apostolic part of the work. Matthew said: "Go, . . . make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I com-

manded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Mark, in giving his account of this same commission, said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." In this, my friends, we have, not only the apostolic part of the commission, but we have the part the sinner is to perform; but before calling attention to this part that the sinner is to perform, the record says: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." I have already called your attention to the fact that this gospel is the power of God unto salvation, and therefore the purpose of the preaching of the gospel was that men and women might be saved. "Go ye therefore"—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." I say that this part of the commission—I mean the commission as given by Mark—contains at least two conditions upon which the blessing may be enjoyed, the remission of sins or salvation. The record is: "Go, . . . preach the gospel to every creature." The statement is: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." And then Luke gives his version of the same commission in these words: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke 24: 46, 47.) I am satisfied that this refers to the same commission and to the same time, and not only so, but this writer declares the place when or where this commission shall begin to be operative.

“Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, *beginning at Jerusalem.*” I state that Luke not only adds another condition upon which man shall enjoy salvation or remission of sins, but Mark states that it is on the conditions that man *believes* and is *baptized* that he receives the remission of sins, or salvation from past sin. I am satisfied from this, then, that we have precisely the commission under which these apostles always preached, and that we have the conditions that they were required to bind on the people.

Christ is the Savior of men. There is no other Savior. “Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4: 12), except the name of Christ. Jesus Christ is man’s *only* Redeemer; he is man’s *only* Savior; and while he is the Savior, he has the right, the supreme right, to announce the conditions upon which he will save men, and in giving to these apostles the great commission he gives us these conditions. By Mark, *faith* and *baptism*. By Luke, *repentance*; and Luke also states what the salvation of man consists in—the *remission of sins*. Therefore, taking this commission as a whole, we find that the gospel was to be preached, that men and women were to be taught, that it was to be preached to all nations, that it was to be carried into all the world and preached to every creature, and that the conditions upon which people were to be saved were that they should *believe* in Christ, *repent* of their sins, and *be baptized* into his name. I say, then, that in this commission I have not only come to conditions, but I have the

conditions of my proposition in very plain, *careful, well-stated and well-chosen words.*

But these apostles as ambassadors were sent out under this commission; and if we have any trouble in knowing what they taught and what they required of men, I believe the best way is to turn to their preaching and to the history of their teaching given in the book known as "Acts of Apostles." I believe we will find examples here that show exactly how they understood the great commission and applied it to conditions that came up. If you are studying arithmetic, and come to a new rule, and some examples worked under the rule, it is done that all students may understand how to apply the rule. In Acts of Apostles we have the application of this great rule, the rule of man's redemption. I believe we have their understanding of it and the application of it to the lives and hearts of the people wherever they went and wherever they preached.

On the first Pentecost after the ascension of Jesus, the first discourse that these apostles preached under this commission, it was very clearly laid down by the apostle Peter, for he was the spokesman on that occasion, upon exactly what terms and conditions man received salvation. You remember the record: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place." That is, these apostles were present in an upper room or chamber in the city of Jerusalem. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." These apostles were not only commissioned by the Savior, but he had told them to tarry in the city of Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high, and this is the fulfillment of that promise made over a week before

that time. "And there appeared unto them [these ambassadors] cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." I say that these apostles were present on that day, and that was the opening day of the kingdom, when the gospel began to be proclaimed, and to be published, and the Savior said, as recorded by Luke, that it should begin at Jerusalem, and the Spirit was poured out upon them, and they had the power to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance; and so these men being present, with such power, began on that day to speak. Peter was the spokesman, and he took his text from the second chapter of Joel: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." And Peter pressed home the point that these people had taken the Savior by wicked hands, had crucified and slain him, and, summing up his arguments, said: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." By this means, by preaching the gospel to them, they were led to believe it with all their heart. There was no other way that they could know it. But the record says: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children,

and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts 2: 1-39.)

Here, my friends, we have the preaching under this great commission, where the apostles were empowered to speak in his name when the Holy Spirit had been poured out upon them, and they were filled with it, and they had possession of tongues. On this occasion Peter, as spokesman, delivered the conditions of salvation, which were: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." You see that Peter did not tell these people to believe. You ask me why. The Savior said: "Go, preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And yet Peter does not tell these people to believe. They already believed. In the thirty-sixth verse we have it very clearly stated: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly." They already believed it, so Peter said: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Therefore, in this first discourse, preached on the day of Pentecost, the apostle Peter, speaking as the Spirit gave him utterance, bound on the hearts of these people that they should *repent* and *be baptized*, every one of them, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.

I understand the "remission of sins" is pardon of sins. In fact, they mean the same thing. It means the same thing as saved from past sins. Saved from sin, the pardon of sin, the remission of sins, and forgiveness of sins, all mean that Jesus Christ, the Savior, will save the people.

I believe that Christ laid the basis of all redemption when he died on the Roman cross for the salva-

tion of men; and when man complies with these conditions, I believe that he has the right to be saved, and will be saved, and Jesus Christ has promised to save him, and through these apostles the promise is made secure, and there is no possible chance for him to miss it, if he will but *obey* the gospel of the Son of God that he shall be saved.

This was to all people. The gospel was to be preached to every nation, to every creature.

I want you to notice, too, that this commission is based on four universal facts. "All authority"—all authority "in heaven and on earth." Surely, my friends, there is no lack of authority in the commission of Christ or in Christ himself, and he delegates that authority to the apostles. "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." "Go ye therefore" (in view of this authority, "go ye therefore"), "and preach the gospel to every creature." We have here "all power" and "every creature," with the result: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." But he says: "Go, . . . make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them: . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." This commission is based upon all authority, and it embraces all of God's commandments, and it is to last for all time, backed up by all power and authority in heaven and in earth; and I say, for that reason, my friends, that this is the commission that the world needs to know, and the man who does not know this does not know the conditions upon which Jesus Christ has promised to save the world.

I believe that the gospel of Christ is to all creatures, for every nation, for all the people, and the

man who *believes* it and *obeys* it, in harmony with these conditions, that man has the promise of salvation and remission of sins, or forgiveness of sins, and I say this: that the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is *the power* of God to save. Paul says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1: 16.) And I remember in this connection, too, that while it is necessary, according to this statement, to believe the gospel, it is also necessary to obey it.

The apostle Peter asks this question: "What shall the end be of them that *obey* not the gospel of God?" (1 Pet. 4: 17.) While Peter asks that question, he does not answer it; but the apostle Paul has answered it, and he answered it with the same authority as the apostle Peter asked it. Paul says: "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that *obey* not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thess. 1: 7-9.)

I insist that not only is it necessary to hear the gospel; but, according to this passage, it is necessary, in order to enjoy the blessings and privileges offered to the human family in the gospel, not only to hear, but to *believe* and *obey*; as I said in the beginning, God has always dealt with man on the very same principle—to *believe* what he says and *do* what he commands. God has always blessed the man that *heard* him and *believed* him and *obeyed* him. This has been true from the beginning, has always been true, and always will be. But I stated in the begin-

ning that God proposes to save man by grace, and so far as God's side of salvation is concerned, it is by grace; but I insist that because God saves a man by grace is no proof that he does not impose conditions. In fact, many of the blessings of this life that we enjoy are graciously offered and given to man, but they are to be enjoyed on conditions.

James says: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." (James 1: 17.) There is not a good thing that we enjoy that is not offered to man by the Lord most graciously, and still these blessings are enjoyed on conditions. This is true with the gospel. When God is dealing with man through the gospel, he is dealing with an intelligent creature with reasoning power, and he gives the gospel to the man that he may enjoy the promises and blessings if he complies with the conditions imposed.

The apostle says: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom. 5: 1, 2.) According to this passage, we have access into this grace by faith, and the apostle, still on the same idea, says: "Not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope: and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly." (Rom. 5: 3-6.)

This passage teaches that man had no strength to prepare a plan by which he could be saved. Only by the death of Jesus could a plan be prepared, so

that man might be saved. The Bible teaches that man shall be saved by grace through faith; and, as I suggested, there are two sides to man's redemption—one side, faith; the other, grace. All that God does he does by grace." [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE'S FIRST REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I am before you in the negative of the proposition which you have heard read : "Faith, repentance, and (water) baptism are conditions of pardon (or salvation) to an alien sinner, and the Scriptures so teach."

I have but little objection to offer to the brother's definition of his proposition, as far as he went, but he failed to tell us, I think, what he means by the word "faith." He tells that it is a means of holiness and righteousness, but *what is faith itself?* However, if I might be permitted, I might just ask, and he can answer, if he sees proper, if he means the same as belief?

MR. SHEPHERD.—I would rather, Brother Cayce, if it is the same with you, that you ask him to answer it in his next speech.

MR. CAYCE.—All right, just so I get it answered. Is it the same as belief? I mean belief on the Lord.

And I also failed to get fully what he means by repentance. I would be glad if he would define that word fully. But he says that faith, repentance, and baptism are means or conditions, and not the cause. Yet he tells us that they are essential; they are necessary in order that pardon or salvation be reached. It seems to me that it is reasonable that if they are conditions necessary in order that pardon or salvation be reached, that they are indirect causes, at least; that there can be no such thing as pardon or salvation without faith, repentance, and water baptism, if they are essential; and if they are not essen-

tial, then it certainly follows that they cease to be a means in order to that end. And if they are essential in order to that end (pardon or salvation), then there can be no such thing as pardon granted to an alien sinner—there can be no such thing as salvation for an alien sinner, without faith, repentance, and baptism having first been performed. These as conditions must first be met, as I understand the gentleman's proposition, and until these conditions are first met, and first performed, there is no such thing as pardon of sins or salvation. Now if I am not correct in this, Brother Srygley will correct me.

He quotes, "By grace," in Ephesians—Eph. 2: 8, 9—"By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."

He says there are two sides to salvation—the human side and the divine side; the divine side is all by grace, that all that God does is by grace, and that what man does is through faith. It is true that everything that God does in the salvation of the sinner is an act of mercy—a stoop of mercy. God bestows everything that he does bestow in salvation as an act of mercy and of grace. God's side of salvation is that God gives eternal life. Rom. 6, the last verse (I think it is the sixth chapter of Romans): "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." The divine side, then, is that God gives eternal life, or saves the sinner. The human side is that we are the unworthy recipients of God's mercy and grace in salvation. These are the two sides to the question.

1 Cor. 15: 1, "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel," in connection with Rom. 1: 16: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that be-

lieveth." Remember that the apostle goes on to say: "To the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein [in the gospel] is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." Here is a character who is destitute of faith, and remember the apostle says that "all men have not faith." He does not mean by that expression, either, that there is not any man who has faith, but he does mean that there are some men who are destitute of faith. That is what he means by the expression that "all men have not faith." Some are destitute of faith. Then here is a man who is destitute of faith, and over here is a man who has faith. The apostle preaches the gospel, and he says that in the gospel, or good news, or glad tidings, is the righteousness of God revealed. Is the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel, which the apostle preached, to this man who has no faith? No. But the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel to this man who has faith. "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." This character, then, who is in possession of faith—the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel to that man, and not to this man who is destitute of faith. If the gospel is instrumental in the salvation of the alien sinner, it would have said that therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to the man who is without faith—this man over here, to this one on this side who is without faith.

Matt. 28: 18, 19, in connection with Mark 16: 15, 16. Matthew says: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." I would ask Brother Srygley this question: Do you teach them to observe all things whatsoever is commanded in God's word? And is

it necessary that all things which he has commanded be taught, in order that sinners be saved in heaven? Must the sinner hear all the things that he has taught or commanded, and observe them, in order that his sins be pardoned? I will just ask him that, in connection with the commission recorded by Matthew.

In Mark: "Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them [Brother Srygley, what is the antecedent of the pronouns *they* and *them*?] with their unbelief and hardness of heart [What is the antecedent of the pronoun *their*?], because they [What is the antecedent of the pronoun *they*?] believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them [What is the antecedent of the pronoun *them*?], Go ye [What is the antecedent of the pronoun *ye*?] into all the world, and preach the gospel [proclaim the glad tidings] to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Now, there are two classes mentioned in that text—one class is the unbeliever and the other is the baptized believer. The text says the unbeliever shall be damned. Now let us grant that Brother Srygley's definition or construction of the text is correct—that one must believe and be baptized in order to eternal life or eternal salvation. Now we agree that the unbeliever is damned. Then over here is the baptized believer. "He that believeth *and is baptized* shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." But I find another class mentioned somewhere in God's word, and that is the class that comes right in here between the unbeliever and the baptized believer. That is the unbaptized believer. I want to know what becomes of the unbaptized believer. You need not say from your text that he is lost, for the text

says it is the unbeliever that is damned. You need not say from your text that he is saved, because it is the baptized believer that is saved. I want to know what becomes of this unbaptized believer. Now don't forget, Brother Srygley, to tell us what becomes of that unbaptized believer. You cannot prove by that text where he goes to, because the text does not say anything about him. The text has the unbeliever and the baptized believer both mentioned, but the unbaptized believer is not mentioned in the text. What becomes of him?

Luke's rendering of the commission that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name [*i. e., in Christ's name*] among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Now, notice that repentance and remission of sins are joined together; repentance and remission of sins, joined together, should be preached in his name. See that? In the very same way that remission of sins is to be preached in his name, just that way is repentance to be preached in his name.

Now, who remits sins? Does Jesus remit sins? If Jesus remits sins, then he bestows the remission of sins; and if he bestows the remission of sins, and remission of sins is to be preached in his name the same way repentance is, then Jesus bestows repentance, and that is the way it is to be preached in his name—not in the name of the sinner, but in the name of Jesus.

Then he goes to the Acts of Apostles to find the carrying out of this—the second chapter of the Acts for the carrying out of the commission. He quoted first to fourth verses. "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." The fifth verse says: "And there were dwelling at Jeru-

salem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven." There were some worshiping characters there; there were some praying characters there, characters who were devout; and then there was another class (others mocking—mockers) present, also, as well as devout or religious characters. These characters, who were the devout or religious characters, when they heard what the apostle said, in the winding up, in the thirty-sixth verse: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ"—"Now when they heard this, they were pricked [or cut] in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you." Brother Srygley, was the promise unto them *before* they were baptized? Please do not forget to answer that. The apostle, before they were baptized, after saying, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," immediately continued, saying, "for the promise IS unto you"—the promise is to them already—"and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

Then the fortieth verse says: "And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves." Do what? Save yourselves. Is this eternal salvation? Brother Srygley has admitted that God saves, that it is the blood of Jesus that cleanses; but here the apostle tells these characters to "save yourselves." Save yourselves from what? From eternal damnation? Save yourselves from

everlasting destruction from the presence of God? No, sir. Save yourselves from this crooked generation. Save yourselves from this perverse nation by which you are surrounded. How are you going to do that? By doing what he said do. Save yourselves, not from an eternal burning, not from eternal perdition, but save yourselves from that crooked nation, that perverse generation, by coming out from among them and being a separate people from them. Save yourselves thus. But I do not suppose we are through with that. Brother Srygley may have further argument to make upon it.

“Commission based upon four universal facts. All power is in Christ, and he delegates that power to the disciples.” Now, I think Brother Srygley is mistaken about that, or else made a slip of the tongue, that he delegated that power to the disciples; but as the power and the authority is his, he sends them forth—“Go ye therefore”—because the power and authority is in him. That is the reason assigned. Go ye, therefore, because he has power and authority to send you.

He quotes 1 Pet. 4: “What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel?” He says Peter does not answer the question, but that Paul answers it in Thessalonians, “They shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord,” and so on. All right. I will ask Brother Srygley this question: In the face of that text, tell us upon what principle of justice God sends the heathen to hell because they do not exercise faith, repent of their sins, and be baptized in water for the remission of sins, when they do not know anything about these conditions in order to salvation. I want you to please answer that. *Upon what principle of justice does God send the heathen to hell for not*

obeying the gospel, when they never had an opportunity of obeying it, when they never had a single opportunity of hearing the gospel, and know nothing whatever about the gospel? I ask you: Does God send them to hell for not obeying the gospel? Now please do not fail to answer that.

The blessings of this life, he says, are enjoyed on conditions. Yes, many of the blessings of this life are enjoyed on conditions; that is a fact; but the blessings of this life are not enjoyed by the dead on conditions. The blessings that pertain to this life were all placed here first by the great Creator. Everything that was necessary for man's comfort and well-being were placed here first, and then the man was brought into being in the natural realm. Even so in grace, all spiritual blessings are in the spiritual realm first; then the character is brought into that spiritual realm, where he may enjoy those blessings by living an obedient and energetic and industrious life, in rendering spiritual service after he is brought into the spiritual realm—just as a man enjoys the natural blessings by living an industrious and energetic life after he is brought into the natural realm. It is just that way in the case of the spiritual realm.

Rom. 5: 2: "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Now notice, here is a man, we will say, according to Brother Srygley's position and proposition (and if I am wrong, he will correct me)—here is a man who first starts out having faith; the next step is repentance, and the next is baptism, and then pardon or salvation. All right. Here he is now with faith, but he is yet without pardon and without salvation, and is an unsaved man. Then we have this dilemma for him:

1. "By whom also we have access by faith into this

grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom. 5: 2.)

2. Unsaved men have faith.—Srygley.

3. Therefore, unsaved men have access by faith into this grace wherein they stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

Hand this to the gentleman, please. I give it to him written out, because I do not want him to fail to answer that. See how he will get out of that dilemma, for his position on that text certainly puts him in a dilemma.

Next, I want to ask a question. Did you, or did you not, say that one can do spiritual works outside of the church?

The next question: Must one be a member of the same church you are, in order to be in a saved state?

The next question: Can one do spiritual works outside of the church?

Here they are written down.

MR. SRYGLEY.—I have the answer written, too.

MR. CAYCE.—If you had asked me those questions, I would answer. Let him ask me if a man must be a member of the church that I am, in order to be saved. See how quickly I will answer it. Why won't the gentleman do it? If he does not answer it, I am going to take it for granted that he believes that no one can be saved unless he is a member of the church he is a member of. Now we will see whether he answers that or not. I don't want him to forget that.

Now I have another question that I want to ask him. On November 9, 1911, Mrs. Fannie Corbett, a member of Carroll Street Methodist Church, Nashville, wife of Uncle Eph Corbett, died in this city. You know of the Carroll Street Methodist Church here, and I suppose many of you were acquainted with Aunt Fannie Corbett, as she was familiarly

called. She was never immersed, never baptized, yet on her dying bed she called her family around her—her husband and her children and grandchildren—and told them farewell, and asked her husband why he would weep and grieve for her. She said: "I am not afraid to die. I feel that I am going home, and it will not be long until we shall meet in a better world than this." I believe from the evidence that has been given to me of this woman that her spirit this evening is basking in the sunlight of God's presence in the paradise of God. I ask you, Elder Srygley, was Mrs. Corbett saved, or was she lost? I insist that you answer this.

I proceed now with my negative arguments. I wish to call your attention again to what is on this blackboard. I use that now as a negative argument against the proposition. The proposition cannot be true, because those in the flesh, alien sinners, cannot please God. Rom. 8: 8, 9: "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." To be on that side of the line is to be in the flesh, is to be without Christ. In order that he please God, he must be on this side of the line. I ask the gentleman to tell us: Does the character on that side of the line have faith, and does he repent on that side of the line? Is he baptized while he is on that side of the line? I want him to tell us: When does the character have faith, and when does he repent, and when is he baptized? Is it when he is on this side of the line over here, or on that side of the line over there? I challenge the gentleman to tell us when it is that the character has faith; when does he repent, and when is he baptized—which side of the line is he on when he does these things?

My next argument is: The proposition cannot be true, for sinners are made righteous by the obedience of one (Christ), while the proposition has in it the idea that sinners are made righteous by their own obedience—the sinner must have faith, repent, and be baptized; in doing this the sinner is made righteous. But the sinner is made righteous by the obedience of one—not by the obedience of the sinner. Rom. 5: 19: “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” By the disobedience of one man (Adam), many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one (Christ), many are made righteous. Then it is by the obedience of Christ that the sinner is made righteous—not by the obedience of the sinner.

Isa. 53: 10, 11: “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.” Who shall do that? “By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.” Those characters, then, whose iniquities Jesus bore are justified by his knowledge; not by what the sinner does, but by what Jesus does. Hence, salvation does not depend upon the works of the sinner, but depends alone on the finished work and the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ. [*Time expired.*]

MR. SRYGLEY'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you, my friends, to continue this investigation, and, first of all, I wish to reply to some things that my opponent said. He claims that I did not give the definitions of "faith" and "repentance." Well, I thought I did, but I might have overlooked this duty. Faith is the *belief* of testimony, the testimony God gives in his word. Repentance is a *change of purpose* or will, produced by godly sorrow, which leads to a reformation of life. Now, my friends, I have given a definition of all the terms of any prominence in my proposition. With all the definitions that I give my worthy opponent agrees; at least, in so far as his speech is concerned, he offers nothing against these definitions. I am very glad of this, because this aids us very much in arriving at a correct conclusion in reference to the matter of man's redemption. He says that the conditions must be met in order to salvation. That is true; but let me state in this connection that *breathing* is a condition of living, but in no sense the *cause* of life. I insist, my friends, that we should make a distinction between conditions and causes, and this distinction my opponent *has never* made. He makes no distinction between the cause of salvation and conditions of salvation. In fact, almost all the passages which he reads upon the subject of man's redemption, which he is willing shall be applied to this question, are with reference to the *cause* rather than the conditions of salvation, and therefore I made

this distinction very prominent in the beginning; and I say that in the illustration I have just given you, you can all see very easily the difference between conditions and causes. Breathing, I insist, is a condition of living, but not the cause of life. Conditions may be as necessary as causes, but we should always make the distinction between conditions and causes.

He says God gives eternal life, and the very fact that God gives it is proof that it is unconditional. Well, my friends, that is not always true. There are many gifts that are given on conditions. In fact, it is necessary for responsible people to be willing to receive the gift before it really becomes one. The railroad officials to whom I called your attention the other night offered my friend a pass, offered to give it to him; but he returned it to the company and demanded a receipt for it. Was that a gift? It was a *proffered* gift, but not a gift, because of the fact that the man himself would not accept it. But when God gives eternal life to responsible people, it is dependent on man's compliance with certain conditions; otherwise, there is no gift at all. If I am not mistaken, Mr. Vanderbilt gave perhaps several millions of dollars to a university with the understanding that it should be located south of the Ohio River. Now, when that university was located south of the Ohio River, was it not a gift, and was there anything in the condition that in any way affected it as a gift? Was it not cherished and loved as much by the Southern people, though it came to them under that condition, as if no such condition had been imposed? I insist from these premises that a gift does not necessarily mean that it is given without conditions, and I believe that this is the very point on which my friend makes his fatal mistake. He

has never been able to see that a gift from God may be given upon conditions, and has never made that distinction between causes and conditions that he should. Furthermore, he will never understand the plan of redemption until he does make this distinction.

Again, he says that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to them that believe it. Of course that is true, but I fail to see how such a passage can help his cause. Doubtless he sought to make some point by this reference; but if so, like many of his points, it is very obscure.

Paul says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation;" and then in the next verse he says: "Therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." My friend tries to make something out of that for his cause. The meaning of this is that there was a faith in the old dispensation, the object of which was not so clear as is ours, and the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, which was in type and shadow, was revealed from the faith of the early day unto the more glorious faith of the day in which we live, and that therein—that is, in the gospel—is the righteousness of God revealed. I understand by the "righteousness of God" here that the apostle means that God's plan of redemption is revealed to man in the gospel, and therefore all the passages in Romans which declare that man is not saved by the deeds of the law do not conflict with this statement that the gospel of Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation. The gospel, therefore, is the righteousness of God revealed to man, who, by the study of the gospel and by understanding and obeying the gospel, can receive God's righteousness through Christ.

I believe that the gentleman's idea of the whole plan of redemption and of man has lowered the human race below the standard God first made for him. It puts him on a level with the brute, without volition or responsibility. This puts him as low down as anything could be. He forgets that man is a reasonable being, and has power to reason on the righteousness of God, and that he can read and obey the gospel and enjoy the promises of the same.

He says: "Do you teach them to observe all things that Christ commanded?" Yes, sir; I always preach the *whole gospel*, like the apostles taught what the Savior said. Do you not do that? If not, why not?

He says there are two classes in the commission: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Well, of course, if a man is looking for damnation, he can find it in one step—viz., by not believing. If the gentleman is looking for salvation, I can tell him he can get it; but according to this commission it is offered not on one, but on two conditions; and wherever a promise is made with any number of conditions, these conditions are always implied where the promise is found. There may be more, but never less, and I insist, according to the commission as given by Mark, that there are two conditions upon which salvation is offered. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." But my friend desires me to tell what will become of the man that believes, but is not baptized. They have *no promise* of salvation, according to this commission. The *promise* is made to the baptized believer, according to the Son of God. I wish the gentleman to understand that *I am not responsible* for this commission.

I *did not give it*, and, moreover, I am not responsible for the *effects* of it. I am not responsible for what it does. I am *solemnly obligated* to preach and teach it to the people, insisting that they obey it. That is all. But again he says: "I want to know what will become of the unbaptized believer." I have answered that, but will the gentleman tell us why any believer is *unbaptized*? He now turns to the second chapter of Acts, in connection with the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke, where it is said that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, and says that repentance was preached exactly like remission. Of course it was preached in his name. Do you want to know how repentance and remissions of sins were preached in the name or authority of Christ? I will tell you. Christ says, "Beginning at Jerusalem;" and it seems to me the best way to learn how these apostles preached repentance and remission of sins is to turn to the place where they did it, and see how they preached it; hence I turn to the second chapter of Acts, where Peter says: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Now, he asked me about preaching repentance and baptism in the name of Christ for the remission of sins, and I have shown him that Peter did not preach repentance *without baptism*. He says: "Repent, and be baptized . . . for the remission of sins." I insist that this gives us exactly how the apostles understood that repentance and re-

mission of sins should be preached in Christ's name, for that is the way they did it; and "they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." I insist that those who were added unto them were those who *obeyed* the word, and that it was necessary for them to *hear* and *obey* the word of Peter to be added. I also insist that no man can receive my preaching without repenting and being baptized for the remission of sins. I believe I could receive all my brother here preaches and never do that, for he never preaches it, but Peter said: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."

