



PREDESTINATION,  
AND THE  
FOREKNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

A DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

REV. JAMES MATTHEWS,  
PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH CARLISLE KENTUCKY,  
AND  
ELDER BENJ FRANKLIN,  
PASTOR OF THE CLINTON STREET CHRISTIAN CHURCH CINCINNATI.

HELD IN CARLISLE KY  
COMMENCING MAY 2 TH, AND CLOSING JUNE 1ST, 1852

---

EX GOV THOS MITCALFE AND IR J F M MIFLAN, MODERATORS,  
J SHARP ESQ PRESIDING MODERATOR

---

CINCINNATI.  
JETHRO JACKSON.  
1852

# THE MATTHEWS — FRANKLIN DEBATE

## PREDESTINATION and FOREKNOWLEDGE OF GOD

This Debate was conducted May 26 — June 1, 1852, in Carlisle, KY., between Rev. James Matthews, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Ky., and Elder Benj. Franklin, Pastor of the Clinton Street Christian Church, Cincinnati, OH. The debate came about as a result of a sermon on PREDESTINATION published by Benjamin Franklin. This sermon appears in Vol. 1 of "THE GOSPEL PREACHER." It also appeared at the beginning of this book. There are a number of pages of "Correspondence" leading up to the debate which do not appear in the electronic version. The Debate begins on the numbered page 95.

[\(Click on title for text\)](#)

SERMON ON PREDESTINATION:

MR. MATTHEWS' FIRST ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S EIGHTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S FIRST REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' NINTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' SECOND ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S NINTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S SECOND REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' TENTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' THIRD ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S TENTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' ELEVENTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' FOURTH ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S ELEVENTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTH REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' TWELFTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' FIFTH ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S TWELFTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S FIFTH REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' THIRTEENTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' SIXTH ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRTEENTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S SIXTH REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' FOURTEENTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' SEVENTH ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTEENTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S SEVENTH REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' FIFTEENTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' EIGHTH ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S FIFTEENTH REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' SIXTEENTH ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S SIXTEENTH REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' SEVENTEENTH  
ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S SEVENTEENTH REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' EIGHTEENTH  
ADDRESS

MR. FRANKLIN'S EIGHTEENTH REPLY

MR. MATTHEWS' CLOSING SPEECH

MR. FRANKLIN'S CLOSING SPEECH

### **SECOND SERIES OF INVESTIGATION**

MR. FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' FIRST REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' SECOND REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' THIRD REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' FOURTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S FIFTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' FIFTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S SIXTH ADDRESS

MR. MATTHEWS' SIXTH REPLY

MR. FRANKLIN'S FINAL CLOSING SPEECH

MR. MATTHEWS' FINAL CLOSING SPEECH

**THEME.--PREDESTINATION AND THE FOREKNOWLEDGE  
OF GOD.**

TEXT.--"According as he has chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he has made us accepted in the Beloved."--EPH. i: 4-6.

THE design of this discourse is to call attention to the teaching of the Bible on election, predestination, foreordination, and the foreknowledge of God. It is delightful to stand free from all creeds, theories, and embarrassing opinions of men, where one can look into the oracles of God simply with a view to understand them. In the present instance, there is nothing in the way to hinder the fullest and fairest investigation in determining what the Bible means by the important terms to be examined.

The terms predestination, foreordination, foreknowledge of God, election, determinate counsel, mystery, secret, and counsel of his will, are all Bible terms. A man of intelligence, in these matters, can not say he does not believe the doctrine of election, etc. Election is in the Bible; so is predestination. The same is true of foreordination, foreknowledge, etc. Whatever the Bible teaches by these terms is as true as what it teaches in any other terms, or on any other subject. But any man may say, in all good

conscience, if he understands the subject, that he does not believe the following from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith:

"By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished. Those of mankind that are thus predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith and good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature as conditions or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace." Con. of Faith, p. 18.

This, an intelligent man may say, he does not believe, or does not understand; but this is one thing, and the teaching of the Scriptures referred to, another and a very different thing. There is something in the Bible called "the foreknowledge of God." The question to solve is simply what is it? or what does it mean? This is the matter first to be settled.

"Foreknowledge" is to know before. But the word "know" is used in two senses in Scripture, as it is in our own time. When we say we know certain things, we mean that we are cognizant of them, or are informed of them. We speak of certain things which we know, or concerning which we have information, in contradistinction from certain things of which we are not informed. In this sense there is nothing which the Infinite One does not know; in this sense he knows every thing. The apostles said of the Savior that

he knew all things. The Almighty Father saw the end from the beginning. Nothing is hid from the omniscient one. In this sense there is neither foreknowledge nor after-knowledge with God. The word know is not used in this sense where we find the word foreknow or foreknowledge. When we read "known to God are all his works," the import is not simply that he is acquainted with all his works, or cognizant of them, for, in that sense, he knows every thing. The sense is, "approved of God are all his works." Another passage of the same kind is, "The Lord knows them that are his." If the word "know" were here used in the common acceptation, you might respond that the Lord knows them that are not his also. There are none whom he does not know in this sense. The Lord is not only cognizant of them that are his, or acquainted with them, but the Lord approves them that are his, as he does not approve them that are not his. The same is true of the words "Depart, you workers of iniquity; I never knew you." He surely did not mean I never was acquainted with you, but I never acknowledged or approved you as I have