Again, he says that they were devout men out of every nation under heaven on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem, and therefore they were saved. They were Jews, devout Jews, but not in a saved state. You know Judaism could not save a man *then*, although they were devout. Yes, there were Jews, devout Jews, out of every nation under heaven, present on the day of Pentecost. It is said by my opponent that there were some there that mocked and some that did not; that those who did not mock were already saved. Well, my friends, if they were saved, they were saved *without* the remission of sins. In fact, the remission of sins and salvation is the same thing, and Peter said: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Is that what you tell church members to do in order to be saved—repent and be baptized for the remission of sins? I do not. I believe these are conditions to the alien sinner, and I believe these aliens were told to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.

“The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off.” I insist that this promise included salvation for them from past sins. The promise was made *on conditions*. I know that when the Lord delivered the promise first, that “in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed,” he did not state the conditions; but when the conditions are stated, they must be complied with. This promise was made to the Jew and to all nations; and the gospel, which was in promise only to Abraham, was now being expounded to all on conditions. Why do I say this? Because when Peter gave them an opportunity to enjoy the blessings and privileges of that promise, he said: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.”

Brother Cayce says that all there was in repenting and being baptized was to save them from the untoward generation! He says: “You do not think a man could save himself from hell and damnation, do you?” I know he can *obey* the conditions of pardon, and God will save him. I know he can do the commandments, and God will save him, just as I know a sinner can damn himself by refusing to obey the Lord. I believe a man can save himself by complying with the conditions of salvation, but I do not believe he can save himself in the sense that he can provide the cause of salvation.

My opponent says that to save themselves from this untoward generation means to save themselves from the crooked and perverse generation surrounding them. How could repenting and being baptized save them from the people? It means no such thing, but it does mean to save themselves from the *fate* of this untoward generation. The fate was that they would be punished with everlasting destruction from

the presence of the Lord; and therefore, if they saved themselves from the fate of the untoward generation, they saved themselves from the punishment to which they were tending. I say *this* is what was meant by saving themselves from this untoward generation.

But again, he insists that I said all power was given to the apostles, and that Christ delegated to the apostles all power. Let that be as it may, I meant to say, whether I did or not, that Jesus Christ had all authority in heaven and in earth, and that back of that commission was all authority, and that in view of that authority he commanded these apostles to preach the gospel, saying: "Go ye therefore." Therefore this commission is backed up and sustained by all the authority in heaven and in earth. And that being true, I insist that there is power enough in the gospel which it embraces to save man. Therefore, I am not surprised that Paul should have said: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1: 16.)

But again, my friend says that the sinner is dead, and as the blessings of this kingdom, this natural kingdom, cannot be enjoyed by the dead, neither can the dead sinner enjoy the blessings of God's kingdom. I have said all the time that a man, in order to enjoy the blessings of this natural kingdom, must have natural life. I have also said that in order to enjoy the blessings and privileges of the eternal kingdom he must have the eternal life. I called his attention to the matter in a former speech, but the brother seems to have gone back to the old proposition. He started off to-night like he was going over the same old ground. That is all right. If I had done as poorly as he did last night and the night be-

fore, I would be trying to bolster it up, too; I would be quoting it over again to see if I could not get a little better twang to it to see if I could not fix it better. I felt perfectly satisfied with what I did last night and the night before. I answered his positions last night and the night before, and am perfectly willing to do it again.

He said he wanted to ask me some questions, and wrote them out. The first was: "Must one be a member of the same church you are, in order to be saved?" The object of this question is to prejudice my contention before the people. There can be no other object but that. However that may be, I say I am a member of the *body of Christ*, and if he can tell me how a man can have life without *union* with the body, I would like to have him do it. If that is not answered, I will put it to him again. I am perfectly willing to answer any legitimate question he may ask me.

The object of my opponent in asking what will become of the heathen is to draw me away from the divine record, and thus have me express an *opinion*, and I here remind the gentleman that preachers and all others are under a sacred obligation to preach the *word* (2 Tim. 1: 2), and this I propose to do.

Peter says: "What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" (1 Pet. 4: 17.) Paul answers it by saying: "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thess. 1: 7-9.) If my friend knows more than the Bible reveals on this subject, let him tell it; and if he wants to go *outside*

of the divine record, he can go, but I will not follow him.

He wants to know if I did or did not say that an alien sinner could perform spiritual works. If I used the word "spiritual" in connection with the works that a sinner can do, I did it through a mistake, and now ask that it be expunged from the record, and the word "good" substituted. We were discussing good works, and I may have unintentionally used the wrong word. For the enlightenment of my opponent, I will inform him that no sinner can do spiritual works. The difference between the good works of the saint and the sinner is not in kind, but in the reward bestowed. Feeding the hungry is classed among good works by the saints. (Matt. 25: 35.) Now let the gentleman tell us the difference between the two; if he has a passage that talks about the sinner's doing spiritual works, let us have it.

He also asked about Aunt Fannie Corbett, and he seems to be most fortunate in finding such cases. Everywhere I have debated with him he refers to some one that has been saved, as it seems to him, *without* obedience to God. I want to ask him this question: How do you know that Aunt Fannie was one of the elect? If she was not, where has she gone? How do you know she was elect of God? If she was not, she could not, according to your doctrine, be saved. Let us keep Aunt Fannie out of this and discuss the propositions.

Then he goes back to his chart, and says that on this side [pointing to the chart] they cannot please God, but on that side they can, and he asked me the other night how they could get from one side to the other. I read the passage, and never heard from it any more until to-night, when it is brought up again. I will read it to you again. I do not mind

doing it. It is a pleasure to me to do it. The apostle Paul, in speaking of salvation, says: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6: 17.) Now, is he answered? I say, Did the apostle answer him? And if he did, I know he answered him right. I do not have to guess at it. I know it was right.

My opponent says that sinners are made righteous by the obedience of one, and not by the obedience of the sinners themselves. Let me say that by the obedience of one many are made righteous. (Rom. 5: 19.) But here the gentleman introduces a passage that relates to the cause of salvation, and not to the conditions. I have told you that he makes no distinction between the cause of salvation and the conditions. If he were speaking of the sun, he would refer to it as the cause of light, when it is only the means of light. God is the cause of all light, and back of all conditions, my friends. God, Christ, the love of Jesus, and the death of Christ are the cause of man's redemption. The gentleman does not know the difference. He turns back to trace the cause of salvation, and thinks there are no conditions on the part of man whatever. That does not prove it.

Again, he quotes: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities." (Isa. 55: 11.) Jesus Christ shall bear their iniquities. Well, I believe that, but in that passage, just like the other, the prophet is talking of God's side of salvation, the divine side; but Cayce has never made any distinction between the divine and the human side. He does not seem to know, to realize the difference between the human

and the divine in the matter of man's redemption, and in looking back to the salvation of man he goes back to the cause, to God's side, and there he finds the cause of salvation, the death of Jesus Christ, and then *assumes* that Jesus Christ gives that salvation without conditions, when, as a matter of fact, he gives that salvation *on* conditions.

Brother Cayce says that sinners are dead, and therefore cannot hear, reason, or obey. I suggested at the beginning that the gentleman has never understood, and, moreover, he does not know that a metaphor must be like the fact in some particulars and unlike it in others. He says the sinner is dead. He cannot do anything. What does Paul mean when he says: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light?" (Eph. 5: 14.) If the sinner can do nothing, why does the apostle say, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light?" I insist that the sinner is dead only in the sense of being separated from God, from truth and righteousness, and that he is not dead in the sense and to the extent that he cannot hear, reason, think, and act. Do you not know, my friends, that in this world we can and do think, reason, and act? The only reason my friend does not know this is because he has made a mistake. He does not understand this question. He does not understand how we died in Adam. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." (1 Cor. 15: 22.) I say when we understand this question we have no difficulty—none whatever.

I want to look a little more closely at the commission under which the apostles were preaching. The Savior said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." I am not surprised

that Paul said: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." I say that according to this commission there are two conditions upon which the Savior authorized the apostles to promise salvation to man, which are *believe* him and *be baptized*.

But I read again: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke 24: 46, 47.) I say that here the writer adds one more condition, and that is *repentance*; and he not only adds this one more condition, but he also tells what the salvation of Mark consists in—viz., "the remission of sins." I say that according to this commission God saves man, but not without conditions. If he saves them before they believe, before they repent, before they do anything, he saves them unconditionally, but the divine record does not so read. I told you last night that God gave those that are saved to Christ in the long, long ago; but who were included in this gift to Christ on the condition that he would die for them? I say all who will *obey* Christ are included in this gift. But if Cayce is right, I want to ask him why the Lord did not give some of the rest of them to Christ. Why did the Lord skip over the rest of us? I tell you that is a great mistake. "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.) According to Cayce's theory, God did not love all the world, but

only a part, and gave the rest to the devil. Hence, they had no chance to be saved. Thus he places a character upon God that would be condemned in his fellow-man. I believe this would be condemned in any man. I believe the man who originated this doctrine had a hard heart. The man who originated this did not have the goodness of heart that he should have had. He believed that the man who differed from him should be sent to the eternal burnings without a chance, have no opportunity. That is a mistake, and you never made a greater mistake in your life.

I am proud of the opportunity and glad of the chance to preach the gospel to my neighbors, and tell them of the love of Jesus, that God will save them upon easy conditions with which all can comply. As I have told you often in the speeches gone before, I know that man is a sinner, and I grant that many have wandered far on the cold, bleak mountains of sin; but Jesus Christ is calling them home, and every invitation of the gospel is but an invitation of my Savior for fallen man to come back. Man belongs to God by virtue of his creation, and he is calling him to come, and he *can come*. Like the mother whose child has a dangerous knife in his hands, she wants to take it from him without destroying what little manhood there is in the little heart, and she holds up the beautiful apple, and bids him drop the knife and take it, and he drops the knife and takes the apple, but receives it on conditions, as we do when we come to Christ.

As I have told you before, I never saw the time I did not love the upright man, I have never heard of Jesus and his righteousness that I did not love it, and you do mankind an injustice when you say that there is no good in him. [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE'S SECOND REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you again in the negative of the proposition: "Faith, repentance, and (water) baptism are conditions of pardon (or salvation) to an alien sinner, and the Scriptures so teach."

I thank the gentleman for his definition of the word *faith*, and so far as this discussion is concerned it is unnecessary that I object to any of his definitions, as it is necessary for me to meet the proposition on his own terms.

Faith he defines as being belief of testimony. Then believing is a condition of pardon. Now I want the gentleman to please tell us what it is that the alien sinner must believe in order that he be pardoned, or in order that he have salvation. I would like for him to please tell us if the sinner must believe that Jesus is his Savior, or must the sinner just believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God? Please note that, Brother Srygley. I want to know just what it is that the sinner must believe.

Now if faith, repentance, and water baptism are necessary conditions that must be performed by the sinner in order to his salvation, and any of us are in an unsaved state, we want to know just what it is that we must believe in order that we reach salvation. So it is necessary for him to tell us just what we must believe.

I want to call attention just here to his answer to my question: "Must one be a member of the same church you are, in order to be in a saved state?" He

says, "I am a member of the body of Christ," and I didn't get all of the answer, the remainder of it, why it is—

MR. SRYGLEY.—Here it is written down.

MR. CAYCE.—Thank you. "I am a member of the body of Christ; and if you can tell me how a man can have life without union with the body, I would like to hear you do it." All right. Now please tell me, do you become a member of the body of Christ by joining the church that you belong to? Is that the way a man becomes a member of the body of Christ? I insist that if it be true that his church, or the church that he belongs to, or is a member of, is the body of Christ, and the body of Christ is that only, and they exclusively compose the body of Christ, we want to know it. We want to know what is necessary for us to do in order that we be saved, if we are in an unsaved state, and we insist that he answer.

But he says a railroad pass is a gift, you know; but the man sent the pass back, he rejected it, and demanded a receipt for it. All right. Would the railroad officials send out the pass if they knew it would be rejected? If God offered eternal salvation, did he know, before he made the offer, whether or not the sinner would reject it? Now God either knew or else he did not know. I insist that you tell us, did God know whether or not the sinner would reject it?

And just while I have these questions here I will ask: Is all of God's power to save in the gospel? I ask this question in connection with Rom. 1: 16, which he quotes or refers to again, and says that the gospel is God's power, or the power of God to save. God's power to save, I gather from his argument, he holds is exclusively in the gospel, and hence I

ask the question: Is all of God's power to save in the gospel?

He says, yes, he teaches them to observe all things whatsoever is commanded. Well, one thing I find recorded in St. John, the Savior said to somebody: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet." Do you teach them to wash one another's feet? Do you?

Yes, he says, there are two characters in Mark 16: 15, 16; but he says damnation is on one condition and salvation on two conditions in that text. Then he finds another condition somewhere else. It seems to me that he is laboring to make damnation very easy and salvation "mighty" hard to get. What do you think about that? According to his rendering and his exposition of the text, damnation is just the easiest thing in the world. But unless you perform the one condition, you are not in a damned state; you must perform only one condition. What about the heathen that never heard the gospel, and never had a chance to reject it? Is he an unbeliever? Say, did he ever refuse to believe the gospel, and is he an unbeliever in the gospel, when he never heard tell of such a thing as the gospel? Is he? Does he perform the condition of damnation? Please do not fail to tell us about that. We want to know something about how that is.

Damnation is easy! Salvation is on conditions. Damnation is hinged on one condition and salvation on three—faith, repentance, and baptism—two in the commission, belief and baptism, and then somewhere else he finds repentance, which he puts in between. The text says, "He that believeth and is baptized," and he prizes in another one from somewhere else—repentance—he puts in between. All right. The

alien must perform three conditions in order to be saved, and only one in order to be lost. Rom. 6, last verse: "The wages of sin is death." Wages is what you get for what you do, isn't it? Sin is what? The transgression of the law. That is what you do, isn't it? Then what are you damned for? Transgressing the law. On the other hand, is salvation what you get for what you do? No, sir. "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." On the one side is damnation by works; on the other side, salvation by grace. Brother Srygley does not seem to agree with the apostle very well on either damnation or salvation, for the way the apostle has it is not the way he has it. The way he has it is that there is only one condition to damnation, and that is unbelief. We, then, would have to refuse to do something—refuse to believe the testimony—in order to damnation. All right. By refusing to believe the testimony, or by refusing to do something, then, you are damned. What have you? *Damnation by grace and salvation by works!* That is what you have it. But the apostle teaches that damnation is by works, and salvation by grace. Just the opposite of what the gentleman teaches, exactly. He reverses the order—just turns everything around. But he says the unbaptized believer has no promise. Jesus says: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." But just here I want to ask Brother Srygley: *Do you believe the language recorded in Mark 16: 15, 16? Do you believe it?* Notice how he answers it now. DO YOU BELIEVE IT? Notice. "He that believeth and is baptized SHALL BE SAVED." Brother Srygley, *do you believe ANY of them MAY GO TO HELL?* I insist that the gentleman believes that some of them may apostatize and go to the bad place after all! Hence

he does not believe the text, but I do. "He that believeth and is baptized [that is *the one* class] shall be saved. He that believeth not [that is the other class] shall be damned." Now we agree that this one is damned all right. And I believe all the text: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Brother Srygley believes some of these may apostatize and go to the bad place, and I believe they shall be saved.

But what about this third class, the unbaptized believer? Brother Srygley says there is no promise for him. What do I say about that, and what does God's word say? "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." Or: "He that hears my word, and believes him who sent me, has life eternal, and into judgment comes not; but has passed out of death into life." We have numerous passages giving the same kind of promise. 1 John 5: 1: "Who-soever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." It does not say "every one that believes and is baptized;" but all who believe, or "every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ has been begotten," or has been born, "of God." We have plenty more that we will give you before this discussion is over—plenty of them.

Acts 2: 38. This time he quotes verse 41: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." All right. Notice now. "Then *they that gladly received his word*."—gladly received the preaching of the apostle—these were baptized. Who were? They that gladly received the preaching of the apostle. They first gladly received the preaching of the apostle before they were

baptized. All right. 1 John 4: 6: "We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us." "He that is not of God heareth not us." There is the alien, the unregenerate sinner over there. Here is a character over here that knows God. John said in his preaching: "We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us." "They that gladly received his word were baptized." Who were they that gladly received his word? Those that knew the Lord. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." They must *have eternal life in order that they know God*, if the Savior told the truth. "We are of God: he that *knoweth God heareth us*; he that is not of God heareth not us." They heard his preaching, gladly received his preaching, and therefore had eternal life; one must have it in order to know God, and hence they already had eternal life—for they gladly heard his word. Again, John 8: 47: "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not." Brother Srygley, can you give a better reason why they did not hear God's words than the Savior gives? The reason he gives is, "because ye are not of God." Then, if they do not hear because they are not of God, they must first be of God, like these characters over here. These characters gladly heard the word; hence they were of God. It was too late for baptism to make children of God out of them, but it was not too late for them to be saved from that crooked generation, that perverse nation, by doing the things God commanded and exhorted, but it was too late to give them eternal life—too late for that.

He says a man can obey and God will save him. Let me ask: Cannot God save him unless he does obey? Now please tell us about that.

He says he did not mean to say that Christ delegated all power to the disciples. All right. I thought surely if he did say that, he certainly did not mean to.

MR. SRYGLEY.—I don't think I said it.

MR. CAYCE.—I do not *know* that you did, either. That is the way I understood it. I wanted to understand you.

Then he says, with reference to the heathen, that I am seeking to draw him away from the proposition, or from the word of God. No, I am not seeking to draw him away from anything. I am only trying to get him to tell us something about the heathen. I want him to tell us upon what principle of justice it is that God damns the heathen for not believing the gospel and not obeying the gospel, when they have never heard it; when they have never heard you or your people preach the gospel. They have never heard you or your people preach, and the reason they have never heard you or your people preach may be given by yourself. Will you tell us why? And do you and your people always go to the very extent of your ability in preaching the gospel and telling the people about baptism in order to the remission of their sins or salvation? Do you do that? Do you go to the very extent of your ability? Do all of you preach every sermon that you could possibly preach? Do you all contribute the use of your means in that direction all you could possibly spare to send the gospel to those that are without it? Don't fail to answer these things, for they are pertinent to the proposition and question that is under discussion.

Then he refers to Aunt Fannie Corbett, and he says that I seem to be fortunate. Well, sir, I will grant you that somehow it does seem that I am fortunate—that God in his providence is good and kind

to have it so arranged, somehow, that I hear about these things, and they are just given right into my hands to use on him; and I want him to tell us: Is Aunt Fannie Corbett saved or lost? You ask me: How do I know she was an elect? By the rule the Savior gives: "By their fruits ye shall know them." That is exactly how I know. "By their fruits ye shall know them." I know the tree by its fruit. That is how I know it. The life that she lived was a Christian life. She proved that she was a Christian by her daily walk. She was an upright woman. She loved God and loved the people of God. John says: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren"—the people of God; and she manifested the fact that she did this. Hence I say I know Aunt Fannie Corbett's soul or spirit is this evening in the paradise of God. *Will you dare say she was lost or saved?* I insist that the gentleman answer. Will he do it? That will ring in his ears from now until Saturday night, unless he answers it.

He notices Rom. 6: 17, in reply to the chart. Notice the chart. "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." On that side of the line, in the flesh, he cannot please God. Did he answer my question? Does the alien sinner believe, repent, and be baptized while he is on that side of the line? Tell me: Does he believe while he is on that side of the line? Which side of the line is he on when he believes? As he fails to answer these, I will ask him this question, then: Is it pleasing to God for one to believe in Jesus Christ? See if he will answer that. If I cannot get him to answer one way, I will try another. I want an answer to these things.

Rom. 6: 17, the original reads: "But thanks be to God, that ye were bondmen of sin, but ye obeyed from the heart a form of teaching to which ye were delivered. And having been set free from sin [not in order to be set free from sin, but "having been set free from sin"]." I am giving it as it is in the original. Brother Srygley, when a man believes, is he a servant of sin? Will he answer that? "Having been set free from sin, ye became bondmen to righteousness." Is he a servant of sin when he believes, or is he serving righteousness when he believes? Do you want this?

MR. SRYGLEY.—No, I have the Greek here. You use it. I am determined that folks shall know that that is not a Greek Testament.

MR. CAYCE.—It is an Interlinear.

Rom. 5: 19. He says the apostle was talking about the cause, and not the means. For this cause, one man's disobedience, many were made sinners; "so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." How is it that they are made righteous by the obedience of one? If it is by that, will he please tell us if it is by something else?

Isa. 53: 10, 11: "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." He says that is talking about God's side. What is God's side? God's side is to bestow the salvation. What is the human side? We are the unworthy recipients of God's favor. That is the human and the divine side.

He says Cayce says the sinner is dead, can't hear.

All right. I am in good company. John 8: 43—Jesus said: “Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye CANNOT HEAR my word.” I am in good company, am I not? The Son of God says: “Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word.” But he says Cayce said that. All right. Cayce said the truth, or the Son of God falsified, because this is what the Son of God said.

Then he quotes Ephesians: “Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead.” A literal translation would be: “Awake thou that sleepest, and rise up from among the dead.” He is not talking to dead, alien sinners out yonder; he is talking to the church of God at Ephesus. What does his proposition say? Faith, repentance, and water baptism are conditions of pardon or salvation to the alien sinner. Members of the church of God at Ephesus were not alien sinners, were they? He said to them: “Awake thou that sleepest, and rise up from among the dead, and Christ shall give thee light”—l-i-g-h-t, light; not l-i-f-e, life. Quite a difference, isn't there? Christ shall give you *light*. It does not say Christ shall give you *life*. That is what he wants to find—a text that says Christ shall give you life on these conditions. Do you know the reason why he has not produced a text like that? Because it is not there. That is the only reason. If it had been there, he would have had it already produced, indeed he would.

He talks about God's loving, or giving everybody a chance. Two more little questions, Brother Srygley. Did God love Esau? Say, Brother Srygley, do the heathen who die without hearing the gospel have a chance of salvation? But he thinks Cayce's position is horrible, because it don't give everybody a chance.

According to statistics and figures, only about three-tenths of the human family have the gospel. Seven-tenths of them are without it; and nobody has a chance of salvation unless they hear, believe, and are baptized in obedience to the gospel this man preaches. Hence at least seven-tenths of the human family are without the shadow of a chance of salvation! Do the heathen who die without hearing the gospel have a chance of salvation? Do not forget to answer that, Brother Srygley. If you fail, I will give it to you again. I want him to be sure to answer those questions.

I now proceed with my negative arguments.

My third argument is—but he seems to get tired of this chart. I want to say that I shall have something else on that chart for to-morrow night.

My third argument is that the proposition cannot be true, because it is the work of God to put the sinner in Christ, while the proposition would make it the work of men. Let us see whether it makes it the work of men or not. The sinner must hear; then the sinner must believe; then the sinner must repent; and then the sinner must be baptized, so he gets the preacher to do that for him; and that puts him over here in Christ; and as this puts the sinner in Christ, then, according to the proposition, the preacher puts the sinner in Christ. I know every man here with one eye can see that. Whose work is it to put the sinner in Christ? He is out here, out of Christ. 1 Cor. 1: 26-31: "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things

which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him [the antecedent of the pronoun *him* is "God"] are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that, according as it is written, he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." Hence, it is the work of God to put the sinner in Christ, not the work of the sinner and the preacher. [*Time expired.*]

MR. SRYGLEY'S THIRD ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

We are before you to continue the investigation of the question that faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions upon which we are pardoned.

I desire first of all to notice some things that were said last night. Brother Cayce cries long and loud against all conditions upon the part of man in the salvation of his soul. He claims that compliance with conditions upon the part of man refutes the doctrine of salvation by grace, and bases his conclusion upon the statement: "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." (Rom. 3: 20.)

The trouble with my friend is, he fails to comprehend the difference between two laws, one by which no one can be justified, and one by which sinners are justified. One of these is the moral law, which demanded an absolutely perfect life from the moment of one's accountability to God to the hour of his death. If man could have kept this law inviolate, salvation would have been a matter of debt, as Paul argues in Rom. 4: 4, 5, Christ need not have died, and the grace of God could have played no part in the salvation of the world.

The other law by which we are justified is declared to be the law of faith: "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith." (Rom. 3: 27.) It is also termed "the law of the Spirit of life" (Rom. 8: 2), because it was given by the Spirit. Paul says that those who

believe in Christ have this faith "counted for righteousness." (Rom. 4: 5.) Now it is a fact that Jesus himself declares that faith is a work. (John 6: 27, 28.) It is also a fact that Paul says: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Titus 3: 5.)

Now, instead of the laver of regeneration, or baptism, being a work of human righteousness, it is put over against it, and we are declared not to be saved by the one, but by the other.

Christ was the only being that ever lived on this earth that kept the law perfectly, and he took us from under a law that knew no mercy and put us under a law of grace and mercy. "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." (John 1: 17.) An illustration will show us how a gift may be made on conditions, and yet be a gift. Mr. Vanderbilt gave nearly a million dollars to the Methodist Church for the founding of a university, and the gift was given on the condition that it be located south of the Ohio River, and that Bishop McTyeire be put on a salary of \$3,000 a year. When the Methodist Church complied with these conditions, did it nullify the grace of Vanderbilt? The grace of Vanderbilt is memorialized by bestowing his name upon the institution and in the erection of his monument in this city. If Brother Cayce's neighbor should offer him a horse on the condition that he bridle him and lead him home, would that nullify his grace? If not, why should a sinner's believing, repenting, and being baptized nullify the grace of God?

But he wants to know what became of the unbaptized believer. Jesus Christ put the promise of salvation after baptism. He did it in this commission,

that was backed by all authority, and that was sealed by his blood. When he said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16: 15, 16), Jesus Christ put the promise of salvation after baptism, and inasmuch as Christ is the Savior, I am compelled to refer my friend to Christ for an answer. Christ said, "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,*" and my friend cannot understand this plain language. He would do well to get some one to help him analyze the sentence. I am sure even his own brethren can understand it.

As to what becomes of the unbaptized believers, and the unbelievers, too, as to that matter, it is entirely with God, who bestows rewards and punishments.

My proposition requires me to show that the Scriptures teach that certain things are the conditions to the pardon of past sins, one of which is baptism; and if God sees proper to save people short of that, a thing he has not promised to do, since Christ gave the commission, it is entirely within the divine prerogative.

My friend is great in asking questions, and when he fails in one he flies to another, whether it has any relation to the subject in hand or not. His dramatic attitude and evident appeal last night to the audience for sympathy in his hour of distress by reference to Mrs. Corbett is so superficial as to be transparent to all; and when this published debate is seen and read by the calm and reflecting, the gentleman's effort in this will count for but little.

Now his doctrine asserts that none will go to heaven save the elect and those to whom God unconditionally gives eternal life. In view of this fact, I

asked him how he knew she had gone to glory. He said he knows it by her good works.

I now ask the gentleman if he believes the doctrine for which he is now contending to be the truth of Almighty God. If he says yes, I will then ask him if he thinks the rejection and repudiation of the truth of Almighty God is a good work. If he says no, I will here remind him that Mrs. Corbett did not believe one word of his present contention, but that sinners had to do something in order to be saved, and practiced, doubtless, what she believed. Does the gentleman think I am engaged in good work to-night contending and repudiating his doctrine, which he says is the truth of God? If I am not doing a good work here, was Mrs. Corbett doing a good work when she was doing the same thing? The gentleman does not know to this good day that even he and his brethren have eternal life, for they sing a song, and, by the way, I have a book here, and they sing it in this very church—here is the way the song goes:

“ It is a point I long to know,
Oft it causes anxious thought:
Do I love the Lord or no?
Am I his, or am I not? ”

He does not know whether he is saved or not, but he knows Mrs. Corbett is saved. He does not know whether he himself is saved, but he knows that every Methodist in this city is saved if he can get any sympathy by saying so. But then, again, Mrs. Corbett's destiny is not in my hands, and I refuse to be drawn away from the plain words of Christ on the subject: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”

The gentleman is anxious to know whether any

one can be saved out of the church to which I belong. He knows that question is entirely irrelevant to the subject under discussion. I will ask him: Suppose I should be a member of no church, would that in any way operate against the truth of my proposition? If not, then why lug it in? The reason is apparent. He thinks by this method he can array me against the different religious bodies and gain sympathy; but I will answer his question again. I am a member of the body of Christ. (1 Cor. 12: 27.) There is only one body. (Eph. 4: 4.) And Paul says: "He is the savior of the body." (Eph. 5: 23.) Haven't I answered it?

Then he further asks how people become members of the body. I am sorry he does not read the Bible more closely and carefully. One passage I read: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. 12: 13.) In the spirit of faith and truth we are all baptized into the one body.

But again, he says Christ commanded one thing I do not do—wash the saints' feet. Now Paul commanded Cayce to do one thing he does not do—greet one another with a holy kiss. I ask him, Why does he not obey that commandment? Doubtless he will say that Paul was regulating the common custom of brotherly salutation, and since that custom has changed to a handshake, he now greets the brethren with a hearty handshake. It was a common custom to wash feet because of local conditions and the necessity arising from the manner the Orientals clad their feet, but Jesus Christ never did an unnecessary thing. He washed the disciples' feet because they needed washing. Now, if my brother should come to my house and his feet needed washing, would it not be my duty to serve him? But Brother Cayce thinks the early Christians washed feet in the assembly.

Christ told the apostles to teach the baptized to observe all things I have commanded you. I here and now challenge my opponent to show one instance where they ever met to worship God in the public assembly and washed feet. I can show him where they assembled together to break bread, but there is nothing said about foot-washing. We only have it mentioned in one other place, and that is in connection with lodging strangers and other acts of hospitality. (1 Tim. 5:10.) Now I insist that if it had been their practice to wash feet in the public assembly, it would not have been necessary to have the question asked, "if she have washed the saints' feet," because all the saints would have been present and seen them washed, and the very fact that the question was asked was proof that it was done in the home and not in the public assembly.

Then, again, I want to ask if Brother Cayce's people do not only wash one foot, while Jesus washed both? You are not a feet-washer, but a foot-washer. [Laughter.] Don't laugh. I know it is right hard for one to keep from it, but try to do it if you can.

Cayce says the sinner is in a condition that he cannot hear God's word. Cayce should know that the word "hear" is used in more than one sense. It not only means to receive sounds into the ear, but it also means to *heed* or *obey*. "Hear" in John 8:43 is from the Greek word "*akouo*," which means to give ear, hearken, and to hear. The persons to whom Jesus spoke were his enemies, seeking his life, and none such can hear or heed the word of God so long as they remain in that condition. Jesus tells them here that they cannot hear God's word, and it is said through the prophet: "I spake unto thee in thy prosperity; but thou saidst, I will not hear." (Jer.

22: 21.) So long as man *wills not* to hear God's word, that long he *cannot* hear.

My opponent says, in his exposition of Eph. 5: 14, that those addressed were to "arise from among the dead"—that is, for God's people to come out from among the spiritually dead. But unfortunately for the gentleman's proposition, the very word "sleepeth" comes from the Greek word which literally means death. The word "sleepeth" means death in that passage. It is the same word translated "sleepeth" in this: "Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth." (Matt. 9: 24.) Also: "Lazarus sleepeth." (John 11: 11.) We have the same Greek word in the following: "Even so them also which *sleep* in Jesus will God bring with him." (1 Thess. 4: 14.) I suppose he would try to have them sleeping *among* the dead. Now, I ask the gentleman to tell this audience whether or not these were dead who were said to be asleep. I demand that he answer this question, for this passage (Eph. 5: 14) sounds the death knell of his doctrine.

He asks: "What must the alien sinner believe?" I answer, the gospel, for here in this commission the Savior said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth [believeth what they preach, and they preached the gospel] and is baptized shall be saved."

Then he made a great ado about light and life. Paul says: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." (Eph. 5: 14.) "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." (John 1: 4.) Light here is another word for life; hence there is no point in what he says against my position.

But he wants to know if God cannot save people without conditions on their part. I will remind him

that this is not a question of power, but of promise. My contention is that in the revelation God has given to man he has promised salvation upon conditions, and in so far as this feature of the subject is concerned, we are dealing with conditions and promises.

My opponent wishes to know if all of God's power to save is in the gospel. Jesus Christ is the center of the gospel, and he says: "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." (John 8: 24.) Inasmuch as God said that he is "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. 3: 9), and, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live" (Ezek. 33: 11)—I ask you, in view of these passages, if God had any *other* power, would he withhold it?

My friend, in his confusion and evident defeat, gets himself into all kinds of ridiculous positions. He says that the people addressed by Peter on Pentecost were God's people. Now, let us see. Did not Peter command them to believe and repent? Did he not charge them with the murder of Christ? Of course he did, and yet my friend has people God's children who were without faith and without repentance, and whose hands were stained with the blood of God's only Son. Surely he is hard pressed in his efforts to save a sinking cause by such perversion!

MR. SRYGLEY'S BLACKBOARD.

“GO YE INTO ALL THE WORLD, AND PREACH THE GOSPEL TO EVERY CREATURE. HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED.” (Mark 16: 15, 16.)

“AND THAT REPENTANCE AND REMISSION OF SINS SHOULD BE PREACHED IN HIS NAME AMONG ALL NATIONS, BEGINNING AT JERUSALEM.” (Luke 24: 47.)

Well, now, as I said, let me look again at the commission. In discussing this question we are dealing with conditions and promises. We are not dealing with power, but alone with conditions and promises; and while we are not dealing with power, I do state that Jesus Christ said, before giving this commission, that “all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” I say, then, back of this commission is all power, and this commission was given by the Savior himself. It is not something that I have studied up or that my opponent has thought out. It is something that Jesus Christ himself thought out and gave to the apostles, and I want to state in this connection that it is indeed and in truth the organic law of the kingdom of Christ, and I believe that a man had just as well put his hands on the Constitution of the United States, and at the same time claim to be a law-abiding citizen, as to lay his hand upon the great commission and claim to be faithful to God. The Savior said: “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” (Matt. 28: 18.) “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is bap-

tized shall be saved." (Mark 16: 15, 16.) I state to you to-night that this is the language of the Son of God; and shall any man put his hand on "*shall be saved*" in Jesus Christ's commission? Dare any man to take it from its proper connection and put it before the conditions, "believeth and is baptized?" Dare any man to *lay his hands* upon the *commandments* of Jesus Christ? I tell you it is not a question of whether a man can quote more scripture than I can. It is a question as to whether the Scriptures teach what he claims; and if this passage does not teach that faith and baptism are conditions of salvation, I ask you how that can be taught? Are there any words that you can think of to make it plainer? Could Jesus, the Master, have selected words in all the realm of human language to set forth in plainer words than those contained in this commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned?" I said to you that while this is the commission as recorded by Mark, the same commission was recorded by Luke. It is not a different commission. It is the same one, recorded by another writer, and I turn now to read it: "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke 26: 47.) I said that this statement of Luke adds another condition to the commission, and that is "*repentance*." It not only adds another condition to the commission as given by Mark, but it also tells of what the salvation by Mark consists—viz., "*the remission of sins*."

Did you notice last night that the gentleman said he wanted to ask me a question, and that is: "Do you believe the sixteenth chapter of Mark?" I believe,

Mr. Moderator, he was out of order when he asked me such a question as that. I believe that that was a reflection upon my faith in my Savior to ask me such a question. I would rather fall dead in this pulpit and be carried out than to doubt the word of Jesus. Cayce says it means "shall be saved in heaven," but the Savior *never said* that. Christ said "shall be saved," and fortunately for us he tells us exactly what salvation consists in—that is, "remission of sins"—when he says that repentance and remission of sins shall be preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. When we take these two records of the same commission together, we have the fact taught that the gospel shall be preached to all nations, and also that this preaching shall begin in the city of Jerusalem. You also have the facts that the people shall be required to repent of their sins and be baptized into Christ, in order to enjoy the blessing—remission of their sins. If this is not the teaching of this commission, what does it teach? What does it teach, if it does not teach what it says? Jesus Christ, so far as I can see, could not have selected words that could have made it plainer.

I know the gentleman would like for me to quote forty or fifty passages, but I do not need them; for if this passage is true, I need no other; and if this is not true, how do we know any of the Bible is? But in the proposition that I have set before you in this debate, I have the *very words* of Jesus Christ in his commission that he has given to his apostles, by which they were to be guided in the conversion and salvation of the race.

You know I called your attention last night to the fact, also, that these apostles, in preaching under this commission, of course understood it. They went out from the city of Jerusalem and preached

under this commission, and in Acts of Apostles we have the deeds of these men and their understanding of this commission, and we can study these cases of conversion coming up under this great commission, that we may be able to understand how the apostles themselves applied it in the different cases that came up.

I called your attention last night to the fact that the first time they ever preached under this commission Peter preached on that occasion, and as a result there were three thousand conversions. He told those people that they had crucified the Lord of glory (my friend says that they were already God's children, with their hands stained with the blood of the Son of God, with the greatest crime charged against them that could possibly be charged against mortal man), and they heard the preaching of Peter and were pricked in their hearts. Indeed they were. Perhaps they remembered when he was suspended upon the cross he prayed this beautiful prayer, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do;" and, like a star, it came gleaming down through the darkness to give them hope. After Peter had said, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ" (and that means, let them believe it with all their hearts), they believed it, "were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." I suggest in this connection that God is call-

ing men to-day through the gospel. As he was calling men through the preaching of these apostles, he is calling men to come to him now.

I have called your attention time and again to the fact that man sprang from a noble parentage, that he fell from the hand of his Creator, and God was the maker of his body and spirit, and every invitation of this gospel is but an invitation to fallen, sinful man to come home, come home to God; and so the Savior in giving the commission told the apostles to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, and I say that this being the case, this commission was extended to all of the nations, and these apostles preached under it. Preaching under it, Peter said: "The promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation." And that means to save themselves from the fate and the condition to which that wicked generation were hastening; save themselves from the punishment to which that wicked generation were hastening. They were to save themselves by complying with the conditions, by accepting the conditions. They were not to save themselves in the sense that man can be his own Savior. Jesus Christ is the Savior, and the trouble with my brother is that he does not distinguish between the cause of salvation and the conditions of salvation. God is the cause. I believe that God is the cause of all light, but the sun is the means by which God bestows that light upon this earth, and man might as well try to blot the sun out and have light as to blot the conditions out upon which Jesus Christ has offered man salvation and expect Christ to save him. [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE'S THIRD REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I am before you in the negative of the proposition. The proposition reads: "Faith, repentance, and (water) baptism are conditions of pardon (or salvation) to an alien sinner, and the Scriptures so teach."

First, I wish to call attention to a statement that the brother made last night, if I did not misunderstand him (and if I did, he will correct me), in showing the difference between the means and the cause. He said that breathing is the means of life, and not the cause of life, if I understood him correctly, and if I misunderstood him, I am ready now to be corrected. Breathing, then, is a condition of living, and not the cause of life. Just in that sense, then, as he brings that up to show that breathing is not a cause of obtaining life, not in order to the obtaining of life, but is a condition of living, he uses that to illustrate his position that faith, repentance, and baptism are means of salvation, and not the cause of salvation. Then, as breathing is not a condition in order to life, or not a cause of life, and does not produce the life, but the life itself first exists, and then breathing is the result and only a continuation of that life, and through and by the breathing the life grows; then he surrenders his proposition in his illustration, or else his illustration fails. For if that illustrates his position, then it must be that the character must possess the spiritual life prior to the faith, repentance, and baptism, just as one possesses the nat-

ural life prior to his breathing, and hence his proposition falls. He surrenders it by his own illustration.

I wish now to notice some things that he has said in the speech to which you have just listened. He says Cayce cries loud and long against any conditions at all, and that I base my conclusion upon Rom. 3: 20. I did not quote Rom. 3: 20 last night—I don't think I did. My argument was based upon Rom. 5: 19, that it is not by the obedience of many that sinners are made righteous, but by the obedience of one, and that one is Christ.

He says works are excluded by the law of faith. If I understand him correctly, his position is that since the gospel law, or the law of faith, has been put in force, that now works are excluded. Then I will ask him: Were people saved by works before the gospel day? Were they saved one way then, and another way now? Titus 3: 5, beginning with the third verse, I will read: "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." Now here the apostle tells just what they were doing all the time prior to the work of regeneration. "But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done"—I wish the gentleman would tell us if repenting of sins is a righteous work. If it is not a righteous work, is it an unrighteous work? Is it an unrighteous work for one to believe the testimony of your preaching? Is that a righteous work or an unrighteous work? "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us

abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." It is not through the administration of the preacher, but through Jesus Christ our Savior, that the cleansing work of the Holy Spirit is shed on us through Jesus Christ, and hence has no reference whatever to water baptism or to his proposition.

Referring to the question, "What becomes of the unbaptized believer?" he says Jesus put the promise of salvation after baptism in the commission. Well, let's try that again. There are two classes mentioned in the commission—first is the baptized believer, and next is the unbeliever. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now I believe that, and he says that in asking him the question, *Does he believe it?* that I was violating a rule. Whenever I violate the rule, if your moderator will tell me so, I will apologize right there. Now if he says I violated a rule when I put that question, I will apologize, I will beg pardon for it. But as he does not say, I take it for granted that he does not think that I violated a rule. Then I will ask you, do you believe that every one who believes and is baptized shall be saved, or do you believe that some of them may go to hell? Now don't fail to answer that.

The unbeliever shall be damned. All right; we agree on that. The unbeliever is damned. Granting his argument and his position on the text, that it is eternal salvation on one hand and eternal damnation on the other hand, then we will agree that this man (the unbeliever) is damned, and that the baptized believer is saved; but what about the unbaptized believer? There is a class not mentioned in the commission—the unbaptized believer. What about an unbaptized believer? Isn't he all right? What about him? That text does not say anything about

him. What about him? What becomes of him? Does that man go to hell? You can't say from your text. Your text says it is the unbeliever that is condemned. Does he go to heaven? You can't say from your text, for that text says it is the baptized believer that is saved. Now what do you do with that unbaptized believer? Jesus says: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." There they are. I will put them (the baptized believer and the unbaptized believer) together. Now we will see what class he puts them in.

He says I appeal to the audience for sympathy concerning Mrs. Corbett. You remember what I said. If you should ask me the question, I would answer. Whenever I put a question to you, you can ask me the same question, and I will answer it right now. I ask you *again*: What became of Mrs. Corbett? Mrs. Corbett was a good woman. He wants to know what evidence I have that she was saved or one of the elect. He says that my doctrine is that none but elect can be saved, and he asks: "Do you think the rejection of your doctrine a good work?" I am glad to say to you that people do not have to believe the doctrine that I preach in order to reach heaven and immortal glory. *Do they have to believe the doctrine you preach in order to reach heaven and immortal glory?* Do they? I can say to you that people do not have to belong to the Old Baptist Church in order to reach heaven and immortal glory. *Do they have to belong to the church that you do in order to reach heaven and immortal glory?* Do they? Mrs. Corbett did not belong to either of us, so far as church membership is concerned, and yet, by the evidence which she left, I can say that in spirit this evening she is basking in the sunlight of

God's eternal presence. *What do you say about that?* Say, Brother Srygley, is Aunt Fannie Corbett's soul in heaven this evening, or is it in hell? **I DEMAND AN ANSWER.** He says that is for sympathy. Bless your life, if I could not show and sustain my position that she is in heaven, don't you know he would be asking me what became of Mrs. Corbett? Don't you know he would? Of course he would.

Well, he says I am fortunate indeed; he said that last night. I am so. By the way, the Lord in his providence has sent me news of another case like that. Mrs. L. J. Dale, wife of Rev. W. T. Dale, of this city, who died June 6, 1895, in her dying hour her last words were: "I hear the angels." That woman died rejoicing in the Savior's love. I will ask you to tell these people: Is that woman in heaven? Is her spirit in the paradise of God, or is her spirit in the lower regions? I challenge the gentleman to answer this. Say, Brother Srygley, what became of Aunt Fannie Corbett?

He says I don't know whether I myself am saved or not. Brother Srygley, do you know that you are saved? Do you ever have any doubt about it? Don't fail to tell us, if you please. Do you know that you are a child of God?

He says he is a member of the body of Christ. Must I be a member of the same church you are, in order that I be a member of the body of Christ? Must I? Now if I am not a member of the body of Christ, I want to know how to become a member. I must be a member of the body of Christ, according to his position, in order that I be saved in heaven. Now it devolves upon you, as a teacher, to tell me how to become a member of the body of Christ. Must I become a member of your church? He quoted 1 Cor. 12: 13, "in one Spirit." King James'

Version has it, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." Hence it is the work of the Holy Spirit of God that puts you into that body of Christ. It is not water baptism.

With reference to feet-washing, he says: "Why don't Cayce obey the command to greet one another with a holy kiss?" I will ask you: Why don't you do that, seeing you believe you go to heaven by doing the things that are commanded? You are the man that believes that we reach heaven by doing the things that are commanded. Now, why don't you do that? I don't believe that is the way we get to heaven. You do. So why don't you do that?

He says Old Baptists wash only one foot. I understood him the first time—I was pretty sure I did—but I wanted to hear that again, so I asked him. I wanted to be sure about that. "You Old Baptists wash only one foot." I do not want to charge him with ignorance—I don't want to—but did you ever see it done that way? I have engaged in that ordinance numbers of times, for about twenty years—since 1889 I have been engaging in that ordinance, and never yet have I engaged in it without each one who engaged in the ordinance had both feet washed. That shows how much he knew about it. The Savior said: "So ought ye also to wash one another's feet." He says it was because they were dirty. He charges the apostle Peter with ignorance, for the Savior says: "What I do thou knowest not now." Now don't you suppose he would have known if his feet were dirty? "But thou shalt know hereafter."

Then with reference to the widow indeed, he says a question was asked if she had washed the saints' feet. That is not a question. This was laid down as one of the requirements of the widow indeed, that one who is to be taken under the care of the church

and supported and sustained by the church, if she had washed the saints' feet.

John 8: 43. He says "hear" in that text means to give ear, hearken. He says they were seeking his life. Well, they were people that the Savior said, "I know you, that the love of God is not in you," and he said that they cannot hear. Then they cannot give ear, they cannot hear, they cannot hearken. This man's doctrine says they must do what the Son of God says they cannot do, in order to reach heaven and immortal glory. We will see more about that, however, further on.

Eph. 5: 14. He says that the word "dead"—the word there which is translated *sleep* means *dead*. All right. In that verse there are two words which are translated different ways. One is translated *sleepest*, and the other is translated *dead*. He says: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead." I am giving the King James translation. Now what does the word mean that is translated *dead* in that same verse? And what word is it? Now they are not the same words; and if the first word means dead, and the other is not like it, then it would read: "Awake thou that art dead, and arise from thy sleep." Now I don't think that is correct. Brother Srygley, just tell me what that word means, and what it is—what the difference is between the two words. Are the two words akin? Are they any way alike?

He says the alien must believe the gospel. Jesus says he cannot hear, cannot heed. Then how can he believe it? John 1: 4: "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." I ask you, was that life the light of regeneration? Is that the light of regeneration? There are two kinds of darkness. One kind of darkness is death, and another kind is the dark-

ness of ignorance. The Holy Spirit imparts life, raising the sinner up out of the darkness of death. Then the gospel imparts knowledge, and that is delivering from the darkness of ignorance.


Acts 2: 28 again. Do you remember the question I asked him on verse 39: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call?" Did you hear any answer to it? Do you remember the question? Was the promise unto them before they were baptized?

Now here are two more questions I want to give you right here—one of them is that question repeated—but first this question: Upon what principle of justice does God condemn the heathen for not believing and obeying what you preach, seeing they never heard you? That same question was asked before in different words. He has not answered it.

Again, Acts 2: 38, 39, the apostle says: "The promise IS unto you." *Was the promise unto them before baptism?* If not, did the apostle tell the truth? He says the promise IS unto you, and Elder Srygley's idea is that there is no promise and no salvation until after baptism.

[Uncovering the blackboard.] I am not much of a painter, but there is his picture. [Mr. Shepherd rises.] I apologize—

THE BLACKBOARD.

	Matt. 7: 18.	Rom. 8: 8, 9.				Saved. Born.
	John 8: 43.	H.....	B.....	R.....	B	
TLC						

MR. SHEPHERD.—Last night and this evening both Brother Cayce promised me that he would abide by the rules of discussion that we have agreed upon. During this whole discussion it has devolved upon me entirely to enforce the rules. You know my ruling all the way through. I have endeavored throughout this discussion to act with all the fairness possible. Now since this is brought up, and everything that has gone before has and will go to record, so far as the discussion is concerned, I want to say: I was much pleased with the manifest change in Elder Cayce's conduct during last night's discussion, and my pleasure was much increased when he came to me at the conclusion of the discussion and said that he had decided to conform strictly to the rules during the remainder of the debate. He also said that if I would point out wherein he had been out of order, he would make an apology for it. But, as I told him in the conversation, men have sometimes allowed themselves to be drawn into a certain course so long that they unconsciously violate rules when they honestly think they are in obedience to them. And as he requests it, and as duty also demands it of me, I will point out wherein, I believe, he violated the rules last night and is now violating them.

(1) Now, of course, anything of this kind [pointing to the picture on the blackboard] is entirely out of keeping with the rules of honorable controversy. I must rule that way.

(2) Rule III. is: "All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided." This rule forbids the introduction of anything that does not contribute to the proof of the question; and it does not matter what his opponent teaches relative to

foot-washing, the heathen, the pious unimmersed, or as to whether he believes that people can be saved out of the church of which he is a member. Elder Cayce is required to show that the Scriptures do *not* teach that faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions of salvation.

(3) Rule VI. says: "The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them;" and since his opponent does not avow the consequences, his questions requiring him to assume them is a violation of this rule. His opponent's contention is that "Jesus and the inspired apostles, as recorded in the Scriptures, made faith, repentance, and baptism conditions of pardon," and that he is not responsible for any consequences that may follow. "As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proof may be advanced on either side should be considered with fairness and candor." His opponent has already advanced scriptural proof to sustain his proposition, and Rule VII. requires Elder Cayce to examine his proof with fairness and candor; and if this be not done, the purpose of the debate will be defeated.

Now, of course, foot-washing and the condition of the heathen are not in this proposition. The matter to be considered is as to whether or not the Scriptures teach that faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions of pardon. Now that is the proposition under discussion this evening, and why not confine the arguments to it, and when that shall have been disposed of, of course there could be arrangements made to discuss these other propositions.

Now, Brother Moderator, that is my ruling, so far as these matters are concerned.

MR. DAILY.—I think that the moderator on the

other side claims altogether too much in claiming to have acted solely alone in confining the disputants to the observance of the rules, unless he means by that that he alone has called his man to order, which he has done a number of times. Had Brother Cayce violated the rules, according to my understanding of what violation of the rules consists in, as his opponent has, I should have called Brother Cayce to order. I attribute to the moderator on the other side great fairness up to this time. He has acted very fairly. I appreciated very much his calling my attention at one time to the fact that I had not noticed the time that was lost by Elder Cayce when some question came up for our consideration aside from the regular discussion. But I cannot accept his ruling in this case. I insist that Elder Cayce has brought nothing into this debate, the debate on this proposition, that is irrelevant. The questions that he has asked his opponent, Elder Cayce would have been perfectly willing for his opponent to have asked him, and Elder Cayce would have been right to answer those questions. I conceive it to be because an answer to these questions, fair and square, would involve the speaker on the other side in absurdities that he refuses to answer those questions, and that his moderator arises to offer an objection. At the moment that Elder Cayce took the curtain from what appears on the blackboard, the moderator on the other side arose to object. Before Elder Cayce had said one single word about what that signifies, in regard to what it was he intended to make of that, the moderator arose and objected—

MR. CAYCE.—Pardon me, Brother Daily. I think it is the picture that he is objecting to and the expression I used.

MR. DAILY.—Was it the picture?

MR. SHEPHERD.—The picture was what I was objecting to, and not to anything else on that board. The picture was what caused me to act at the time I did.

MR. CAYCE.—Unthoughtedly I used the expression, "That is his picture." I said that before I thought.


MR. DAILY.—You apologized for that?

MR. CAYCE.—Yes, sir; I apologized for it before Brother Shepherd spoke.

MR. DAILY.—That slipped my notice. I am sure that that was not the intent of that picture, and when he said that was his picture, I had no thought of Brother Cayce meaning that was Elder Srygley's picture. If I had realized that was his meaning, I would have called him to order myself, if I had thought so. But as he says he said it unthoughtedly and apologized for it, will that suffice, Brother Moderator?

MR. SHEPHERD.—That will suffice, just so that picture is entirely erased from the board. [Mr. Cayce erases the picture.]

THE BLACKBOARD.

		Rom. 8: 8, 9.				
	Matt. 7: 18. John 8: 43.	H.....	B.....	R.....	B	Saved. Born.

MR. DAILY.—I insist that the moderator on the other side specify what particular things have been

introduced that are not relevant or pertinent to the question under discussion, and why they are not relevant. I insist that he tell why they are not, so that we may understand, and so that I may have an opportunity to reply, if a reply is needed.

MR. SHEPHERD.—In what I said just a few moments ago I specified exactly what I had in mind. I said that the proposition affirmed by Brother Srygley is that “faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions of pardon or salvation, and that the Scriptures so teach,” and that by asking these questions he requires the introduction of matter that is entirely irrelevant to the subject under discussion.

What has the condition of this good woman to whom reference has been made to do with the subject? If the lives of all the men and women in this hall to-night depended upon it; if the lives of all the men and women in this city depended upon it; if the lives of all the men and women in this State depended upon it; if the lives of all the men and women in the United States depended upon it; and if the lives of all the people in the whole world depended upon it, that question could not be answered. Who knows? God alone. And for these reasons I contend that this is a question that is irrelevant, and that it is not germane to the question under discussion; for, as I have said, the proposition is that “faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions of pardon, or salvation, and that the Scriptures so teach.” The question is: Do the Scriptures teach that? And now, before I hear another word from Brother Daily, in regard to his decision, my decision is this: That Brother Srygley shall proceed with the discussion of this proposition as his affirmation requires. Of course, if Brother Daily takes another course than that, why, then, I cannot decide that question for him.

MR. DAILY.—I want to remind the gentleman on the other side that a disputant has the right to argue in the way of a *reductio ad absurdum*. He can show by reducing a position to an absurdity the ridiculousness of that position. My friend on the other side knows that I am correct. That Elder Cayce has the perfect right to argue in the way of *reductio ad absurdum* he dare not deny.

Now he says, in regard to Aunt Fannie Corbett, nobody knows. We claim to know. Elder Cayce proved where that sister went by showing that by their fruits you know them. There are fruits by which we know where that sister went. But the position of the affirmant, in affirming his position, is that unless his conditions are complied with, it matters not what good fruits they bear, in this life, they will sink down to endless perdition. That is the *reductio ad absurdum*.

MR. SRYGLEY.—You are arguing the proposition.

MR. DAILY.—If it was not so warm for these fellows, they would sit still. Their chairs are hot. [Brother Shepherd arises, and Brother Daily says: "It is my time to speak; I was before you."] These questions are introduced—get this now—these questions are introduced to show this position relative to the teaching of these passages cannot be correct, as additional argument to the direct argument that Elder Cayce has brought in to show this position is false. It makes Brother Cayce doubly successful in proving directly that the gentleman is mistaken, and then proving, *reductio ad absurdum*, that his interpretations of those passages were wrong. That is why these questions were introduced. They are relevant, and if he does not answer the questions asked him, and his moderator so rules that he shall not, it remains that they are afraid for the questions to be

answered, and Elder Cayce will take the position that that will involve them in as great an absurdity as if they should come out and answer the questions fairly, like men.

MR. SHEPHERD.—I want to say a few words, as we do not agree in regard to the relevancy or the irrelevancy of the matter that has been introduced. My ruling is that Brother Srygley shall continue the discussion of the proposition as he affirms it. Of course, if Brother Cayce takes a different course than that, I cannot help it. So, Brother Srygley, I instruct you, when you come to speak, that you present this subject from the point of view that it is taught by the Scriptures that faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions of pardon.

MR. SRYGLEY.—All right; I will do that if I can.

MR. CAYCE.—Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I proceed with my subject. I wish first to call attention to a question that I introduced, that I asked the gentleman, or to an answer, rather, which he gave last night to a question which I asked him. The question was, "Did you, or did you not, say that one cannot do spiritual works outside of the church?" and his answer was: "Neither sinners nor saints can do spiritual works." I call attention to 1 Pet. 2: 5: "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." Is that doing spiritual works?

He yet fails to answer: Must one be a member of the same church you are, in order to be in a saved state? Since the gentleman refuses to answer, and his moderator refuses that he answer, and directs that he proceed with his affirmative arguments without answering, I shall quote from some of their writings.

I now quote from the Christian Pilot, January 28, 1908: "The leading sectarian churches do not claim to contain all of the redeemed in the aggregate; therefore they are not the church of Christ. The church to which I belong claims to contain the redeemed in the aggregate; therefore it is the church of the New Testament. There is but one way to get into the church of Christ, and that is to obey the gospel. It takes faith, repentance, confession, and baptism to put a man into Christ, or into the church that contains the redeemed. (Signed) W. W. Young." Mr. Young says it takes faith, repentance, confession, and baptism. The gentleman's proposition says faith, repentance, and baptism.

I quote again from the Christian Pilot of May 17, 1910: "When a man becomes a Christian he becomes a member of God's family, and God's family is the church of Christ. Whatever it takes to make a man a child of God, it takes that to put him into the church of Christ. A man can be in human institutions and not be in the church of Christ, but a man cannot be in the church of Christ and not become a Christian; neither can he become a Christian and not become a member of the church of Christ."

This clearly shows that their teaching is that in order that one be a member of the body of Christ, and be in a saved state, he must be a member of the church that this gentleman is identified with; and, hence, whatever it takes to get into his church is what it takes to put the sinner in a saved state, and hence the questions that I put to him I maintain were fair, pertinent to the proposition, and to the point. Do you want to see this?

MR. SRYGLEY.—I can find something to read, I guess.

MR. CAYCE.—Do you want to see it?

MR. SRYGLEY.—No.

MR. CAYCE.—You remember the question I asked you, "Would the railroad officials send out the pass if they knew it would be rejected?" brought up by your illustration of God giving eternal life as a railroad official offers the pass, and it is sent back to them—would the railroad officials send out the pass if they know it would be rejected? Then the question is: If God offered eternal salvation, did he know before he made the offer whether or not the sinner would reject it? He has been as silent as the grave on that question. *Did he know before?*

Is all of God's power to save in the gospel? "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." *What if he believes and is not baptized, what becomes of him?*

Another question: Upon what principle of justice does God condemn the heathen for not believing and obeying what you preach, seeing they never heard you? His moderator says that the heathen are not concerned in this question. Are they not members of the human family, and is not salvation a personal matter? I ask you: Upon what principle will God condemn the heathen for not believing what you preach, when they never heard what you preach?

Acts 2: 39, the apostle says: "The promise is unto you, and to your children," and so on. Was the *promise unto them before baptism?* *If not, did the apostle tell the truth?*

Another question which I asked him last night and which is unanswered yet: Did God love Esau? I put this question when he was arguing that God loved all the race.

Another question: Do the heathen who die without hearing the gospel have a chance of salvation?

This question was asked when he was arguing that God in his gospel gives everybody a chance. I insist that these questions are relevant to the proposition, and that they demand an answer, and if they are not answered they go to record unanswered.

I have some more:

1. How many ways does God have of saving people? Is there just the one way—by faith, repentance, and being baptized in water?

2. Was Jesus a sinner?

3. If water baptism is a condition of pardon or salvation, and Jesus was not a sinner, for what purpose was he baptized?

4. Cannot one be saved without water baptism?

5. Can one be saved without the pardon of his sins?

6. If no one can be saved without the pardon of his sins, and if baptism is a condition of pardon, how can one be saved without baptism?

7. Would you knowingly baptize an idiot? If not, why not?

8. If anything is a condition in order that a certain end be reached, can that end be reached unless the condition is first performed?

9. If the end can be reached without the condition being performed, then that thing is not a condition in order to the end, is it?

10. If you should baptize an idiot, could he know what the baptism is for?

11. Does the expression (Mark 10: 15), "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein," mean that the little child is saved one way and the intelligent adult is saved another way?

12. Does not that expression teach that they are saved the same way?

13. If it does not teach this, what does it teach?
14. Was Abel saved?
15. If Abel was saved, was he not saved without baptism?
16. If Abel was saved without baptism, and people cannot be saved now without it, does it not follow that God has more than one way of saving people?
17. If Abel was saved without baptism, and if God has but one way of saving people, are they not saved now without baptism?
18. If no one can be saved without baptism, and Abel was not baptized, then he was not saved, was he?
19. How were people saved before the gospel dispensation?
20. Were they saved by keeping the law?
21. If they were saved by keeping the law, then what was the necessity for the death of Christ?
22. Has there been a law given that could give life?
23. If people were saved by keeping the law before the coming of Christ, was not his death in vain?
24. If no one can be saved without baptism, can the heathen be saved, when he has never heard of baptism?
25. Is it not impossible for the heathen to be saved, seeing they know nothing about baptism?
26. If the heathen are damned for want of baptism, when they know nothing about baptism, are they not sent to hell on account of your failure?
27. If the heathen are sent to hell on account of your failure, are not the wrong parties sent there?
28. Does John 3: 5 ("born of water") refer to water baptism?
29. When one is baptized, is he born from the water?

30. Is water the mother?

31. Who is the father?

32. Do you think more of your mother than you do of your father?

Pass that over to him, please.

I wish now to call attention to this on the board. Matt. 7: 18 and John 8: 43. Matt. 7: 18: "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Jesus says this. This mark here represents a man. He is an alien, in the condition the apostle calls "in the flesh," all the time an alien until he crosses this line here. The gentleman's position is that he must hear, believe, repent, and be baptized. That puts him over here, across the line, born of God, saved, or in possession of salvation. He is in an unsaved state, an alien sinner, all the time prior to that, hence a corrupt tree, and the Savior says "a corrupt tree *cannot* bring forth good fruit." Certainly hearing and taking heed to the gospel is a good fruit; believing the testimony of our Lord is a good fruit; repenting of sins is a good fruit; and being baptized is a good fruit. The gentleman's position says that this man *must* do what the *Son of God* says he CANNOT DO, in order to be saved in heaven.

John 8: 43: "Why do ye not understand my speech?" [*Time expired.*]

MR. SRYGLEY'S FOURTH ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I am before you, my friends, to continue the discussion of the proposition that faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions upon which God promises to forgive sins.

I have endeavored in all my speeches to emphasize the fact that we are dealing with *conditions* and *promises*, rather than with power. (I will ask the gentlemen who took my board from me to put it up again. You can take mine down later, and let Brother Cayce make his argument on his board.)

MR. SRYGLEY'S BLACKBOARD.

"GO YE INTO ALL THE WORLD, AND PREACH THE GOSPEL TO EVERY CREATURE. HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED." (Mark 16: 15, 16.)

"AND THAT REPENTANCE AND REMISSION OF SINS SHOULD BE PREACHED IN HIS NAME AMONG ALL NATIONS, BEGINNING AT JERUSALEM." (Luke 24: 47.)

I want you to understand, when this board is put up here, that this is the language of the Son of God. I want you to know that this is the statement of the Savior, and I would have you understand, too, my friends, that this commission is the very basic prin-

ciple of all the teachings of the gospel. It was, indeed, the constitution under which they preached; it contained the authority for their preaching; and not only does it contain the authority for their preaching, but it also contains the conditions upon which they were to offer salvation to the race.

John, in giving his account, briefly, of the same commission, says: "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John 20: 23.) Whatever these apostles bound upon the earth will indeed be ratified in heaven; and, as the apostles were sent out under this commission, I would naturally expect that they always preach the conditions that the commission itself contained, and we notice here, as given by Mark, he said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Preach the gospel to every creature. I notice that Matthew, in giving his account of the same commission, says: "Go, teach the nations." And Mark says not only to go and preach the gospel to every creature, but he says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

If God has spoken to man, the very first thing that is necessary for man to do is to believe what God has said, and so, in this commission, the record is that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

But as I suggested in my last speech, no man should lay his hands upon the "saved" in this commission and move it. No man has the right to take it from the place where the Savior put it, and make it precede teaching, faith, and baptism, or any of the requirements of the commission. I say that no man, however holy his hands may be, should be allowed to lay them upon this commission, and you know, my

friends, that the man who would dare to do that, or that would dare to even express an opinion about what becomes of a person who did not obey this commission, it seems to me, is taking liberties that no one should consider for one moment. I say I would not dare to express an opinion in the face of this commission. If this commission had been a statement of man, of my moderator, or of both of the moderators, I could afford to make some statements in its face; but when I consider that this commission is not the statement of man at all, that it is the statement of the Son of God himself, who died that man might live, I would not dare lay my hand upon it. And I say to you, that it will be a sad day for this world when the preachers of this country have no regard for the statements of the blessed Son of God. This commission is backed up by *all authority*. The Savior said before he gave it: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore"—that is, in view of this power and authority—"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing." Or, as given by Mark: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." I believe that all can see, according to that commission, that there are two things placed between man and salvation at least. The one is *believing*, and the other is being *baptized*, and I say that the very fact that men can stand in the face of this commission and put their hands on the statement of the Son of God, to change it from the place where he himself has placed it, should cause us to blush with shame tonight. I do not believe that man has ever dared to do a worse thing than that—lay his hand upon the statement that the Son of God himself has made, and change salvation from the place where he put it

to another place. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

But I would have you notice that we have this same commission recorded by Luke, and Luke says: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." (Luke 24: 47.) The gentleman asked me a while ago if I believed that commission. I told him I did, and I said I believed that indeed it was a reflection upon me to even ask the question, for, as sweet as life is to me, I would rather die in your presence than to doubt it for one moment. I would rather, indeed, be carried out of this house feet foremost than to doubt the statement that the Son of God has made. I tell you I cannot afford to doubt what inspired men have said, and I cannot afford to doubt what the blessed Son of God himself has said. *All*, he says, shall be saved, and he believes it, but that Brother Srygley does not believe it. How does he know I do not believe it? Do I look like I do not? Have I talked like I do not? Have I acted like I do not? I say to you, I believe that the salvation there promised is the remission of sins, and I believe that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved from his past sins, and the reason I believe that salvation is the remission of sins is because Luke, in giving the same commission, said that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." And then my opponent turns around and says: "Do you believe it? Do you believe that commission?" I tell you, friends, it looks to me like the gentleman does not believe it, for he is the man who would dare put his hands upon that commission, and that is the one that looks to me like does not believe it. I have not said anything in this controversy that would indicate that I do not

believe it. I have not made one sign that would indicate it.

But the apostles, as I have suggested, preached under this commission, and numbers of people were saved. We have in the Bible a book called "Acts of Apostles." It has been called the "book of conversions," and the man who desires to know how these apostles applied this commission to the different cases that came up under their preaching has but to turn to Acts of Apostles in order to do so. I say that in that book we have a number of cases where the apostles themselves in preaching under this commission applied it to the cases that came up. As I said before, it is like the study of arithmetic. When the boy comes to a new rule, he of course wants to understand it. He memorizes it, and after that is done he should examine very carefully the problems worked out under it, in order to see how to apply it to the different problems that follow.

But I said in this connection that the great problem of man's redemption is laid down in this commission. I wish to say, it is not a new problem, indeed, but there were new conditions here employed; and that answers, by the way, the proposition about Abel and Abraham, and all those people that were saved before this commission went into effect. God always has saved man on the same principle, and that principle is to *believe what he says and do what he commands*, and I believe in every case of salvation in the olden days you will find that that principle was prominent. To believe all that God says and do what he commands has always brought to man the blessings; but when it comes to the problem of man's redemption under the commission, the conditions are different, and here the Savior himself, who died in order to make it possible to

offer the promise to man that God had made to Abraham, that "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," put these conditions into the commission, and sent the apostles out to preach under it, and under this commission God gives us some examples of conversion in Acts of Apostles. We have already examined the example given on the day of Pentecost; but I note that the gentleman has made some statements about that, saying that these people were already saved because they were devout Jews. But, my friends, the time had passed then for being a Jew to save a man, for the prophet asked the question: "When will the Sabbath be gone?" The meaning of that was: When will the law end? It was answered: "I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." (Amos 8: 9.) And that never happened on this earth but one time, and that was when Jesus Christ was crucified. Then indeed the sun went down at noon, and there was darkness in the earth on a clear day, for Jesus had been crucified. He now offers man salvation under the terms and specifications of this commission.

I will say that the argument he has attempted is about the only argument, if you may call it an *argument*, that the gentleman can make. Peter preached and required believers to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, with the promise that they should receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. I know my friend said that all the salvation promised in the sermon preached on Pentecost was simply salvation from that untoward generation, meaning that they should come out from among that untoward generation. I do not know that Christians come out; they are already out, if saved. I say to you that the meaning of that is: they were

to be saved from the fate and punishment that came unto that untoward generation, by complying with the terms of this commission, believing in Christ and repenting of their sins, and being baptized into his name.

After this I called attention to one other plain case where God undertook to save, and did save, a man that was, at the time the story begins, in the city of Jerusalem, a man who had gone up to worship under the old law. He did not know, of course, that the law had been abolished. He had gone to the city of Jerusalem to worship. I refer to the case of the conversion and salvation of the Ethiopian eunuch, a nobleman, who was in the city of Jerusalem at the time the story begins. He was in that city, having gone there for the purpose of worshiping, and the record begins with this statement: "And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip." Philip was the preacher, and he was in the city of Samaria, thirty miles north of Jerusalem, at the time. The angels are interested, it seems, in the salvation of man; but on this occasion, instead of sending the angel to the sinner to save him, or give him evidence that God had saved him, God sent him to another city, thirty miles north of Jerusalem, to tell the preacher to go to him. Why was it necessary for the preacher to go? I want to state, while on this question, in every case of conversion recorded in Acts of Apostles there is always a preacher present. Why? Because the gospel must be preached. It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes it. So the angel said to Philip: "Arise, and go toward the south, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert." And the record says "he arose and went," and about the time he was entering the road, the old Jerusalem road, that led

from Jerusalem to Gaza, which is desert—and that does not mean that the road was desert, but that old Gaza had been deserted and the new Gaza built, but the old Gaza road still led there—and just about the time this preacher was entering the old Gaza road, a man came riding along in his chariot reading the Old Testament Scriptures. He was worshiping under the Old Testament, and knew nothing of the Redeemer. The Savior had not been revealed to him. At the time he was reading about Jesus. You remember that the preacher asked him if he understood what he was reading. It is a good thing to read God's word, but man must understand it in order to be blessed by it; so the preacher asked him if he *understood* what he was reading, and he answered: "How can I, except some man should guide me? And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him." He tells us what he was reading: "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: in his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth." You remember the man said to the preacher: "Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?" And the record says he began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus—Jesus as his only Savior. I do not understand from this that he rode along just saying, "Jesus, Jesus, Jesus," but I believe he told who Jesus was, and what he was, and what he promised to do, and what he would have him do, and you remember the record says: "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart,

thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing." He had a right to rejoice, for this commission said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and certainly the man had done it. He surely had believed in the Redeemer. He had heard the story of the Redeemer, he had believed the story; and when he believed it, put it into practice by obedience to the gospel, he had the right to rejoice in the forgiveness of sins. He went on his way rejoicing. He had the right to do it. He believed that God would do what he had promised to do in this matter, and I tell you there is no man that has better right to rejoice tonight than the man that has obeyed the Savior and is relying on his promises, and I would rather have the one "*shall be*" of Jesus Christ than all the "feelings" of all the uninspired men that have ever been expressed in this world from the time that I first saw the light down to this present moment. I would rather risk my chances, my friends, on one "*shall be*" of Jesus Christ than to stand upon the "feelings" of all the uninspired men that have ever breathed the breath of life since the day I first had being in this world down to this present time. But this man had been taught the conditions of the commission; he had rendered obedience to it; he had complied with the conditions of the commission. Why, what a simple story is that! You know the brother complained last night that, according to my preaching, salvation is harder to get than

damnation. Well, my friends, it is worth more when you get it. However, it appears to me, according to this commission, there are about three conditions in order to salvation; while, according to Mark, there is but one condition to get damnation—if a man is looking for that.

The gentleman says: "I want you to tell what becomes of the man that believes and is not baptized"—that the commission does not say. If the commission does not say, why does he expect me to say? Why does he expect me to say where the Lord has not spoken? I do not want to say anything in this that would cast doubt in any man's mind in reference to the authority of the Savior to give it to the apostles.

But the story I have read you of the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch shows you what a simple story it is. Here is a man in the city of Jerusalem. God undertook to bring him under the gospel of Christ. Instead of sending the Holy Spirit into his heart to turn him to Christ, he sent an angel to a preacher thirty miles north of that city, and the angel sent the preacher. I had a friend who was preaching in a little town in this State, and there came up before him a man that was a deaf mute, but he had been educated in Knoxville, Tenn., and could read. He had a little black-backed Testament in his hands, and he walked up before the preacher, and pointed to this text: "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized." My friend pointed him to the next verse: "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." The deaf mute pointed to the next verse: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." That man rendered obedience, and I declared, when I heard it, that that man came as near confessing his faith in Jesus Christ with his mouth as mortal

man could who was dumb, and I have thought how that man could have gotten into the wrong church, and read it out of the book, and I have wondered how he could make a mistake, and read it out of the divine record that way.

I remember some years ago a man came to my house and called me. He was in a buggy. He said: "I want you to ride with me." We rode along to a little creek, a very beautiful stream of water. Finally he stopped his horse, and said: "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" I said: "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." And he answered and said: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." We got out of the buggy, and I went down with him into the water, and I buried him in baptism, and then we rode along back past my house. I got out and went in, and he went on his way rejoicing. Fourteen years after that I received a message over the telephone that that man was dead. I went to the house, and in the presence of his mother, who had never obeyed the gospel, because she had been taught that she could not do anything, I read this story from the eighth chapter of Acts, and I told them the story of how my friend had come for me and what I did for him. The two stories are exactly alike. It is easy and simple. I say that if God had made every possible effort, he could not have made it any plainer, easier, or simpler than he has made it. And the preaching of those apostolic preachers under it, and their acts coming up under it, are as plain and simple as it is possible to be made. How easy is the gospel! How plain the matter of man's redemption! How easy it is to understand it! And I tell you this evening, it is a more difficult thing for a man to get around it than to walk up and accept it. I believe

it requires more effort and study on the part of man to get around these plain statements than to accept them, believe and obey them, every time and all the time.

The question came up with reference to whether good works will save a person or not. I do not believe that good works will save an individual. I have never advocated this. In the tenth chapter of the Acts of Apostles a man is mentioned who certainly had many good works to his credit, for it was said: "There was a certain man in Cæsarea called Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian band, a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always. He saw in a vision evidently about the ninth hour of the day an angel of God coming in to him, and saying unto him, Cornelius." This man was a moral man. He was not only a moral man, but a praying man. He was not only a moral, praying man, but he saw an angel, and still that was not enough to save him, for in the eleventh chapter of Acts, in talking about the same thing, when the angel went to Cornelius, he 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." He was not a saved man, though he was a devout man. He was not a saved man, though a praying man. He was not a saved man, though he had seen an angel, but his salvation was reached by *obedience* to the commission. I say that the only difficulty with this man was that he had not heard the apostles preach the commission; and when he did hear this and obeyed it, he was not only a devout man and a praying man, but a saved man, because he had complied with the conditions of the commission. I say that the gospel

of the Son of God is that easy, that simple, that I believe, as I said before, that it requires more effort on the part of man to get around these things than it does to obey them. I believe it is so plain and easy that anybody can comprehend it.

I want now to state that not only was it a fact that this man in the eighth chapter of Acts was saved in harmony with this commission, but in the ninth chapter we have the record of the salvation of another. The man of whom I speak is Saul of Tarsus, and surely he was a sinner, a great sinner, for, in talking about himself, he says that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." (1 Tim. 1: 15.) Therefore, I say that the salvation of Saul of Tarsus was the salvation of a great sinner. He was on his way to Damascus at the time the story begins, with authority on his person to bind all that called upon the name of the Lord, whether men or women, and bring them back to Jerusalem to be punished. And on his way to Damascus a great light shone round about him, above the brightness of the sun, and he 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 there it shall be told thee what thou must do." (Acts 9: 4-6.) I call your attention to the fact that this man is in actual conversation with the Savior, and the Savior does not tell him what to do. Why? He had commissioned men to do this. He had placed the matter of preaching the gospel in the hands of men, and therefore he sent him to a man to tell him what to do. And Saul, in

harmony with the statement of the Savior, went into the city, and was there fasting and praying for three days and nights, without his sight, and Ananias came to him and said: "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." (Acts 9: 17.) And Ananias further said to him: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 22: 16.) I understand that his sins were washed away in the blood of Jesus Christ, but he had to comply with the conditions of salvation in order that it might be done. I say, according to this commission, that when he was baptized he had the promise "*shall be saved.*" I believe the washing away of sin means the same thing as "*shall be saved*" in the commission, and means the same thing as "*remission*" in the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke. Therefore, when Saul complied with the same conditions, I believe he received the same blessing.

You asked me this evening why Ananias did not tell him to believe and repent. If he had said, "You must believe," Saul could have said: "I have been a believer for three days; the Lord appeared to me three days ago, and I came here in obedience to that." If Ananias had said, "You must repent; you have been a very wicked man; you must repent of your sins," I believe Saul could have said: "I am penitent. I have been fasting and praying for three days and nights." And knowing these facts, instead of saying, "Believe and repent," he said: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." I believe that when Saul of Tarsus did that, he had the promise of salvation under this commission.

How plain is the plan of salvation! How easy its conditions! And I state to you this evening that we are talking to you—to men and women that have opportunities to learn the truth and know the teachings of Christ—and we are calling upon you to comply with these conditions in order to enjoy the blessings of this great and grand and glorious commission that was backed up by all the authority of Jesus Christ, and was sealed with his own heart's blood. I insist that this call is to you, to men that have opportunity, for I believe that what God requires of men in order to salvation is to lovingly and loyally submit to his authority. I believe that Jesus Christ is our only Redeemer, and has the right to give the terms and conditions upon which he will save us. He has the right to offer us salvation upon any terms he chooses. He has the right to elect the terms of salvation upon which he will save us, as he has done, and these terms are given in this remarkable commission, and they are placed here in such light that all can see and appreciate and understand them, if they can understand ordinary language. [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE'S FOURTH REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Before proceeding to notice the things that were brought out in the speech to which you have just listened, I wish to call attention to the fact that last night the gentleman introduced a text, Rom. 5: 2, and I gave him an argument on it in the form of a syllogism, placing him in a dilemma on his text. I handed it to him again a while ago, and he dropped it, and so I will just read it again.

1. "By whom also we have access by faith unto this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom. 5: 2.)

2. Unsaved men have faith. (Srygley.)

3. Therefore, unsaved men have access by faith into this grace wherein they stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

With reference to his blackboard, almost all of his speech is made on that. I might answer that again the same way it has been answered, and it would answer every statement that he made concerning it. However, he says or intimates that I am putting my hands on that commission, and proposing to tear it up and change it, because of the plain statement that I read you from God's word.

Let us try it again, and see whether I change it or not. Here is the unsaved man, or the unbeliever—that is the unsaved man. His text, the commission, says, "He that believeth not shall be damned," or "shall be condemned." We agree on that. All right. But here is another character that is men-

tioned in his text, which is the baptized believer. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." All right. We agree that that character is saved. Now, then, there is another class which this text does not mention. They are mentioned in other places in the Bible, and his proposition must necessarily involve them. According to his proposition, faith is first, repentance next, then baptism. What is he from the time he believes the testimony until he is baptized? He is an unbaptized believer. That is what he is. Then what about a man who is an unbaptized believer? What becomes of him? He cannot prove by his text what becomes of him. He cannot prove by that text whether he goes to heaven or to the lower regions, because the text says, "He that believeth not shall be damned," and it is the *baptized believer* that shall be saved. Hence we have disposed of the two classes mentioned in that text. But what about the other class that are not mentioned in that text—the *unbaptized believer*—what becomes of him? The gentleman's statement at one time was that there was no promise for them. All right. Let us agree that the baptized believer is saved and that the unbeliever is lost. Now, let us see about this third class, the unbaptized believer. John 5: 24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." There is the believer mentioned. What about his baptism? The text does not say. But he is a believer. Not only is that true, but I will quote the Interlinear: "He that hears my word, and believes him who sent me, has life eternal, and into judgment comes not, but has passed out of death into life." There is one who hears. What about him? "Has passed out of death into life." Let the gen-

tleman tell what he thinks becomes of the unbaptized believer. Then let him prove it by the Bible.

Several times he has quoted the text: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." But here is a man who is an unbeliever. I challenge him to find a text in God's word which says the gospel is the power of God to that man. Find it! Here is a man that is a believer, away over here. We do not deny that the gospel is the power of God to that man; but to sustain your position you must find a text that says the gospel is the power of God to this man here, the unbeliever. I challenge you to produce the text.

He would not "dare to express an opinion in the face of the commission." Well, I give you God's word. I don't have to express an opinion. The believer is one that has passed out of death into life. That is not simply my opinion, Brother Srygley; it is what the Savior said, and my opinion is that the Savior told the truth. What is your opinion?

He says, yes, he believes the commission, and that the salvation promised is remission of sins, saved from past sins. The proposition says that faith, repentance, and (water) baptism are conditions of pardon (or salvation) to an alien sinner. That is what the proposition says, that *faith, repentance, and (water) baptism are conditions of pardon (or salvation) to an alien sinner.*

He says it is like studying arithmetic. All right. The boy goes to school and studies his arithmetic. He works out an example. Then he is quickened into life. That is all there is to it. He says it is like that. The boy has no more life after he works the example than he had before. If he was dead when he began working the example, he is dead when he

gets the answer to it. He has the same life he had before, if he had any to start with.

He says that Abel and Abraham were saved before this commission went into effect. You remember the question I put to him: How many ways does God have of saving people? Is there just one way, by faith, repentance, and baptism? Did God save Abel and Abraham, then, without water baptism? The proposition does not say that God has always saved sinners upon the principle of believing and obeying what God says, but the proposition says that faith, repentance, and water baptism are conditions of pardon or salvation to an alien sinner. *That* is what the proposition says. Abel and Abraham were saved without these conditions; then, if Abel and Abraham were saved without these conditions, I will ask the gentleman: Were they saved God's way, or were they saved some one else's way? And if they were saved God's way, was it a perfect way? And if it was a perfect way, why did God change that way and put this way in effect? Is the way he has now a perfect way? How many ways does God have of saving people, anyhow? Answer that.

What became of Aunt Fannie Corbett?

If Abel and Abraham were saved without immersion in water, why not Aunt Fannie Corbett be saved that way, unless God has more than one way of saving people?

Then he quotes the promise made unto Abraham: "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." In one place I believe it says: "In thee and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." In another place: "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." He says the commission was given in order to the fulfillment of that promise. If so, it is

a signal failure. Seven-tenths of the human family, according to statistics, are without the gospel to-day! God made a failure! I always did believe your god was a failure.

Acts 2: 38 again. You notice how he answers my question on that! He answers that question by saying nothing about it. What was the question? In Acts 2: 38, 39, the apostle says: "The promise is unto you." He said that to these people before they were baptized. Was the promise unto them before baptism? If not, did the apostle tell the truth? That answers everything he has said with reference to Acts 2: 38.

He refers to Philip and the eunuch, in the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and he read at some length. I will just call attention to the thirtieth and thirty-first verses. "Philip ran thither to him." The Lord told Philip to go down there now, and Philip went, and saw the eunuch sitting in his chariot reading the prophet Esaias; he was reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. "And Philip ran thither to him, and heard him read the prophet Esaias, and said, Understandest thou what thou readest? And he said, How can I, except some man should guide me? And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him. The place of the scripture which he read was this," and so on. Now going to the thirty-fifth verse: "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. And as they went on their way they came to a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Now, what have we before we go further? We have this: Here is a man that had been to Jerusalem to worship God; hence he was a worshiper of God, but he needed instruction; he needed

the light of knowledge; and this man Philip was sent down there to guide him or instruct him aright, in the right way, and how to serve God acceptably. "They came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." The Elder would not baptize an unbeliever if he knew it. I am going to assume that for him, that he would not baptize an unbeliever if he knew it. Philip says that "if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." He believed. What is his condition now? St. John 5: 24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life [has eternal life], and shall not come into condemnation [or does not come into judgment]; but is passed from death unto life [or has passed out of death into life]."

Then, there was a child of God, and Philip went down there and baptized him. It was too late to baptize him to make a child of God out of him.

He says he has wondered how a man could get in the wrong church, and read it, or get it, out of the Book. That is presuming a great deal, it seems to me. That seems to me to be presuming a great deal—that people must be very ignorant that would do that way. Now you may take the rest of that for what it is worth.

He does not believe good works will save a man; but without doing good things the man will go to the bad place, all the same. Now let's see. Are faith, repentance, and water baptism works of righteousness, or are they works of unrighteousness? Please hand this to him. Now they are either works of righteousness or they are works of unrighteousness, and he says that they must do these in order to be

saved. Now I want him to tell us: Are they works of righteousness or unrighteousness?

He refers then to the case of Cornelius. Cornelius was a devout man. The very same word which is translated "devout," with reference to Cornelius, is translated "godly" in Peter's language, when he says that God "knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment." The very same word is translated *devout* with reference to Cornelius which is translated *godly* with reference to these characters. Let him deal with that and see what he does with it.

Then he refers to Saul journeying to Damascus to bind and cast into prison those that called on the name of the Lord. Saul had no will or desire to engage in the service of God in a gospel way when he started to Damascus, but before he got to Damascus he had a different will from what he had when he left Jerusalem. The first thing he heard was Jesus speaking to him: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord?" And the answer was: "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest." Saul was then made acquainted with the Lord right there, wasn't he? All right. John 17: 2, 3: "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." Those who know God already have eternal life. Then he said: "Lord, what will thou have me to do? [I am willing now to do your will; I am willing to do what you say do]." He was not willing to do this before, but now he is. From whence does this will spring? Certainly the gentleman will not tell us that a will does not spring from life. If the will for natural things springs from and grows out of the natural life, then a will for holiness and righteousness, a will to serve God aright, grows out of the divine

life. God implanted the divine life in his soul, and now he has a will to serve the Lord springing out of that life. And so the Savior said: Go down to Damascus, and there it will be told you what you shall do. The Lord was working with Ananias at the same time. In the ninth chapter, fifteenth verse, we have what the Lord said to Ananias. The Lord told Ananias to go to a certain place, where he would find this man—go and preach to him; go to him. Ananias said: No, I am afraid of that man; I know how this man has persecuted those who called on thy name. Listen to what the Lord said to him: “Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel. For I will show him what great things he must suffer for my name’s sake.” Hence, he was a chosen vessel, and Ananias was made acquainted with that fact. The Lord had also said: “Behold, he prayeth.” So Ananias is ready to go, and the first thing he said was, “Brother Saul.” “Brother Saul”—what does that mean—that Saul was a child of the devil and Ananias a child of God? Certainly Ananias recognized him as a brother in Christ in this. “*Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me*” unto you. Jesus was working then with the hearer and working with the preacher. He was working at both ends of the line, if you please. He prepared a man to hear the gospel, and now he prepares a man to preach the gospel, and sent him to preach to the man prepared. So that is the Lord’s work, and that is for the benefit of this character, then, to whom the Lord has appeared, and hence for God’s people, and not alien or unregenerate sinners.

Now I refer again to this chart. Matt. 7: 18, the Savior says that “a corrupt tree cannot bring forth

good fruit." Hearing the gospel preached—that is, giving heed to it, believing the testimony of the gospel, repenting of sins, and being baptized—is either bearing good fruit or else it is bearing bad fruit. It is one or the other. We maintain that to do this is to bear good fruit. The Savior says that a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. There is an alien sinner, a corrupt tree. The gentleman's doctrine says that this man, in order to reach this place over here, must do what the Son of God says he *cannot* do. John 8: 43: "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." The gentleman's position has in it that this man must do what the Son of God says he cannot do. But if he cannot do what the Son of God says he cannot do, and must do what the gentleman says he must, and the Son of God is correct about it when he says he cannot, then he cannot ever reach this place here. He cannot ever reach that place.

Let's see again. Hear, believe, repent are all before he crosses the line, and in the act of baptism he crosses the line. I put the line right over the B there, representing the idea that in baptism he crosses the line. Or, is it there, just before baptism, that he crosses the line? Or, is it just after baptism that he crosses it? I have asked the gentleman, I think, something about that, and I have not yet heard any reply. I will ask him now to tell us: Does the man cross the line just before baptism, or in the act of baptism, or just after baptism? Just when does he cross that line? You remember I had that up on Rom. 8: 8, 9: "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." On that side of the line he is in the flesh and cannot please God. Is it pleasing to God for him to hear, believe, repent, and be baptized? The apostle says while he is on that side of the line

he cannot please God. If it is pleasing to God for him to do these things, the apostle says he cannot do them. If he is saved by doing them, then the apostle having told the truth, that he cannot please God, then he is saved by displeasing God. The gentleman says that this man is saved by doing that which is displeasing to God. He cannot afford to do that, to say that he is saved by doing things that are displeasing to God. He must say that it is pleasing to God for the sinner to hear, believe, repent, and be baptized. Then if he is saved by doing that, he is saved by displeasing God, for the apostle says that on this side of the line he cannot please God. Will you tell us how you are going to get him across this line? Suppose he does come across that line. The gentleman argues that he does not have eternal life in this world only in promise. If not, he is not born of God when he crosses that line and does not possess eternal life. What has he then? That he is born dead, every one of them crossing the line born dead, every one of them. Hence his religion is a dead religion; has no life in it. No life in it, but a dead religion! All that cross the line are born in a state of death! No change! It is like working out an example in arithmetic; that is the way he says it is. He begins here and works on the example of hearing, believing, repenting, and being baptized, crossing over the line, and is then just like he was before he got to the line, has no more life.

Again, I will ask the gentleman: What does the word "quicken" mean in Eph. 2:1: "You hath he *quicken*ed?" I want him to answer that.

I shall now introduce some more negative arguments.

I introduce this argument: Repentance is not a condition in order to eternal life, because those who

truly repent are led to do so by the Lord, and those who are led by the Spirit of God are already children of God. Rom. 2: 4: "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" Please notice here that the goodness of God leadeth them to this place here, repentance.

Now, Rom. 8: 14: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." The apostle here says this man who is being led by the Spirit of God is a son of God. Now these arguments based on this:

First—

1. Those who repent of, or turn from, their sins, are led to do so by the Spirit of God. (Rom. 2: 4.)
2. Those who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God. (Rom. 8: 14.)
3. Therefore, those who repent (penitent characters) are children of God.

Second—

1. Those who repent (penitent characters) are children of God.
2. God's children have eternal life.
3. Therefore, those who repent (penitent characters) have eternal life.

Third—

1. Those who repent (penitent characters) have eternal life.
2. Baptism should be administered to penitent characters only.
3. Therefore, baptism should be administered to those only who have eternal life.

Here on the board we have the gentleman's position just exactly the reverse of what is the correct way. Instead of having born or saved over here, if he will put born over here, and after the birth then

hear, then believe, then repent and be baptized, he will have it correct. The one who hears is one that has been born.

Say, Brother Srygley, what did you hear about your father before you were born of your father? Did you have to hear and believe that he was your father? Say, did you have to hear something about him in order that he be your father, or in order that you be born of your parents?

My next argument which I introduce is: The proposition cannot be true, because eternal life is promised because of the work of Christ, not because of what the sinner does. Rom. 5: 6-10: "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." What is the promise in this text? That those characters for whom Christ died shall be saved by his life. That is the promise of God. The promise, then, is based on what Jesus Christ does, and not on what the sinner does, and hence his proposition cannot be true.

My next argument is: The proposition cannot be true, because it sets aside the work of Christ in the eternal salvation of sinners. Matt. 1: 21: "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins." Acts 4: 11, 12: "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of

the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." There is none other name save Jesus Christ. Salvation, then, depends on what Jesus Christ does, not on what the sinner does. [*Time expired.*]

MR. SRYGLEY'S FIFTH ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

MR. SRYGLEY'S BLACKBOARD.

“GO YE INTO ALL THE WORLD, AND PREACH THE GOSPEL TO EVERY CREATURE. HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED.” (Mark 16: 15, 16.)

“AND THAT REPENTANCE AND REMISSION OF SINS SHOULD BE PREACHED IN HIS NAME AMONG ALL NATIONS, BEGINNING AT JERUSALEM.” (Luke 24: 47.)

I am before you to continue the affirmation that faith, repentance, and baptism are conditions of salvation to an alien sinner. Those of you who have been present during this controversy will remember that I have based my contention almost entirely upon these two passages that are on the blackboard, and these passages are the language of the Son of God. Not only is that true, but this great commission is backed up by all *authority* in heaven and in earth; and not only is that true, but it embraces all of God's commandments, and is to continue for *all time*, with the promise of the Savior that he would be with it even to the end of the world.

But there were some things said last night that it would be well, I think, for me to examine. Perhaps you remember the syllogism. I may not be able to

state it exactly as he did, but I shall be able to give you the substance. He says that I preach faith before baptism, and that Paul says, in Rom. 5: 2: "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Therefore we are in God's grace before baptism. I have repeatedly shown, and will do so again, that my opponent has no proper conception of the term "faith" upon which salvation or justification is predicated.

In the beginning of this discussion I laid down, as a rule in dealing with faith and the grace of God, this statement, that "by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God;" and I have shown that faith is the medium or channel through which every spiritual blessing is received and enjoyed.

Now, if the gentleman wishes to know at what stage or degree in the development of faith we have access into the grace of God, let him note the following passages: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." (Eph. 1: 7.) Inasmuch as the remission of sins is the first blessing enjoyed by faith, it becomes necessary to inquire how we enter Christ, wherein these blessings are. God himself has told us, through the inspired apostle, that we are baptized into Christ. (See Rom. 6: 3, 4; Gal. 3: 27.) Hence when faith leads one to obey Christ in baptism, it is then through and by faith that we have access into this grace. Now I think the gentleman can understand that.

But just here I am reminded that the gentleman stated very emphatically yesterday that the baptism that puts us into Christ or into his body is Holy Ghost baptism, or spiritual baptism. I most em-

phatically deny that this is true, and demand that in his next speech he prove that it is Holy Spirit baptism.

He may ask how I know that it is water baptism. I know it for the following reasons: When a word is first used in any writing, whether human or divine, and its meaning and nature clearly defined by circumstances or specific description, it must then always and in every place in that writing or book mean the same, unless there is something in the context to show that the author uses it in a different sense or to indicate a different thing. Now, according to this rule, which my opponent cannot deny without doing violence to every law of language, I assert that the word "baptized" as first used in the New Testament means water baptism, and therefore it must in every place in which it appears in the New Testament refer to water baptism, unless there is something in the context to show that it is another kind of baptism. In harmony with this position I now read two passages. First: "And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." (Matt. 3: 6.) That is the first instance in which the word occurs in the New Testament, and my friend will not deny that it means water baptism there. The second passage is: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Matt. 3: 11.) Now if John had said "he shall baptize you" and stopped without saying "with the Holy Ghost," is there a mortal on this earth that would ever have concluded that Christ would ever baptize with anything but water? Now suppose, my friends, that when John had told how baptism was performed, and what it is, that they were baptized with water, suppose

that after this, the very next statement, he should have said, "And he shall baptize you," do you suppose that any man could have known but what Christ would baptize them with water?

Now let the gentleman say, if he can, that the word "baptize" in 1 Cor. 12: 13, Gal. 3: 27; Rom. 6: 3, 4, means Holy Ghost baptism. Suppose you try your hand on that. You have asserted it. I deny it. I give these as my reasons for not believing it. Will you tell us why it is Holy Ghost baptism? The only reason I can see why any man should think it Holy Ghost baptism is to get around one of the commandments or conditions. I cannot think of any other reason.

But again he says the believer is saved from sin. That depends on what kind of a believer he is. There are believers who live in sin, as stated in John 8: 31; 12: 42. If Brother Cayce means a penitent believer, I answer him, "No," but all such are under the guilt of sin until pardoned, which takes place when he obeys from the heart that form of doctrine which is delivered. "Being then made free from sin" (Rom. 6: 17) means from the guilt or dominion of sin.

But I want to call your attention to the evidence of pardon, as this has been brought up. How does Brother Cayce know that he has the remission of his sins, or does he really know it? As a matter of fact, he said positively of some unbaptized people [I wish you would hand me that song book] that he knew they had gone to glory; but, as a matter of fact, he does not know that he is going himself, according to his own songs, if he believes what he sings. I read you last night one song which says:

" It is a point I long to know,
Oft it causes anxious thought:
Do I love the Lord or no?
Am I his, or am I not?"

And in song No. 285 I notice here:

" If I love, why am I thus?
Why this dull and lifeless frame?
Hardly, sure, can they be worse,
Who have never heard his name."

Listen to the last verse:

" Let me love him more and more,
If I love at all, I pray;
Shine upon thy work of grace,
If it be indeed begun."

He does not know whether it is begun in him or not, but still he could say positively of some one that died without obedience to the gospel that she had gone to glory; but he cannot say it about himself, if he sings what he believes.

On this evidence of pardon, I notice—how does Brother Cayce know that he has remission of sins? His evidence is in his feeling, but God says: "He that trusteth in his own heart [feeling] is a fool." (Prov. 28: 26.) "I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake." (1 John 2: 12.) Now if personal feelings are evidence, how could John know what took place in the heart of others? Paul says: "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" (1 Cor. 2: 11.) Ah, but my friend says: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." That is true, but he has only told half the truth. How do we know that we love the brethren? Let the same apostle tell us. "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his com-

mandments." (1 John 5: 2.) What is the love of God? "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." (1 John 5: 3.) Is not baptism a commandment of God? And do we love him if we do not obey it?

But Brother Cayce says that people do not have to believe his doctrine to be saved. I am sure you all remember his saying that last night, and I am sure he said that with as much grace as anything he has said in this meeting. Does not my opponent see the ridiculous position in which he put himself by lugging into this debate the destinies of the pious unimmersed? With one single remark he has unwittingly surrendered his whole contention in this discussion. He says people can have Christ and go to heaven without believing the doctrine advocated by the Old Baptists. Very well. In this I am sure he is right. But I ask: Can they have Christ and go to heaven without believing and accepting the doctrine of Christ? Can they? It is said: "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." (2 John 9.) If a man can disbelieve the Old Baptist doctrine and be saved, then it is not the doctrine of Christ, because John said that if any man has not the doctrine of Christ, he is not with him, he neither has God nor Christ. The gentleman then admits that his doctrine is not the doctrine of Christ, and that he is wrong in his contention. It is true that he has been forced to do so, but he has done it, nevertheless. But this is not the first time that he has unwittingly surrendered his contention, for it will be remembered that when I pressed him to know if God had forced eternal life upon the sinner whether he wanted it or not, he, in an unguarded

moment, said the sinner had to desire eternal life before God gave it to him. That is admitting at least *one condition* before God bestows eternal life. I am sure you remember that, and I am sure my friend does, too.

But, again, the gentleman seems exceedingly anxious for me to tell him what becomes of the unbaptized believer. Whenever he opens his Bible and points out a believer that did not at the same hour of the day or night obey God in baptism, I will look after the case, if it comes under the commission. Again, if he will open his Bible and find, after this commission went into effect, an unbaptized believer that is not making an effort to be baptized, I will tell him, if such an individual can be found, that he did not have the promise of the commission. The truth is that the New Testament knows only two kinds of believers—viz., those who obey God in baptism and those who, like the characters in John 12: 42, believed, but refused to confess or acknowledge Christ. Does he hold that a believer who refuses to acknowledge Christ, or who is ashamed of Christ, is in a saved state? If so, I will remind him of the fact that Christ said: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." (Mark 8: 38.)

Now about spiritual works. Healing the sick, cleansing of leprosy, etc., are spiritual works, because they were done by miraculous power. Christian works are not worship, but those acts performed by Christians which terminate not within or upon themselves, but upon others. We can only serve God by serving his creatures. The gentleman, in an ef-

fort to answer this position, quoted a passage with reference to worship, and not to Christian work.

But, again, he asked, I believe, thirty-two questions last night, and of course he prepared them at his home. I know he must have spent considerable time and effort on them, because I watched him, and I looked at the questions, and the attitude with which he got them off showed that he was proud of them, that he had given them considerable attention; and I took them and put them in my pocket, and went home, and took a little time to answer them, and I have the answers. I want the stenographer to get these answers and the numbers as I give them; and if the gentleman is not able to make out by the numbers the answer that belongs to each question, if he will call around at my office some time, I will tell him how it goes.

No. 1. Only one at a time.

No. 2. No.

No. 3. To fulfill all righteousness.

No. 4. No responsible person has a promise.

No. 5. Not according to the gospel.

No. 6. No promise to responsible people.

No. 7. No. He is not responsible.

No. 8. No, not unless the one who made the promise omits the condition.

No. 9. In answering Question 8 this one is answered.

No. 10. The answer to Question 7.

MR. CAYCE.—Brother Moderator, I insist that he read the questions.

MR. SRYGLEY.—Why, you read the questions. You do not expect me to read your questions? He read them himself. I will not stand for that. You have not read these answers yet, but will have the privilege. They were not asked for anything but to take up my time to read them. We will give them the questions, of course, if he desires to read them.

MR. CAYCE.—This audience will not know what question he is answering, unless he reads the question.

MR. SRYGLEY.—Yes, yes.

MR. SHEPHERD.—We propose that the debate shall be published, and they can read them in the published book.

MR. CAYCE.—I insist that these questions not go in his speech unless he reads them.

MR. SRYGLEY.—You read them. Read them yourself. Don't read them on my time. There is not a thing in them.

MR. DAILY.—On this point I want to say that inasmuch as doubtless there are many here that were not here last evening, they have not heard the questions at all.

MR. SRYGLEY.—Brother Cayce can read them on his time.

MR. DAILY.—And doubtless those who are here who were here last evening cannot remember the questions by the numbers.

MR. SRYGLEY.—He can read them.

MR. DAILY.—So I insist that he read the questions and the answers. That is the proper way to answer the questions.

MR. SRYGLEY.—I insist that I will not do it. He has his own time to read them in and can take up all the time he wants to in reading them.

MR. SHEPHERD.—The questions have been answered here, and, of course, as they were read quickly and put in that way, Brother Cayce can read them as he gets to them.

MR. CAYCE.—I insist, Moderators, that if he does not read the questions as he answers them, that these questions be not inserted in his speech, only the number.

MR. SRYGLEY.—You will have all the time you want when your time comes to read the questions.

MR. SHEPHERD.—These questions will be published in your speech, and also in Brother Srygley's speech with the answers to them.

MR. CAYCE.—No, sir; what goes in his speech is what he says, and he is not giving the questions.

MR. SHEPHERD.—The speech that he is now delivering will embody these questions with the answers.

MR. CAYCE.—He has no right to insert the questions in his speech unless he reads them.

MR. DAILY.—Mr. Chairman, may I have a word? It is expected that this debate be published in book form, and what Elder Srygley says is expected to be published in Elder Srygley's speeches. If he does not read the questions, the questions do not go into his speeches.

MR. SRYGLEY.—No, these questions do not go in my speech, but the answer to them goes into it.

MR. CAYCE.—I will agree to that.

MR. SRYGLEY.—No. 10. The answer to Question 7 disposes of this question.

No. 11. The little child is not saved, but safe.

No. 12. No.

No. 13. It teaches that a person should receive the kingdom, and of course he receives it by complying with the conditions.

No. 14. Yes.

No. 15. Yes.

No. 16. No, not at the same time.

No. 17. No. See answer to Question 16.

No. 18. Yes. See answer above.

No. 19. By faith and obedience.

No. 20. That depends on what law you are talking about.

No. 21. Without the shedding of blood there is no remission.

No. 22. Paul said there had been. (Rom. 8: 12.)

No. 23. No. (See Heb. 9: 15.)

No. 24. I answer by referring to Deut. 29: 29.

No. 25. The Bible gives no information on that subject.

No. 26. I am doing what I can to preach the gospel, and it is Elder Cayce that belittles it by saying there is no power in it to save.

No. 27. God will attend to them. It is not my fault, but Brother Cayce's fault.

No. 28. J. R. Graves said: "It means nothing else, and no Baptist that we ever heard or read of believed otherwise until A. Campbell frightened them away from an interpretation that is sustained by the consensus of all scholars of all denominations in all ages."

No. 29. Christ said: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." (John 3: 5.)

No. 30. Jerusalem which is above is our mother. (Gal. 4: 26.)

No. 31. God.

No. 32. A man shows his love to God by respecting his institution, the church.

Now I have answered these questions. You put the questions down in that way that all who read can see the answer that belongs to it. I will not take up my time reading the questions.

But, again, concerning death and sleep. Now I believe just at this point is a vital mistake that my friend makes. You remember during this controversy all the time he was insisting that if a sinner was dead, or said to be dead in the Bible, that the condition described by death was of such a nature

that man could not hear, believe, and obey God, and then he could not do anything to raise himself to life, and illustrated it by real death, and did not make the proper distinction, as I have insisted all the time, between the metaphorical and the literal meaning of the word. And so, my friends, the matter went on for a few nights, and I called his attention to a statement made by Paul, where he said: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." (Eph. 5: 14.) I called attention to that passage to show that a man could do something in arising from the dead. My friend complained, because he said those were not alien sinners. I did not say they were. I did not quote it to prove that. I quoted the passage to show you that man *could do* something in arising from the dead. Then the gentleman came back at that, and said it ought to be "arise from among the dead." I looked over some translations of the Greek, and I found that no man had translated it that way before him. There may be others, but I did not find them, and so I began to look back at the other word, "Awake thou that *sleepest*," and I find that sleep was the word that Jesus Christ himself used in connection with death—not only in connection with it, but used that very word to describe the very same state or condition. You remember the case. Jesus said to his disciples before he got to the home of Lazarus, "He *sleepeth*," though "when Jesus came, he found that he had been dead four days," and still he describes it with that word "*sleep*," and that, my friends, is not the metaphorical use, but the literal use of it.

The difficulty with my friend is that he does not understand the words "death" and "sleep" when they are used in the word of God tropically or metaphorically. His contention is that because the Bible

says a sinner is dead, he therefore cannot believe and obey the gospel. He should consult some good dictionary or lexicon on the meaning of these words.

Thayer gives the metaphorical meaning of the word "*katheudo*" as follows: "*To yield to sloth and sin, and be indifferent to one's salvation.*" Thayer says that is *sleep*. He not only defines it that way, but, rather, back of that, he gives the meaning of the word without a figure, and says it means death, and quotes the very passage that I quoted a while ago: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead." Not only is that true, but under the metaphorical meaning of the word "*nekros*" (death), he quotes the passage that my opponent has been quoting from the fifth chapter of John that he thought meant literal death, as death to sin: "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." (John 5: 25.)

Now he has looked at his Greek, and talked about reading from the original, when he was reading from nothing but a translation of the original.

I will read you the definition of the word "*nekros*," the word translated by "death." Not only do we have the word "sleep," but here is the word "death." Thayer says: "Spiritually dead—that is, *destitute of a life that recognizes and is devoted to God, because given up to trespasses and sins; inactive as respects doing right.*" Thayer says that is the meaning of the word translated "dead." And let me tell you, he gives under that definition the very passage I have quoted from the fifth chapter of Ephesians, and also he gives under that definition the one that my friend relies upon in the second chapter of Ephesians to prove that the sinner is so dead that he cannot hear God and believe the truth;

and I say, that being the case, I commend the gentleman to the study of some good dictionary or lexicon upon the meaning of the word "death" in the figurative or tropical meaning of it.

I read you Thayer's definition as I have it here: "*Katheudo, to fall asleep, to drop off to sleep, the literal meaning of the word,*" as in Matt. 25: 5. The tropical or metaphorical meaning of the word is asleep to sin, to be indifferent to one's salvation. Under this last definition he places Eph. 5: 14 to be "dead." He gives that as a definition of the word "asleep," to be dead. He also defines "*nekros*" tropically, spiritually dead, or destitute of a life that recognizes and is devoted to God, because given to trespasses and sins, negative as respects doing right, and under this definition he puts John 5: 25, the one that you thought referred to literal death, refers to death to sin, and my friend Cayce's passage, Eph. 2: 15. In the saying, "Let the dead bury their dead," Thayer says: "Leave those who are indifferent to the salvation offered them in the gospel, to bury the dead bodies of their own dead (Matt. 8: 28; Luke 9: 60)."

A man who is dead to Shakespeare is the man who knows nothing about him and cares nothing for his works. Therefore, the only way to make such a man alive to Shakespeare is by giving him information about him and his writings. The same is true of one who is dead to God. The only way to make him alive to God is by teaching him, and therefore Christ said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" and Paul said: "But ye have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus." (Eph. 4: 20, 21.)

Reference has been made here to the baptism of

Cornelius. My friend says that Cornelius was a godly man before he was baptized. I say he was a worshiper of God; but he, like the eunuch, did not know that the old law had been replaced by the new covenant. Peter was sent to preach to the Gentiles, and said: "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." (Acts 15: 7.) Now I submit that if Cornelius, though a pious and a devout man, was saved before Peter preached to him, he was saved without the gospel, which was God's power to save; but this cannot be true in this case, because Peter was sent to tell him words whereby he and his house should *be saved*. (Acts 11: 14.) This goes to emphasize my contention in this controversy. If this pious, reverential man was not saved until he obeyed the gospel of Christ, by what authority can my opponent claim that such characters to-day are in a saved state, who have not obeyed the gospel?

Every government, whether human or divine, is built upon a constitution which embodies the basic principles of that government, and all subsequent enactments must harmonize with the constitution. In the Constitution of the United States we have as the basic law of our government the terms and conditions upon which foreigners may become citizens of this commonwealth and be entitled to all the privileges and immunities as citizens of this government. Now any effort at citizenship, or promises of such privileges which do not harmonize with the Constitution, contain the spirit of treason; and I insist that the man who would dare lay his hands upon this Constitution is a traitor against God. When Congress or legislatures enact laws that conflict with the Constitution, they are ineffective because of their un-

constitutionality. The constitution of the commonwealth of Israel came from the glory-lit summit of Mount Sinai, in which were embodied the basic principles of that commonwealth, with the supreme sovereignty of God emphasized in thunder tones. Now once more I call your attention to the constitution of the kingdom of Christ, in which is laid down the basic law of this government, and every future act of conversion sought to be impressed upon the world not in harmony with this constitution breathes the spirit of treason. Whoever offers poor, lost, and ruined sinners the privileges of the kingdom of heaven short of the terms of this constitution, sealed with the blood of the Son of God, is an enemy to Christ and a traitor to his God. I insist that this is true. I do not care who does it. Any man who lays his unholy hands upon this and changes "shall be saved" from the place where my Savior put it, is a traitor against high heaven, and I insist that no man can do it and I not raise my voice against it. I do not claim to have more power than other men. I do not claim to be more loyal than others in this city. I believe there are numbers who will stand for the Constitution of this kingdom, and will not stand by quietly and allow any man to lay his hands upon the basic law of the government of God. [*Time expired.*]

MR. CAYCE'S FIFTH REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you again in the negative of the proposition which reads: "Faith, repentance, and (water) baptism are conditions of pardon (or salvation) to an alien sinner, and the Scriptures so teach."

I do not remember hearing the proposition stated in the speech to which you have just listened.

Before taking up the things to which you have just listened in the speech gone before, I wish to call attention to something that has already transpired.

But, first, I would ask Brother Srygley what became of Aunt Fannie Corbett.

The statement was made last night by the gentleman's moderator that no one on earth knows what became of Mrs. Corbett. If my friend's proposition is true—you get that—if my friend's proposition is true, Mrs. Corbett is in hell. Why? His proposition is that no one can attain unto pardon or forgiveness of sins without faith, repentance, and water baptism, and you understand what he teaches water baptism to be—immersion. So, if no one can be saved in heaven without the pardon or forgiveness of sins, and no one can obtain pardon or forgiveness of sins without faith, repentance, and baptism in water, then Mrs. Corbett could not obtain pardon or forgiveness of her sins, because she was not baptized in water. Hence, if the gentleman's proposition is true, Mrs. Corbett is in hell.

But the statement was made that no one on earth knows what became of Mrs. Corbett. Then, if no one on earth knows what became of Mrs. Corbett,

no one on earth knows whether that proposition is true or not.

The statement was also made that no one knows what becomes of the heathen. If no one can obtain salvation, or eternal life, or pardon of sins, without faith, repentance, and water baptism in order to that end, then none of the heathen can obtain salvation; and if no one on earth knows anything about what becomes of the heathen, then no one on earth knows whether the gentleman's proposition is the truth or not. He doesn't know whether the proposition is the truth or not. He has been affirming a proposition for three nights, and does not know whether it is the truth or not. Does any one know whether it is the truth or not? Yes; I know, according to the plain statement of God's word, that "whosoever loveth is born of God." Mrs. Corbett gave evidence that she loved God, and hence she was born of God. If born of God, a child of God; and if a child of God, saved in heaven. Hence I know that the proposition is not the truth.

Brother Srygley, is Aunt Fannie Corbett in heaven or in hell?

I tried also to get him to say whether or not one must be a member of the church that he is a member of in order to be a member of the body of Christ. The gentleman would not say. Then I read from their own publications that this is their position, and hence I was not charging consequences, but that is the doctrine itself.

He does not read to you the dilemma in which I have placed him. I had the dilemma numbered twelve, and gave it to him in writing. He does not read that so that you may have before you what he is answering, but I will read it for you. I think I can quote it from memory:

1. "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom. 5: 2.)

2. Unsaved men have faith. (Srygley.)

3. Therefore, unsaved men have access by faith into this grace wherein they stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

Unsaved men doing that!

With reference to Rom. 6: 17, he says I was not reading the Greek. I did not profess to read the Greek words, but I was reading the Interlinear translation. It says: "But thanks be to God, that ye were bondmen of sin, but ye obeyed from the heart a form of teaching to which ye were delivered. And having been set free from sin, ye became bondmen to righteousness." Whose servants were they until they were set free? Bondmen to what? To sin. Is a man a bondman to sin who is repenting of his sins? If so, he is serving sin. When were they set free from sin? When they were delivered to the form of teaching.

He denies that it is the Holy Spirit baptism that puts one into Christ, and demands that I prove it. Well, it devolves upon him to prove now. He is in the affirmative. He is the gentleman to prove.

"Baptism first used means water," and then he quoted two passages referring to John's baptism. I wonder if he would accept John's baptism as Christian baptism? What do you say about it?

If I understand your position correctly (and if I am not correct, you will correct me), it is that Christian baptism began on Pentecost, and you have Holy Spirit baptism mentioned before Pentecost; so you have not gained anything at all by your contention.

He says Cayce's confidence is in his feeling. He

made sport, the other night, of feeling. Not only that, but you will remember that he indirectly charged, on the last night of the first proposition, in his last speech, when I had no opportunity of replying, that we hold that a man may be wicked and do all manner of wickedness and sinfulness, and so on—that God predestinated and fixed it all—which position I *deny emphatically*.

But here I will ask you a question: *How do you know you love your wife?* Please hand this to him. Did somebody have to tell you in order that you find it out? He does not know anything about how he loves his wife. He doesn't know unless somebody told him. He never would have known that he loved his wife, he could not have found that out, by the way he feels toward her. He denies feeling. He makes sport of that.

And he said: "Can they go to heaven without accepting Christ and his doctrine?" I ask the gentleman to tell us: How can one accept Christ and his doctrine who has never heard of Christ and his doctrine? Then, *will God send them to hell because they do not accept Christ and Christ's doctrine, when they have never heard of Christ and his doctrine?* If so, upon what principle of justice will he do that?

He says that I said the sinner had to desire eternal life before God would give it to him. Mistaken! I said that desire springs from life. If one has a desire for natural things, it proves that he has the natural life. A desire for godliness, a desire for holiness, a hungering and thirsting after righteousness, is proof that the righteous life already exists in the soul. That is what I said, and I say it again.

"Spiritual works are spiritual works because done by spiritual or divine power." I showed him where the apostle said that you, "as lively stones, are built

up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God." That is rendering service to God and doing spiritual works.

Eph. 5: 14 again. He dwells at some length on that, and then gives Thayer's definition. The gentleman's contention last night was that the two words were the same—

MR. SRYGLEY.—I leave that to the moderators, if that was my contention last night. I deny that.

MR. CAYCE.—If you deny it, I will accept it. Then there is a difference, and he admits it. All right. "Awake thou that sleepest." The lexicon published by Hinds & Noble, New York, gives the word "sleep," defines that word sleep—the very word he defines as dead. Liddell and Scott define the word which is translated *dead* there in Ephesians as a dead body, a corpse. Hence they were commanded to come out from among the dead, and the word "dead" means the same as a dead body or corpse. That is the same word that is used in John 5: 25—the same word. The same word is translated "dead" in both places. "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." (John 5: 25.) It is the same word—*nekroi*. Look and see. All of you investigate it. I know what I am talking about. And so when he says, "Awake thou that sleepest," he is not talking to those that are in that dead state, as a corpse; but you rise up from among them, come out from among them. He says he has investigated, but he has not found a translation that reads that way. Well, let me see. Here it is in the Interlinear translation: "Wherefore he says, Arouse thou that sleepest [or the sleeping ones], and rise up from among the dead, and shall shine upon thee the Christ." That is the Interlinear translation. That

is one translation. Wilson's Emphatic Diaglott says: "Awake thou the one sleeping, and arise thou out of the dead ones." *Arise out of the dead ones.* What does that mean but to rise up and come out from among the dead ones? He did not tell the dead ones to arise, did he? But he told somebody that was asleep and had life to come out from among the dead ones. What are you doing over there? You have no business there. You are in the wrong place. Come out from among the dead ones.

He says that if Cornelius was saved before Peter went there, then he was saved without the gospel, which is God's power to save. You will remember that I asked the gentleman if all of God's power to save was in the gospel. Has he answered it? No, sir, he has not answered that. But do you remember the challenge that I made him last night in regard to his text, Rom. 1: 16: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth?" We do not deny that the gospel is God's power to save to the believer; but what he needs is a text that says the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to the unbeliever. I challenged him to produce the text that says that. Has he done so? Not yet. He has one more speech. Perhaps he will produce it then.

But with reference to Cornelius, he admits he was a pious man. All right. The very same word is translated *godly* in 2 Pet. 2: 9: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the *godly* out of temptation." That is the very same word.

Brother Srygley, what became of Aunt Fannie Corbett?

I now have a few more questions for the gentleman:

If you would not baptize a man before he believes,

what has baptism to do with the new birth, since "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God?" (1 John 5: 1.)

Did John tell the truth when he said: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God?"

If a believer is born of God, do you not administer baptism too late for it to be in order to regeneration?

If a believer has been born again, and one must believe before he is baptized, and is born again in water baptism, how many times is he born again?

Brother Srygley, is Aunt Fannie Corbett in heaven or in hell?

If "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," then what is that which is born of the water?

In the new birth, which do you consider the more important element—God or the water?

If one must be baptized in order to the pardon of his sins, or in order to receive eternal life, must he not be baptized with that express object in view in order that he receive pardon in baptism?

Do you believe any of the Methodists will be saved?

Do you believe any of the Presbyterians will be saved?

Do you believe any Missionary Baptists will be saved?

Do you believe any Primitive Baptists will be saved?

Do you believe anybody will be saved except the Mormons and those who belong to your church?

If no one can be saved without baptism in order to the remission of sins, how can any be saved except the Mormons and your people, with possibly a few

immersed Catholics, seeing the others do not baptize in order to the remission of sins?

Do you believe infants are saved?

Were not eight souls saved in the ark by water?

Were they saved with an eternal salvation by water?

Were not all those persons who were not in the ark destroyed by water?

Were all those persons sent to hell who were destroyed by water, not being in the ark?

If they were sent to hell, were they not sent there by water?

If those in the ark were saved with an eternal salvation by water, did they not go to heaven by a water route?

If those who were destroyed were sent to hell, did they not go to hell by a water route?

Was it not water that destroyed those who were not in the ark?

Did not the water damn more people than it saved in this instance?

If you believe that all who were destroyed, not being in the ark, were sent to hell, do you not believe some infants are in hell?

Can a system of salvation be true which would damn more people than it would save?

Were people saved before the coming of Christ by faith, repentance, and baptism?

If not, were they saved some other way?

Then did not God change his way of saving people?

Did he know before the change was made that the present way would be better than the old way?

If he did not know that it would be a better way, then he did not know which was the better way, did he?

If he knew that the present way was a better way, why would he try the inferior way first?

Hold these till I come there. I want to change these to read exactly as I read them; there are two or three words changed.

Brother Srygley, is Aunt Fannie Corbett in heaven or in hell?

I wish now to introduce some negative arguments; but before introducing negative arguments again, I want to call attention to this blackboard again. Matt. 7: 18: "Neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." My friend's doctrine requires this man to do what the Son of God says he *cannot* do, in order to be saved, in order to have salvation.

John 8: 43: "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." The gentleman's doctrine requires that this man do what the Son of God says he *cannot* do, in order to his eternal salvation. The gentleman's doctrine is that he must hear, that he must believe, that he must repent and be baptized in order to be born again, or in order to obtain salvation. He has the order turned right around. If he would place the birth first, he would have it in the logical way. I asked the gentleman to tell us: What did you hear and what did you believe concerning your parents before you were born of your parents? He has not answered that. Again, if one is first born of his parents before he hears of his parents, then one must first be born of God, first born of the heavenly parentage, then he may be taught who his Father and who his mother are; then he begins to believe, and realizing that he is a sinner in the sight of God, or a sinner by nature, this having been made manifest to him by the light of life which delivers from the darkness of death, he then begins to repent of his sins and

to hate them. Then there is a light in the gospel which delivers from the darkness of ignorance, and this must necessarily be for those who are living.

I now introduce my negative arguments; but first I want to ask Brother Srygley another question. Brother Srygley, is Aunt Fannie Corbett in heaven or in hell?

The proposition cannot be true, because salvation is by grace, while the proposition would make it by works. *Is baptism a work, or is it grace?* Sinners are saved by grace, and works are excluded. Eph. 2: 1-10: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved)."

Now, notice, when they are over here in this condition, they are walking after the course of this world, and are by nature the children of wrath, even as others. They are not seeking after God. They are not loving him, are not loving his gospel, are not believing in Christ, but are in sin, and committing sin all the time prior to the time that they reach this point in their pathway, and at this point in their pathway they are quickened into life, put on the other side of the line by the quickening power of God's Holy Spirit, and that is because God loved them.

By the way, you remember I asked the gentleman: Did God love Esau? He has not answered that yet, and I do not suppose he will in his last speech.

“And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” They are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus UNTO good works. Where are the good works? Where do they come in? On which side of the line? After being created in Christ Jesus; then in this he is brought to where the good works are, and where he is commanded to obey God; and I maintain that this character is the one who can render acceptable service unto God—the one created in Christ Jesus *unto* good works.

Rom. 11: 6: “And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.” Now it is either by grace that the sinner receives eternal life, or else it is by works. It is either one way or the other, for the apostle here says that if it is by grace, then it is no more of works, and if it is by works, then it is no more of grace. It is not a mixture, as the gentleman would argue, at all. It is altogether one way or the other, and the apostle has told us which way it is, *by grace, not of works*, lest any man should boast; and hence his proposition cannot be true.

I wish also to introduce this argument: The gentleman's proposition or position cannot be true, be-

cause it denies that God's people have eternal life. It therefore denies the record that God has given of his Son, and makes God a liar. 1 John 5: 10-12: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that GOD HATH GIVEN TO US ETERNAL LIFE, and this life is in his Son. He that *hath the Son HATH LIFE*; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

My next argument is: The proposition cannot be true because God imputes righteousness without works. Rom. 4: 1-8: "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, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin."

Brother Srygley, is Aunt Fannie Corbett in heaven or in hell?

My next argument is: The proposition cannot be true, because repentance is not a condition to be performed by the sinner in order to eternal life, because Jesus *gives* repentance to Israel. Acts 5: 30, 31: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior,

for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins."

My next argument is: Repentance cannot be a condition in order to eternal life, or the promise of it, because it would proceed from a worldly source, hence would be a worldly sorrow. 2 Cor. 7: 10: "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death." This man is a worldly man while in that condition which the apostle calls "in the flesh." He cannot please God until he crosses this line. While he is on the other side, if he exercises repentance there, on that side of the line, it cannot be a condition in order to his eternal salvation, because he cannot please God until he is brought across the line.

My next argument is that the proposition cannot be true, because faith is a fruit of the Spirit. Hence one must first possess the Spirit in order to produce the fruit (faith), and one who possesses the Spirit is already a child of God, already has life. Gal. 5: 22, 23: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law." I wonder which the gentleman would expect first in the order of nature, the tree or its fruit? Here we are emphatically told that faith is a fruit of the Spirit. As the tree must exist in order to the production of the fruit, it follows that one must first have the Spirit of God in order that he manifest the fruit of the Spirit, which is faith, and hence he is already in possession of the Spirit and a child of God.

Rom. 8: 9: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

1 John 5: 12: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

My next argument is: The proposition cannot be true, because faith is dealt to and given us by the Spirit of God. Rom. 12: 3-5: "For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith. For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."

Here we have it emphatically stated that God deals faith. If God deals faith, then he measures it out, and it is therefore the gift of Almighty God—not something to be done by the sinner in order that he have a home in heaven, or in order that he be saved in heaven.

My next argument is: The proposition cannot be true, because a man cannot exercise something he does not possess, and some men (alien sinners) do not possess faith.

2 Thess. 3: 1, 2: "Finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified, even as it is with you: and that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: for all men have not faith." The apostle does not mean that no man has faith, but some men are not in possession of faith. Suppose a man is here who is destitute of his right arm, he has his right arm cut off here at the shoulder, and I say to him: "Exercise your right arm! Exercise your right arm, I tell you!" You would know I was telling him to do something impossible for him to do. The gentle-

man's proposition and his doctrine have in them that a man must do something that is impossible for him to do. The man cannot exercise faith who is destitute of it. [*Time expired.*]

MR. SRYGLEY'S SIXTH ADDRESS.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you to make the last speech that I shall have occasion to make during this debate. There are some things that were said during the first part of the debate on this proposition that I desire to notice, as well as a few things that were said in the speech to which you have just listened, and then I desire to sum up the arguments, as best I can, that I have been able to make during the discussion of this proposition.

I state, first, that my friend not only makes a mistake in the metaphorical meaning or use of the words "sleep" and "death," but he makes the same mistake in the metaphorical meaning or use of the word "born." He has asked me time and again if I had any choice with reference to my natural birth, or if that birth was brought about by any act of mine, and since it was not, therefore he comes to the conclusion that the spiritual birth is accomplished in the same way. Now, I would have you notice, my friends, that the gentleman makes the same mistake here that he does with reference to "death" and "sleep." Let me call your attention to these words: "And when Peter was come to himself, he said, Now I know of a surety that the Lord hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me." (Acts 12: 11.) The word there translated "*delivered*" is the word translated in other places by "born," and Peter was therefore born at that time. Of course

he did not mean that he was born anew or born of the Spirit; but that is the word, the same word, in a metaphorical sense, that we have for born. Well, does that mean that Peter knew nothing before that time? Or does it mean that he was not an active, intelligent being when he was delivered? He had to follow the angel in order to be delivered or born? I stated that the gentleman does not understand the metaphorical use of the word "*death*" or "*sleep*" or "*born*," and that is the reason that he makes such a *mistake* in his conclusion.

Now let me state that on the matter of *sleep* and *death*, he started to say that I said that they were the same word. He misunderstood me. I said that two words meaning the same thing were sometimes used for double emphasis, and that sleep and death were used in the fifth chapter of Ephesians for that purpose, and that the same state is described by the two words. My Master said, "The maid is not dead, but sleepeth," and they laughed him to scorn. More than that, when he said, "Lazarus sleepeth," he used this word "sleep," but he used it in a literal sense to describe the state of death in which Lazarus was, and my contention is that he used the word "sleep" in Eph. 5: 14 in a metaphorical sense to describe their spiritual condition. The reason the gentleman cannot take hold of this is because he *cannot answer it*. I say that the two words are different, but they describe the same condition, and when Paul said, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead," Cayce says it means arise from *among* the dead, and he sought to avoid the force of this position by introducing the word "among." My friend, you surely do not put Wilson down as the equal of the men that gave us the Revision. You certainly know more about this matter than that; but granting

that it is "among," the contention I make is that the apostle describes the same state by "sleep" and "death" when he said, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead," and he does not get out of his difficulty by putting the word "among" in before "dead," for they were commanded to *awake* from sleep. I suppose if he had known that in time, he would have tried to twist something in before "sleep," to get it fixed, but it came too late on that.

I notice, furthermore, the gentleman's speech about old Sister Corbett. I have tried to speak of her in a respectful way, and I say to you that if she has relatives and friends in this audience, I do not believe they will appreciate this joke-making of her. I do not believe they will appreciate the fact that he endeavors to make a joke about the death of this old lady. I do not believe there is any joke about it. I have never seen the day that I would make a joke of the death of anybody's mother. I remember too well the telegram that came to me that said, "Your mother has passed over the river," to speak about it in such a way as this, and I tell you if that old mother has children in this audience, or in the city, who know that you are bandying her name in this way, and making a joke of her death, I am very sure that they will not appreciate it. The question was only introduced to gain sympathy, and I do not believe he will get it. I think he carries this entirely too far, my friends. It is too serious a matter for him to treat in such a light way as that, and I tell you that no man can *joke away* the commission of my Lord; and, more than that, all the jokes he can pass over the death of all the people in this country will never take from the minds of these people the statement of my Savior when he said: "He that be-

lieveth and is baptized shall be saved." I say that will ring in their ears, and they will remember it long after that joke has lost its effect.

Again, my friend wishes to know whether or not God knew before he offered eternal life to sinners that they would not receive it. The idea in asking this question was, if God did not know, it would limit his knowledge, and if he did know, it would place him in a ridiculous attitude which no man with common sense would be willing to occupy. I will ask the gentleman if God did not know beforehand that there were some who would not *hear* his word? If so, why did he make the provision to have the word *preached* to them when he said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature?" I say that so far as that matter is concerned, it does not make any difference with me. I propose to *stick* to the commission and its conditions.

Now, what becomes of the gentleman's point? I want to ask you, my friends—I do not ask my opponent, because I hardly expect him to answer these questions—but I ask you: Does not this commission place the promise "shall be saved" after baptism? Look at it. "He that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved.*" Did not all the authority the apostles received in their ministry come from this commission? And could they have been true to this commission and placed the promise of salvation in their preaching *before* baptism, when the commission itself puts it *after*? And if they could not have been true to the commission in promising salvation before baptism, can you be true to it and at the same time tell sinners they have the promise of salvation *before* they are baptized?

But, again, will my friend Cayce harmonize his contention, that he that believeth on the Son hath

everlasting life, apart from baptism, with the commission that says "he that believeth and is baptized shall be *saved*?" My position on the meaning of "he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life" will harmonize perfectly with "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," but he cannot harmonize the two statements with his position. He is compelled to reject one or the other. Which statement of the Son of God do you reject? I say that is the proper way for us to look at this matter.

There is another matter I want to notice, and that is on foot-washing. You know I suggested the other night that the Old Baptists washed only one foot. That is the way they did where I came from, and I thought that they did it both ways—some washed both feet and some washed one; but Brother Cayce says that he never did wash only one foot, but he washed both.

Brother Cayce wants to know by what means I arrived at the conclusion that Christ washed the disciples' feet for the purpose of removing from their feet dust and dirt. When a thing is universally practiced for a purpose, and there is no record of that thing ever having been done for any other purpose, why should we conclude that foot-washing upon that occasion was for any other purpose than that involved in the general practice? The fact that Christ said, "I have given you an example, that you shall do as I have done," does not prove that the purpose of the action was changed. It was an example which should be followed whenever the same occasion for foot-washing should arise. If my brother should come to my home, and in the privacy of the bedroom I could serve him in that way, it would be my duty to do so. But I told him the other night when he introduced the question of foot-washing that if he

would affirm on some future occasion that foot-washing is a church ordinance, and should be performed in the meeting where the Lord's Supper is partaken of, I would take pleasure in denying it. I do not believe that this should be lugged into this controversy, and I believe that my moderator ruled it out of the debate.

There are a few more things I wish to notice, and then I desire to sum up my arguments.

He gave a definition from Liddell and Scott of the word rendered "dead," and claimed it meant a person literally dead. Why, of course, it means a person literally dead; but if the sinner is a literal corpse, he should be taken to the graveyard and buried. I say Liddell & Scott defined the word both literally and tropically; but when it comes to the metaphorical or tropical use of the word, as I read from Thayer, it simply means inactive as respects doing right; and let me suggest that, of all the lexicons that have ever been published, there is not a greater one on New Testament Greek than Thayer—not one.

I desire to sum up now, as I have only this speech. I began very early in this investigation to draw a careful distinction, and did indeed draw a very careful distinction between cause and conditions. I showed you that faith, repentance, and baptism are not *causes* of salvation, but only *conditions*. I illustrated this matter by the material world—that the sun is not the cause of light, but the means of light; but still if the sun were blotted out, there would be no light upon this earth. God himself is the cause of light, but the sun is the means.

I called your attention to the fact that God works after his own patterns, and that faith, repentance, and baptism are not the cause of salvation, but only means to that end.

I called your attention to the fact that conditions may be as important as causes, but conditions are never causes; that the death of Christ, the love of Christ, and the love of God are the great cause of salvation, but the conditions of salvation are faith, repentance, and baptism. I was careful to make this distinction because of the fact that my friend has never made the proper distinction between cause and condition. In fact, he makes no difference, and the only passages he relies on are the passages that refer to the *cause* of salvation, but in the commission we have very clearly the conditions.

I called your attention to the fact that the commission is the basic law of the government of God; that it, indeed, is the very constitution of the Christian economy; and that any man who lays his hands on this organic law of the kingdom is laying his hands upon the constitution of the kingdom of Christ; and I say to you that any man who undertakes to show how men are made subjects of this kingdom, and does not recognize the constitution, the great commission, would make the same mistake that one would make if he should undertake to naturalize a foreigner and make him a citizen of this government without recognizing the organic law of the government of the United States. If you undertake to make any man, or anybody, a citizen of this government in disobedience to that law and contrary to it, it would be unconstitutional. It would not stand. I call your attention to the fact that all of the legislatures and courts of the United States have to recognize the organic law of the government of the country in which we live, and I have called your attention time and again to the fact that this commission is the organic law of the government of God. It is, indeed, the very constitution upon which all the promises that Jesus

Christ has made to the world are involved, and when the apostles were sent out to preach under this commission, they were sent, of course, without the authority to alter or change it; they were sent with the understanding that they were to preach *under* it. Jesus, my Master, said: "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and teach" the nations, or "preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

I called your attention to the fact that not only did Mark give this commission, but that Luke recorded the same commission, and, by the way, we have his record of it here on this board: "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." I called your attention to this part of this verse [pointing to the blackboard], "*shall be saved*," but I said this was explained by this [again pointing], "*the remission of sins*"—shall be saved from past sins; and the next part of the commission is: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." My friend undertook to lug that into the debate, and asked me if I taught them to observe all things. I say this proposition has nothing to do with the second part of the commission. It only has reference to that part recorded here on this board. I say the latter part of the commission has nothing to do with this debate. This clause is for the alien, the unpardoned man, and the Savior, in giving the commission and the conditions upon which men and women can be saved from their past sins, in this most wonderful document, said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

I called your attention to the fact that the apostles preached under this commission, and I said that when in school, if any one did not understand a rule, the very best way to understand it is to examine very carefully the problems worked out under the rule. My friend either misunderstood me or purposely misrepresented me in that. He said I said becoming a Christian is like going to school. I never said anything or thought anything of that kind, and the reason that he changed it was because he thought he could answer it a little better that way than the way I said it. I said if we would understand this great rule, or problem of redemption, we should examine the cases of conversion given under it. I called your attention to the second chapter of Acts, where there is an account of the events of the opening day of the kingdom, when the organic law of the kingdom became operative. They were there in the city, waiting for the promise of the Father of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth, and the Holy Spirit was poured out upon these apostles, and sat like cloven tongues of fire upon each of them, and they spake as the Spirit of God gave them utterance. The apostle Peter was the spokesman, and he sums up his argument by saying: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." The only effort I remember my friend has made to answer my argument on this was that these people were already God's people and already saved. These, let me tell you, are the same people referred to in John 8: 43, who he claims could not hear the word of the Lord, because the Savior said, in the eighth chapter of John, that they were trying to kill him, and were the very same people who did kill the Son of God. My friend fails to

understand why they could not hear. They were trying to get a pretext to crucify the Lord and Savior, and that was the reason they could not hear at that time, but afterwards they did hear. Let me suggest further that a man might be in the position to-day that he could not hear God's word, and yet to-morrow something would occur to change this and he could hear. I insist that these were the same people he says were saved, they were the same people my friend says were saved before the foundation of the world, and yet the apostle Peter says: "Ye have taken [the Savior], and by wicked hands have crucified and slain."

It seems that the last passage he relies upon has been wrested from his grasp, and he has nothing. Therefore my proposition stands before you *unassailed*. In fact, it does not seem to me that mortal man could afford to assail the commission of our Lord, and put things in it which are not in it. The apostles preached under that commission; and when Peter preached to those who crucified the Savior, those that Brother Cayce said were already God's children, God's people—when Peter preached, he said: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this they were *pricked in their heart*." They believed it, and perhaps they remembered that prayer, the prayer that Jesus prayed on the cross: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." They believed the preaching, and so they said to Peter and the rest of the apostles: "Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Here is the way he preached it: "Repent, and be bap-

tized . . . for the remission of sins." So in that case they believed, they repented, and they were baptized in order to their salvation, or in order to the remission of their past sins. I say this case is *plain enough*, and the great commission is plain enough. Not only is that true, but every case of conversion recorded in Acts of Apostles under this commission has within it the *very same* conditions, either expressed or implied. In some of them these conditions are not all *expressed*, but there is one strange thing, if my friend is correct, and that is the fact that in all the cases we have recorded in Acts it is expressed that they heard the gospel and were baptized. The fact that they repented is sometimes implied, but not expressed, while the fact that they heard the gospel and were baptized is expressed in almost every case. The two things that the religious world says are not necessary to salvation are the very things that are clearly laid down in the cases of conversion given us under this commission; but, my friends, with these things before you, can you say that this proposition is not true? Can you question it for one moment?

He asked what becomes of the heathen. I am not talking to heathens to-night. I am talking to men and women in Nashville, who ought to know what God requires, and I believe that if they do not *know* it and *do* it, that the Lord will hold them responsible for not doing it. I am talking to my friends, who have the opportunity to know the will of God. He has expended much effort in trying to get around these things, but I insist that if he would show the same diligence in trying to learn the will of God as he has shown in getting up those irrelevant questions he has asked, he could understand this great com-

mission, and the conditions upon which the Savior of the world has promised to save men.

I call your attention to the fact that they were not only saved under this commission on the day of Pentecost, but I also showed you, from the eighth chapter of Acts, that when the Lord undertook to save a worshipping man, the first thing was to send for a gospel preacher and have the gospel preached to him. My friend says: "O, but he was a worshiper of God!" True, he *was* a worshiper under the old covenant, but he did not know Jesus, he did not know anything about Jesus, for he asked: "Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?" He did not know that he was worshipping God under an abrogated law. The fact that he was worshipping God under the *law* would avail nothing, but he must believe in and obey the Christ. And God sent an angel to another city, thirty miles north of Jerusalem, unto Philip, and told him to "arise, and go toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert. And he arose and went." And when the Ethiopian nobleman came along in his chariot, the Spirit of God *spoke*—but he *spoke to the preacher*—and said: "Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." In all of these cases of conversion the fact that the gospel was preached is expressed in every one. So he says: "Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." I say that in all these cases of conversion the fact that the gospel was preached is clearly expressed. And so this man "desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him." The place of the scripture he was reading was this: "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: in his humil-

iation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth." "And the eunuch answered Philip, and said, I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?" And the record says: "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." I suggest here, just in this connection, that the last statement I read is not in the Revision—"he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" but I am sure he believed that. Philip said: "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." So the chariot was commanded "to stand still: and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing." My friends, here is where the joy came in, because the commission said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and this man has the promise "*shall be saved.*" But my friend says that he can tell by his feelings that he is a Christian. A man can tell by the fact that he has obeyed God, and therefore has his promise that he is saved. But, he says, you have not the good feeling. Yes, I have. I have all the good feeling the Old Baptists have, and the word of God in addition. And I never felt more triumphant in the truth of God than I do this evening. I have all the good feeling that it is possible for you to have, and I have

the promise of the Savior besides, because he said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

I say, my friends, in all these cases of conversion the very same conditions were required and the same promises made.

I have called your attention to the fact that under this commission Saul of Tarsus, the chief of sinners, was saved. You remember that he was on his way to Damascus when the Lord appeared to him in a light above the brightness of the sun, and he "heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" But, my friends, the day of miracles is past, and now we are living in an age of law, the reign of the gospel, and you need not expect such manifestations. More than this, that voice was not to save him, anyway. If you will watch, you will see where he is saved. 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." (Acts 9: 5, 6.) I want to ask you, why did the Lord not tell him what to do? Because of the fact that he had commissioned *men* to preach the gospel. This matter had been placed in the hands of *men*; so he told Saul to go into the city, and there it would *be told him* what he must do. Brother Cayce says he was already a Christian, a brother in Christ, because Ananias called him "Brother Saul." I would like for him to *prove* that. I believe he was a brother Jew. In fact, the Jews called each other "brethren." He was not in Christ, for Paul himself said, "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ," and he had not been bap-

tized at that time. I know he is mistaken. He was not a brother in Christ, but a Jewish brother. "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." It is the blood of Jesus Christ that cleanses from all sins, and I find, according to this statement of Ananias, that the man had to arise and be baptized in order that his soul might be cleansed from sin *by the blood of Christ*, and that is in harmony with the commission that says: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." There is not a word said about Saul's *believing* or *repenting*. The only statement is that he "was baptized."

I think, if you will notice these cases of conversion, you will find that God frequently speaks of conversion with only one condition mentioned—sometimes one, sometimes two, and sometimes all, but it is not necessary to mention all every time. If I were talking about my crop of corn, I could say that I made it with a plow, but that does not mean without a horse—just a plow without a team. It does not mean that I made it without a hand to use the plow or a horse to pull the plow. Again, I might be talking about *hands*, and I might say I made this corn with an eighteen-year-old boy. You would understand that I did not mean that it was made without any implements, but that was one condition. I might be talking about stock, and I might say I made it with a horse— [Time expired.]

MR. CAYCE'S SIXTH REPLY.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am before you in the negative of the proposition: "Faith, repentance, and (water) baptism are conditions of pardon (or salvation) to an alien sinner, and the Scriptures so teach."

But little was said in the speech to which you have listened just preceding but what has been gone over time and again. It is a continual repetition, over and over. It was the same way last night—much of it repetition. But I shall notice some of the things again.

He refers to Acts 12: 11, the apostle came to himself. This does not at all touch his proposition. There is nothing in that text to prove that faith, repentance, and water baptism are conditions of pardon to an alien sinner.

He refers to the Savior's expression with reference to Lazarus. He said that "Lazarus sleepeth." One definition of that word is *sleeping* or *resting*, so that when the Savior used that word with reference to Lazarus he just simply meant that he was resting, he was in a state of rest.

But he says that I make a joke out of Mrs. Corbett's case. It is easier to say that—much easier for him to say that—than it is for him to answer the question put to him concerning the good lady. He knows that if he says Mrs. Corbett was saved, his proposition falls, he surrenders it; and, on the other hand, he knows that the people in this community were too well acquainted with that good woman to

accept the statement from him that she is in the lower regions. That is the dilemma the gentleman is in, and so it is much easier for him to say that Cayce makes a joke of the matter, and that her children and her people would not appreciate it, and Carroll Street Methodist Church would not appreciate it, than it is for him to answer the question. I wonder if they would appreciate it if the gentleman should have said, in harmony with his proposition, that Aunt Fannie Corbett was lost? To answer the question in harmony with his doctrine and in harmony with his proposition, he would have to say that Aunt Fannie Corbett is in hell. Would they have appreciated that? No. He said I asked the question to gain sympathy. You might have put any question you pleased to me during this discussion to gain sympathy, and I would have answered it. He endeavored to turn that question against me to gain sympathy by asking: "How do you know that Mrs. Corbett was one of the elect? Do you not hold the doctrine of election, sir? Mr. Cayce, do you not hold that nobody can be saved but just the elect? Now, how do you know that Mrs. Corbett was one of the elect? Perhaps she was not embraced in the number of the elect and sank down, after all, to eternal destruction." I answered his questions. Could he answer mine? If he could, he wouldn't; but I am going to grant that he could not, because he said during the discussion, "I am doing the best I can." and I believe he did the best he could. He could not answer it. I said that Mrs. Corbett loved the people of God; she proved that she did love them. John says: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." I know by this that Mrs. Corbett had passed out of death into life, because she loved the people of God. I

know by this that her soul this evening is in the presence of God, basking in the sunlight of his love. I *know that*—John having told the truth. Again, John said, which I quoted also, “Whosoever loveth is born of God;” and Jesus said (John 17: 2, 3): “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” She knew God. She loved God. Hence she was born of God, and knew God, and those characters that know God have eternal life; and as she had eternal life, she is living this evening in spirit in the presence of God. She was a child of God, and is in heaven now. And as this is true, the gentleman’s proposition is not true, for his proposition is, and has in it, that without baptism in water they cannot enter heaven and immortal glory.

But, again, I call attention to the fact that his moderator said last night that “no man on earth knows what became of Mrs. Corbett. God only knows.” Then, if no man on earth knows what became of Mrs. Corbett, then no man on earth knows whether his proposition is true or not; for if his proposition is the truth, no one can be saved without water baptism, and Mrs. Corbett was never immersed in baptism, and hence, if his proposition is the truth, Mrs. Corbett could not be saved. But he does not know whether she was saved or not. *He does not know!* HE DOES NOT KNOW!! He has affirmed for three nights here that a proposition is true, and then does not know whether it is true or not! *It is a given up thing that no man on earth knows whether the proposition is the truth or not!* It is a given up thing!!

But he asks me: “Did not God know beforehand that some would not hear his word?” I certainly think he did, for he said that “he that is of God

heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." And again, he said in the forty-third verse: "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." Did the Son of God send the gospel out for the benefit of the man that he himself said could not hear it? The Son of God says he cannot hear.

He asks then: "Does not the commission place salvation after baptism?" Not necessarily so. But has he told us what becomes of the unbaptized believer? His text has two classes in it—the *unbeliever* and the *baptized believer*. The unbeliever is condemned. We agree on that. The baptized believer shall be saved. Matt. 7: 18: "A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit." Is believing and being baptized a good fruit? Yes. Then is it a corrupt tree who believes? No. It must be a good tree; hence one who is saved. Then, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But here is a third class, not mentioned in that text—the unbaptized believer. What becomes of him? *Elder Srygley has not said*. John 5: 24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." The Interlinear translation says: "He that hears my word, and believes him who sent me, has life eternal, and into judgment comes not, but has passed out of death into life." *He shall be saved*. "Harmonize your contention," he says, "on John 5: 24 with the commission." All right. The commission says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." John 5: 24 says: "He that hears my word, and believes him who sent me, has life eternal, and into judgment comes not, but has passed out of death into life." All right. There they are—the unbaptized

believer and the baptized believer placed right together. That is easy. The gentleman could not do that. John 5: 24 has been staring him in the face ever since he has been on the proposition. What has he attempted to do with it? Not one single thing. I can put them together, but he cannot. There is the man that cannot put them together.

But he says we wash only one foot where he came from. I deny that the people with whom I am identified wash only one foot in the ordinance, and demand the proof. Now, you may have my time to prove it.

MR. SRYGLEY.—What is the proposition?

MR. SHEPHERD.—That is all right.

MR. CAYCE.—That is exactly what I said, and it goes to record that way.

MR. SRYGLEY.—All right. It goes to record that the moderator objected to it.

MR. CAYCE.—Brethren who are identified with me and stand with me are present who have been in from ten to twenty-four States, and have engaged in the service in from ten to twenty-four States, and in no place where they have been has that been the practice. I myself have been among the Primitive Baptists in sixteen States. I do not say it boastfully, but I think I know, and have a right to know, as much about their practices as the gentleman in the affirmative on this proposition, and I know his statement is not their practice.

He says: "Of course death means a dead corpse." Well, that is the way exactly that Liddell & Scott define the word which is translated *dead* in Eph. 5: 14, and the word which is translated *sleepeth* is not so defined by Liddell and Scott, but is defined *asleep, to rest in sleep, to lie down in sleep*. It is defined that way. It is not defined a dead corpse; but the

word which is translated *dead* in Eph. 5: 14 is defined by Liddell and Scott as dead, a dead person, or a dead corpse, a corpse. This is their definition of it. There is Liddell and Scott in that grip right there if you want to look at it. That is the way that Liddell and Scott define it. Hence, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead." What does the apostle mean there? Does he mean arise out of a dead state? No, sir, but arise from among those that are dead. "Awake thou that sleepest," or awake the sleeping one, "and arise from the dead," or, as the Interlinear has it, "from among the dead." Come out from among the dead. That is the meaning.

Then he refers again to the day of Pentecost. You remember the question that I put to him concerning the language of the apostle: "The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all them that are afar off." Peter said that to these people before they were baptized; he said *the promise IS unto you*. Did Peter tell the truth when he said that? If Peter told the truth, the promise was to these people before they were baptized, for he made that statement to them before they were baptized; and hence baptism was too late for it to be in order that the promise be unto them, or in order that they be saved or have eternal life. The gentleman did not answer that.

Would the railroad officials send out the pass if they knew it would be rejected? If God offered eternal salvation, did he know before he made the offer whether or not the sinner would reject it? He answered that, you know, by asking me one which I have answered, concerning the Lord knowing whether any would not hear his word. That has been answered.

Time and again I have asked him this question:

Is all of God's power to save in the gospel? Has he answered it? No, sir. He has been as silent as the grave on that, so far as answering it is concerned. He neither says yea nor nay.

Upon what principle of justice does God condemn the heathen for not believing and obeying what you preach, seeing they never heard you? Has he answered that? He has made no effort to do so.

In Acts 2: 38, 39 the apostle says: "The promise is unto you." Was the promise unto them before baptism? If not, did the apostle tell the truth? He has made no effort at all to answer that.

Did God love Esau? Time and again that question has rung in his ears. Has he answered it? Not a word.

Do the heathen who die without hearing the gospel have a chance of salvation? Have you heard any answer to that? Not a word.

How do you know you love your wife? Did he answer that? Not much. Say, Brother Srygley, do you know you love your wife, anyhow? Do you really know you love your wife? Or do you love your wife? I wonder if he does. I wonder how he knows it. I wonder who told him about it. I wonder who brought the message to him that gave him the knowledge that he loved his wife?

Are faith, repentance, and water baptism works of righteousness, or are they works of unrighteousness? Have you heard any answer to that? Not a word. Not a word has he answered to that.

He refers to John 8: 43, "Ye cannot hear my word," but he says that something might take place with them so that they could hear after that. Well, the only thing that could take place with them after he said that so that they could hear must necessarily be that God implant the divine life in the soul and

take them out of the condition which they were in when he said: "Ye cannot hear my word." He was talking to characters that he said: "I know you, that you have not the love of God in you." These characters were destitute of the love of God, and were not children of God, and he says: "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word."

He says: "I have all the good feeling you have, and the promise of God, too." That means Cayce has not got the promise of God. That is what it means. That means no one has the promise of God only those who hear, believe, and obey what he teaches—no others have the promise of God. Hence it is a universal damnation to everybody but him and his folks. Nobody else got a promise of life! Nobody else got a promise of salvation! He said it after waiting so long to say it, that he has the promise of God, too, besides the good feeling that Cayce has.

Then he refers again to the case of Saul, Acts of the Apostles, ninth chapter: "And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" He heard the voice of the Son of God, and said: "Who art thou, Lord?" The Savior did not tell him to go down to Damascus, and Ananias would make him free, did he? What did he say? "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." He tells him who he is. Now listen—St. John 17: 3: "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Did Saul know him? If he did, then he had eternal life. The Savior says: "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." The Savior told him who he was. Now he says: "Lord, what wilt

thou have me to do?" He was willing now to do different from what he was willing to do when he started from Jerusalem. When he started from Jerusalem to bind and cast into prison those who called on the name of the Lord, he was not willing to do God's will, but now he is willing to do God's will; he is willing to do God's service, and now inquires what the Lord will have him to do. Will springs from life; it belongs to life. It is a product of it. No man has a will concerning natural things unless he first has natural life; and so that man who has a will to serve God, a will for holiness and righteousness, has the divine life. That will springs from the divine life that God has implanted in his soul. Hence, Paul was a child of God before he ever got to Damascus. He was a child of God, or else God's word is wrong.

Everything he has introduced in the affirmative of his proposition has been answered. Since this proposition began I think I have introduced fourteen negative arguments. Not one of them has been noticed by the gentleman. In support of these negative arguments I have introduced twenty scriptural proof texts. Not one of the proof texts has he pretended to notice; and as these proof texts stand out—besides what is on the board (except this one, Rom. 8: 8, 9), twenty besides these two on the board—and as these arguments and proof texts stand out untouched in opposition to the gentleman's proposition, it follows, therefore, that his proposition falls, notwithstanding the fact that it is given up that no man on earth knows whether the proposition is the truth or not.

Brother Srygley, when this debate closes, will you kindly whisper in my ear and tell me what you believe became of Aunt Fannie Corbett? If you will, and don't want me to, I won't tell on you.

MR. SRYGLEY.—I am not the judge.

MR. CAYCE.—If the proposition is the truth, Aunt Fannie Corbett could not be saved, because she was not immersed. If Aunt Fannie Corbett is saved, the proposition is not the truth. It was said last night that no man on earth knows what became of Aunt Fannie Corbett. Therefore, no man on earth knows whether the proposition is the truth or not. Surrendered it! Let us notice this board again. On that side of the line, Rom. 8: 8, 9, in the flesh. The apostle says on that side of the line this man *cannot* please God. The gentleman's position and doctrine requires a man to do something to get on this side of the line that God's word says he cannot do. Matt. 7: 18 the Savior says: "Neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." The man on this side of the line is a corrupt tree, and the gentleman's doctrine requires that man to do what the Son of God says he *cannot* do to be saved. On this side of the line the alien sinner does not love God, and to those characters Jesus says (John 8: 43): "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye *cannot* hear my word." The gentleman's doctrine requires this man to do what the Savior, the Son of God, says he *cannot* do to be saved. That is a hard doctrine! *That is a hard doctrine!* He cannot do that which he must do in order to be saved!

I want now to call attention to some of the negative arguments I introduced.

I introduced this argument: Repentance is not a condition in order to eternal life, because they who truly repent are led to do so by the Lord, and those who are led by the Spirit of God are already children of God. I am going to repeat the proof texts and arguments I made on this. Rom. 2: 4: "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and

long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" Rom. 8: 14: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."

I showed you that the gentleman has the word *born*—has the birth over here on the wrong side; according to logic, and according to reason, and according to God's word, the birth should be right here [pointing to the blackboard]. Then that character, as he is first born, is able to hear, then to believe, then to repent. But we start with him here; he is being led unto repentance. What is it leads him there? It is the Spirit of God. But the apostle, in Rom. 8: 14, says: "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Hence he is already a child of God. Now listen:

1. Those who repent of, or turn from, their sins, are led to do so by the Spirit of God. (Rom. 2: 4.)

2. Those who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God. (Rom. 2: 14.)

3. Therefore, those who repent (penitent characters) are children of God.

Next:

1. Those who repent (penitent characters) are children of God.

2. God's children have eternal life.

3. Therefore, those who repent (penitent characters) have eternal life.

Next:

1. Those who repent (penitent characters) have eternal life.

2. Baptism should be administered to penitent characters only.

3. Therefore, baptism should be administered to those only who have eternal life.

Has the gentleman paid any attention to this argu-

ment? Not at all. Not one single word has he said about it.

Then the argument based on Rom. 8: 5-9. On this side of the line he is in the flesh and cannot please God. On the other side of the line he is not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, and can please God. I asked the gentleman to tell us if it is pleasing to God for the character here, before he is brought across the line, to believe, repent, and be baptized. He has never said whether it pleases God or displeases God. He has never said which way it is. If the character must do that while on that side of the line, the apostle yet emphatically says on that side of the line he *cannot* please God. Hence it displeases God if he does those things on that side of the line. Does God save him because of his doing that which is displeasing to him? That is the difficulty the gentleman is in on his position and from that argument.

The next argument was: The proposition cannot be true, for sinners are made righteous by the obedience of one (Christ), while the proposition has in it the idea that sinners are made righteous by their own obedience. I called attention to Rom. 5: 19. [*Time expired.*]

TLC

[The page contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the document. The text is too light to transcribe accurately.]

INDEX TO MR. CAYCE'S SPEECHES.

Accept, must, before a thing becomes a gift, 150.

Adam, as in, all die, 33, 59, 88; multiplied, 114.

Adults and infants are saved the same way; and as infants are not saved by performing conditions, so adults are saved without performing them, 11, 36.

Alien sinner, the meaning of, 2, 27.

Arguments: (1) God gives spiritual or eternal life to alien sinners without condition on their part, because the alien or unregenerate sinner is represented in God's word as being in the flesh, and they that are in the flesh cannot please God, 2, 155. (2) The alien or unregenerate sinner is in a state of death, 4, 155. (3) Eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because they do not perform good works, 6, 155. (4) Eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because adults and infants are saved the same way; and as infants are not saved by performing conditions, so the adult is saved without performing them, 11, 156. (5) Eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because they cannot come to the Lord, or do good works, 13, 38, 59, 155. (6) Eternal life must be given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because sinners are justified by grace, 61. (7) Eternal life is given to the alien sinner without conditions on their part, because it is the work of the Lord that puts the sinner in Christ, and not the work of the sinner; hence he is saved without performing conditions on his part, 65. (8) Eternal life is given without conditions on the part of the alien sinner, because the covenant of God's peace is an unconditional one, 65. (9) Eternal life is given without conditions on the part of the alien sinner, because Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners and accomplish the work of redemption, 66, 91. (10) Eternal life is given to sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of that life is represented in the Scriptures as a translation, 92. (11) Eternal life is given to

- the dead sinner without conditions on his part, because becoming in possession of eternal life is represented in the Scriptures as a birth, 93, 119. (12) Eternal life is given to dead sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of eternal life is represented in the Scriptures as a resurrection, 96, 121. (13) Eternal life is given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of eternal life is set forth in the Scriptures as a creation, 122. (14) Eternal life is given to dead sinners without conditions on their part, because the family of God (the people of God as a body) is represented as a building, 124. (15) Eternal life is given to dead sinners without conditions on their part, because they are without strength, and, therefore, unable to perform conditions, 126. (16) Eternal life is given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of eternal life (regeneration) is set forth in the Scriptures as a circumcision of the heart, and it must, therefore, be without conditions, 126, 153.
- Believer, a**, is one who has been born of God, 146.
- Birth**, coming in possession of eternal life represented as a birth, 93, 119.
- Blessings of this life** enjoyed on conditions, 191.
- Building**, eternal life is given without conditions, because God's family is represented as a, 124.
- Child**, receive the kingdom of God as a little, 11, 36, 39, 59, 117.
- Christian Pilot** quoted, 249.
- Church**, must one be a member of the same, you are, to be in a saved state? 119, 192, 209, 248, 299.
- Circumcision**, eternal life is without conditions, because it is set forth in the Scriptures as a, of the heart, 126, 153.
- Come**, no man can, to Jesus, except God draw him, 39, 145.
- Commission**, the, 186, 312, 331; "based on four universal facts," 190; he says he believes the, 271.
- Conditions** are indirect causes, 184.
- Corbett, Mrs. Fannie**, where is? 192, 215, 237, 272, 298, 303, 306, 307, 328, 329, 330, 336.
- Cornellus**, the case of, 275, 303.
- Creation**, eternal life is given to alien sinners without conditions on their part, because becoming in possession of it is set forth in the Scriptures as a, 122.

- Dale, Mrs. L. J., where is? 238.
- Damnation, labors to make, easy and salvation hard, 211.
- Dead, in trespasses and sins, 6, 10, 33, 57, 86; sinner, and cannot hear, 218; awake and arise from the, 218, 240, 302; Liddell and Scott's definition of the word rendered, 302, 328, 332.
- Death, the alien or unregenerate sinner in the state of, 4.
- Die, in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely, 5, 32, 53.
- Element, life is suitable to, 149.
- Eternal life, the meaning of, 1; does God give, till sinner wants? 28, 57; if one does not have, now, his religion is dead, 55; in prospect, 116.
- Ethiopian, can the, change his skin? 13, 36.
- Eunuch, Philip and the, 273.
- Evil fruit, a good tree cannot bring forth, 253, 276, 306, 331, 339.
- Faith, justified by, 63; by whom we have access by, 191; defined as belief of testimony, 209; a fruit of the Spirit, 310; is dealt to and given to us by the Spirit of God, 311.
- False, he makes a positive, statement, 34, 128.
- Feet washing, 211, 239, 332.
- Figuratively dead, 57, 86.
- Finished work of the Lord, salvation does not depend upon works, but on the, 66.
- Finished, it is, 66, 90, 92.
- Flesh, they that are in the, cannot please God, 2, 29, 58, 117, 193, 216, 253, 277, 336, 339.
- Form of doctrine, 149, 216, 300.
- Gift, eternal life bestowed as a gracious, 64; would God offer, if he knew it would be rejected? 210, 250.
- Gladly received his word, 213.
- Good works, sinners cannot perform, 6, 60; he does not believe, will save a man, 274.
- Gospel, the, the power of God unto salvation, 150, 185; in the, is the righteousness of God revealed, 186.
- Grace, sinners are justified by, 61, 185, 308; is baptism a work of? 307.
- Hear, ye cannot, my word, 54, 214, 240, 270, 306, 330, 334, 337.
- Heathen, will God punish the, for not obeying him? 152, 190, 215, 241, 250, 299, 301, 334.
- Hope, the man who has a, to live eternally has the eternal life, 86; in, of eternal life, 91, 116.

- Iniquities, he shall bear their, 194, 217.
- Jailer, the Philipplan, 37, 59, 89, 114, 127, 151.
- Just, there is not a, man on the earth, 11, 35.
- Law, no flesh justified by the law, 8, 35, 55, 85, 90, 118.
- Liar, the gentleman's position makes God a, 309.
- Lost, Jesus came to seek and save the, 91.
- Means and cause, 234.
- Needle, easier for a camel to go through the eye of a, 60, 89, 118.
- Negative arguments: (1) The proposition cannot be true, because those in the flesh, alien sinners, cannot please God, 193. (2) The proposition cannot be true, for sinners are made righteous by the obedience of one (Christ), while the proposition has in it the idea that sinners are made righteous by their own obedience, 193. (3) The proposition cannot be true, because it is the work of God to put the sinner in Christ, while the proposition would make it the work of man, 219. (4) Repentance is not a condition in order to eternal life, because those who truly repent are led to do so by the Lord, and those who are led by the Spirit of God are already children of God, 278. (5) The proposition cannot be true, because eternal life is promised because of the work of Christ, not because of what the sinner does, 280. (6) The proposition cannot be true, because it sets aside the work of Christ in the eternal salvation of sinners, 280. (7) The proposition cannot be true, because repentance is not a condition to be performed by the sinner in order to eternal life, because Jesus gives repentance to Israel. (8) Repentance cannot be a condition in order to eternal life or the promise of it, because it would proceed from a worldly source, hence would be a worldly sorrow, 310. (9) The proposition cannot be true, because faith is a fruit of the Spirit; hence one must possess the Spirit in order to produce fruit (faith), and one who possesses the Spirit is already a child of God, already has life, 310. (10) The proposition cannot be true, because faith is dealt to and given us by the Spirit of God, 311. (11) The proposition cannot be true, because a man cannot exercise something he does not possess, and some men (alien sinners) do not possess faith, 311.
- Nicodemus, 94, 119.
- Obey, author of eternal salvation to all that, him, 38; unregenerate sinners cannot, God, 85; what shall the end be of them

- that, not the gospel? 190; cannot God save any but those who, him? 214.
- Observe, do you, all things commanded in God's word? 186.
- Peace, God's covenant of, is unconditional, 65.
- Pentecost, some of those to whom Peter preached on the day of, were devout, 188, 333.
- Phillip and the eunuch, 273.
- Poisoned, the stream, 114.
- Power, is all of God's, to save in the gospel? 210.
- Promise, was the, before baptism? 189, 241, 250, 273, 334.
- Purified, souls, in obeying the truth, 95.
- Quickened, 96, 122, 278.
- Questions, thirty-two, 251; a few more, 303.
- Redeem, 147.
- Repentance, syllogism on, 279; Jesus gives, 309; cannot be a condition of pardon, because it would proceed from a worldly source, 310.
- Resurrection, becoming in possession of eternal life represented as a, 96, 121.
- Rich young ruler, the case of the, 60.
- Righteous, the sinner is made, by the obedience of Christ, 194, 217, 235.
- Righteousness, imputed without works, 63, 309; of God revealed from faith to faith, 150, 186.
- Salvation, work of God, 219.
- Saul of Tarsus, the case of, 275, 335.
- Save yourselves from this untoward generation, 189.
- Scriptures, the meaning of, 2.
- See, cannot, or understand the gospel unless he is born, 94.
- Seek the Lord, 147.
- Short, all have come, of the glory of God, 6, 34.
- Sinners, saved and unsaved, 28; those to whom the Lord will not give life, 144.
- Spirit, who is in the, 87; baptism of the Holy, brings into one body, 238, 300.
- Spiritual service, 85, 114, 144, 191, 248, 301.
- Strength, sinners without; therefore they are unable to perform conditions, 126.
- Surety, Jesus, for his people, 63.

- Terror, knowing the, of the Lord, we persuade men, 151.
 Translation, coming in possession of eternal life a, 92.
 Tree of life, the, 53, 84.
 Unbaptized, what will become of the, believer? 187, 213, 236, 250.
 Word, the, by which we are begotten is the same that John says
 was made flesh, 95.
 Workmanship, they are his, created in Christ, 308.

INDEX TO SCRIPTURES.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Gen. 1: 3-5—123. | John 1: 4—240. |
| Gen. 2: 15-17—4, 32. | John 1: 11-13—93, 146. |
| Gen. 3: 4, 5—5. | John 3: 1-9—94, 119. |
| Gen. 6: 5-12—9. | John 5: 20—121. |
| Ps. 10: 2-11—9. | John 5: 21—97. |
| Ps. 53: 1-3—8, 85. | John 5: 24—237, 270, 274, 331. |
| Ps. 104: 30, 31—124. | John 5: 25-29—96, 120, 302. |
| Ps. 127: 1—125. | John 5: 37-44—13, 14, 38, 59,
145. |
| Eccles. 7: 20—11, 35. | John 6: 44—39, 145. |
| Isa. 42: 1-4—67. | John 6: 63—97, 122. |
| Isa. 45: 17—67. | John 8: 43—54, 240, 253, 277,
306, 334, 337. |
| Isa. 53: 10, 11—194, 217. | John 8: 47—214. |
| Isa. 54: 9, 10—65. | John 14: 20—57. |
| Isa. 55: 6—147. | John 17: 1-4—91, 275, 335. |
| Isa. 63: 1-5—66. | John 19: 28-30—92. |
| Jer. 13: 23—13, 36, 38, 59. | Acts 2: 38—189, 213, 241, 273. |
| Ezek. 18: 20-32—55. | Acts 2: 39—189, 241, 250, 273,
333. |
| Zech. 9: 11—67. | Acts 4: 11, 12—280. |
| Matt. 1: 21—67, 90, 280. | Acts 5: 30, 31—309. |
| Matt. 6: 33—147. | Acts 7: 51-54—154. |
| Matt. 7: 18—253, 276, 306, 331,
337. | Acts 8: 26-40—273. |
| Matt. 18: 11-14—68. | Acts 9: 15—276. |
| Matt. 19: 16-26—60, 89, 118. | Acts 12: 11—328. |
| Matt. 25: 46—28, 57. | Acts 13: 38, 39—64. |
| Matt. 28: 18, 19—186. | Acts 16: 30, 31—37, 59, 89, 114,
151. |
| Mark 10: 13-16—11, 36, 39, 59. | Rom. 1: 16—150, 185, 210, 271,
303. |
| Mark 16: 15, 16—186, 211, 212,
236. | |
| Luke 18: 15-17—12. | |
| Luke 19: 10—91. | |

- Rom. 2: 4—279, 337.
 Rom. 2: 28, 29—127.
 Rom. 3: 8-23—6, 32, 34, 64, 90.
 Rom. 4: 1-10—62, 90, 309.
 Rom. 5: 2—191, 269.
 Rom. 5: 6—126, 280.
 Rom. 5: 12-14—5.
 Rom. 5: 19—194, 217.
 Rom. 6: 17—149, 216, 300.
 Rom. 6: 23—64.
 Rom. 7: 5—117.
 Rom. 8: 5-9—2, 3, 29, 58, 88,
 117, 193, 277, 310.
 Rom. 8: 14—279, 338.
 Rom. 11: 6—308.
 Rom. 12: 3-5—311.
 1 Cor. 1: 26-31—65, 219.
 1 Cor. 12: 13—238.
 1 Cor. 15: 1—185.
 1 Cor. 15: 22, 23—33, 59, 88.
 2 Cor. 5: 11—151.
 2 Cor. 5: 17—124.
 2 Cor. 5: 20—38, 151.
 2 Cor. 7: 10—310.
 Gal. 2: 16-21—63.
 Gal. 3: 10—11, 35.
 Gal. 5: 22, 23—310.
 Eph. 2: 1—6, 10, 33, 57, 87, 96,
 121, 278, 307.
 Eph. 2: 8, 9—185, 308.
 Eph. 2: 10—124.
 Eph. 2: 19-22—125.
 Eph. 5: 14—218, 240, 302.
 Phil. 3: 3—153.
 Col. 1: 12, 13—92.
 2 Thess. 3: 1, 2—311.
 1 Tim. 1: 15—91.
 1 Tim. 6: 12—147.
 2 Tim. 1: 9—116.
 Tit. 1: 2—56, 91.
 Tit. 3: 3-7—61, 89, 235.
 Heb. 2: 1-4—120.
 Heb. 5: 9—37.
 Heb. 7: 19-22—63.
 James 2: 10—35, 55, 85.
 1 Pet. 1: 2-5—95, 125, 190.
 1 Pet. 1: 22-24—95.
 1 Pet. 2: 5—248.
 2 Pet. 2: 9—303.
 1 John 1: 9—151.
 1 John 2: 25—55.
 1 John 4: 6—214.
 1 John 5: 1—146, 213, 304.
 1 John 5: 11, 12—56, 86, 309,
 311.
 Rev. 22: 14—145.

INDEX TO MR. SRYGLEY'S SPEECHES.

- Accept, sinner must, before God's offer becomes a gift, 137, 196.
Acts of Apostles gives examples of conversion under the commission, 177, 258, 321.
Adam, as in, all die, 21, 46, 76; forfeited Eden by disobedience, 20, 40, 69, 100.
Alien, my opponent has not sufficiently defined, 16, 171.
Author of eternal salvation to all who obey him, 25, 48, 134, 159, 168.
Baptist songs, 224, 285.
Baptized into one body, 225, 283.
Baxter, Richard, 142.
Born, of water and of the Spirit, 108; from above, 109.
Breathing a condition of living, 195.
Child, receive the kingdom of God as a little, 23, 47, 51, 76.
Christian, the difference between the, and the sinner, 75.
"Church, must one be a member of the same, you are, to be in a saved state?" 160, 203, 225.
Commission, the great, 174, 198, 206, 229, 254, 316; is based on four universal facts, 180; all authority back of the, 202, 223, 256, 319.
Condition defined, 171.
Conditions, if God saves some without, why not all? 26; upon which God offers pardon, 173; all blessings enjoyed on, 182; must be met in order to salvation, 195, 319.
Corbett, Mrs. Fannie, 204, 223, 315.
Cornelius, the salvation of, 139, 265, 296.
Dead, in trespasses and sins, 21, 47; sometimes used figuratively, 45, 73, 104; sinners, cannot hear and obey, 206; arise from the, 206, 227, 292, 314, 318.
Death, what, did Adam die when driven from the garden? 20.
Depravity, hereditary total, 102, 110.
Dodge, I have no inclination to, 40.
Draw, how does God? 78, 161.
Eternal life, not sufficiently defined, 15; does sinner get, while

- on earth? 16, 42, 78, 101, 103, 131, 167; is it necessary for a sinner to desire, before God gives? 18, 44, 48; is a gift from God, 137.
- Ethiopian, can he, change his skin? 24, 71.
- Eunuch, salvation of the, 260, 324.
- Faith, definition of, 195.
- False statement, my opponent says I made a, 48, 128.
- Feet washing, 225, 317.
- Fight the good fight of faith, 133.
- Figuratively, dead sometimes used, 45, 73, 104.
- Finished, it is, 108.
- Flesh, they that are in the, cannot please God, 18, 44, 204.
- Forgiveness of sins through Christ, 81.
- Form of doctrine, 136, 205, 285.
- Gift, sinner must accept God's proffered, 137, 196, 222, 316.
- God, how does, dwell in a man? 74; no absolute goodness in any except, 23.
- Good, none, 22; some good in some sinners, 32, 46.
- Gospel, not ashamed of the, 48, 80, 107, 136; the power of God to save, 174, 197, 202.
- Grace, saved by, 79, 173; at what degree of faith do we have access to? 283.
- "Hath" sometimes looks to the future, 72, 103, 133, 167.
- Hear, ye cannot, my word, 226.
- Heathen, will the, be saved? 203, 323.
- Hope, eternal life a, 72, 107.
- Imputed righteousness, 80.
- Infants, are, saved? 23, 47, 51, 76.
- Iniquities, he shall bear thine, 205.
- Jailer, the Philippian, 24, 49, 76, 127, 140.
- Jericho, the taking of, 72, 103, 133, 167.
- Just, there is not a, man, 51.
- Justified, by deeds of the law shall no flesh, 23, 106, 221.
- Katheudo*, Thayer's definition of, 294, 295.
- Law, no one justified by, of Moses, 23, 106, 221; he that offends in one point guilty of all, 41, 101; the, of faith, 221.
- Laws, two, in Rom. 8: 1-7, 75, 221.
- Love, what is the, of God? 285.
- Means, the Christian institution is a system of, 172.
- Mercy, how does God save according to his? 80.

- Needle, easier for a camel to go through the eye of a, than they who trust in riches to enter the kingdom, 105.
- Nekros*, Thayer's definition of, 294.
- Obeys, author of eternal salvation to all that, him, 25, 48, 70, 106, 134, 159, 168; what shall the end be of them that, not the gospel? 141, 181, 203.
- Observe all things, 198.
- Old Baptists, a man can disbelieve the doctrine of the, and be saved, 287.
- Pardon, meaning of, 171, 179; the evidence of, 285.
- Pentecost, Peter's sermon on the day of, 177, 199, 228, 232, 322.
- Phillip and the eunuch, 260, 324.
- Poisoned, the stream, 134.
- Power, is all God's, to save in the gospel? 228.
- Promise unto you and your children, 201, 232, 259.
- Questions answered, Cayce's thirty-two, 289.
- Receive Christ, 130.
- Reconciled, be ye, to God, 140.
- Redeem, the meaning of, against him, 134, 168.
- Religion, not discussing my, 71.
- Remission of sins, the meaning of, 179.
- Repentance, definition of, 195.
- Rich, the, young man, 78, 105.
- Saul of Tarsus, salvation of, 266, 326.
- Save yourselves from this untoward generation, 201.
- See, cannot, the kingdom, 108.
- Seek the Lord, 132, 138, 166.
- Sinners, saved and unsaved, 42; made righteous by the obedience of Christ, 205.
- Spirit, who are in the? 74, 105; baptized by one, 225, 284.
- Spiritual service, 102, 204, 288.
- Surety, Christ a, of a better testament, 81.
- Terror, the, of the Lord, 138.
- Tree of life, 20, 40, 69, 100, 130, 162.
- Unbaptized, what will become of the, believer? 199, 222, 263, 269, 288.
- Victory not sought, but the truth, 157.
- Wind, the, bloweth where it listeth, 110.
- Word, does the, by which we are begotten refer to Christ? 130, 164.

Works, certain kind of, forbidden in the Bible, 80; will good, save a person? 265.

INDEX TO SCRIPTURES.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Gen. 2: 17—20, 69. | Luke 11: 38—138. |
| Gen. 3: 5—40. | Luke 18: 29, 30—43. |
| Josh. 6: 1, 2—72, 103, 133, 167. | Luke 24: 46, 47—175, 207, 229. |
| Ps. 53: 1—22. | John 1: 4—227. |
| Ps. 95: 7, 8—110. | John 1: 11, 12—131, 165. |
| Prov. 28: 26—286. | John 1: 17—222. |
| Eccles. 7: 20—23. | John 3: 3-9—108. |
| Eccles. 12: 13—162. | John 3: 16—161, 207. |
| Isa. 55: 6—132, 166. | John 5: 25—294. |
| Isa. 55: 7—138. | John 5: 37, 38—77. |
| Isa. 55: 11—205. | John 5: 40—129, 160, 162. |
| Jer. 13: 23—71. | John 6: 27, 28—222. |
| Jer. 22: 21—226. | John 6: 44, 45—161. |
| Ezek. 18: 20-32—42, 139. | John 8: 24—228. |
| Ezek. 33: 11—228. | John 8: 43—226. |
| Amos 8: 9—259. | John 11: 11—227. |
| Matt. 1: 21—82. | John 12: 26—138. |
| Matt. 3: 6—283. | John 12: 42—288. |
| Matt. 3: 11—284. | John 20: 23—255. |
| Matt. 5: 8—108. | Acts 2: 1-39—177, 178, 232, 233,
322. |
| Matt. 6: 33—166. | Acts 2: 41—130. |
| Matt. 7: 7—132. | Acts 4: 12—176. |
| Matt. 9: 24—227. | Acts 5: 32—135. |
| Matt. 11: 28—103, 142. | Acts 8: 26-40—260, 325. |
| Matt. 19: 16, 17—23, 78. | Acts 9: 4-6—266, 326. |
| Matt. 19: 29—43, 106. | Acts 9: 17—267. |
| Matt. 25: 35—204. | Acts 10: 6—265. |
| Matt. 25: 46—17, 73, 133. | Acts 11: 14—139, 296. |
| Matt. 28: 19, 20—174, 255. | Acts 12: 11—313. |
| Mark 8: 38—288. | Acts 13: 38, 39—81. |
| Mark 10: 13-16—76. | Acts 15: 7—296. |
| Mark 10: 27—106. | Acts 16: 30, 31—24, 49, 50, 77,
127, 140, 141. |
| Mark 16: 15, 16—70, 109, 175,
198, 207, 223, 229, 255. | Acts 16: 34—49. |
| Luke 3: 38—102. | |

- Acts 17: 26—102.
 Acts 22: 16—267.
 Rom. 1: 16—48, 107, 136, 174,
 197, 203.
 Rom. 2: 5—78.
 Rom. 2: 7—132, 167.
 Rom. 2: 13—140.
 Rom. 3: 8—23—48.
 Rom. 3: 9—22.
 Rom. 3: 13—102.
 Rom. 3: 20—106, 221.
 Rom. 3: 22—22.
 Rom. 3: 27—221.
 Rom. 4: 4, 5—221.
 Rom. 4: 6—80.
 Rom. 5: 1, 2—182.
 Rom. 5: 9—81.
 Rom. 5: 14—21.
 Rom. 5: 19—205.
 Rom. 6: 17—136, 205, 285.
 Rom. 8: 2—221.
 Rom. 8: 5, 6—18, 19.
 Rom. 8: 7—44, 45.
 Rom. 8: 8—18.
 Rom. 8: 9—74.
 Rom. 8: 25—72, 104.
 1 Cor. 2: 11—286.
 1 Cor. 9: 27—19, 104.
 1 Cor. 12: 13—225.
 1 Cor. 12: 27—225.
 1 Cor. 15: 1, 2—174.
 1 Cor. 15: 22, 23—21, 46, 76,
 206.
 2 Cor. 5: 11—138.
 2 Cor. 5: 20—26, 140.
 Gal. 3: 10, 11—23.
 Eph. 1: 7—283.
 Eph. 2: 1, 2—21, 47, 73, 104.
 Eph. 2: 8—173.
 Eph. 4: 4—225.
 Eph. 4: 20, 21—295.
 Eph. 5: 14—206, 227, 293, 314.
 Eph. 5: 23—225.
 Col. 1: 14—109.
 1 Thess. 4: 14—227.
 2 Thess. 1: 9—141, 181, 203.
 1 Tim. 1: 15—266.
 1 Tim. 4: 1—110.
 1 Tim. 5: 10—226.
 1 Tim. 6: 12—133.
 Tit. 1: 2—72, 104.
 Tit. 3: 5—80, 222.
 Heb. 2: 1—4—112.
 Heb. 3: 7, 8—110.
 Heb. 5: 8, 9—25, 49, 70, 106,
 134, 168.
 Heb. 7: 25—141.
 Heb. 12: 9—139.
 James 1: 17—182.
 James 1: 18—131.
 James 2: 10—41, 71, 101.
 1 Pet. 4: 17—141, 181, 203.
 2 Pet. 1: 5—10—100.
 2 Pet. 3: 9—228.
 1 John 1: 9—42, 51, 139.
 1 John 2: 1, 2—101.
 1 John 2: 12—286.
 1 John 2: 17—138.
 1 John 2: 25—43.
 1 John 5: 1—165.
 1 John 5: 2, 3—287.
 1 John 5: 11, 12—72, 103.
 2 John 9—287.
 Rev. 2: 7—70.
 Rev. 22: 14—130, 162, 164.
 Rev. 22: 17—142.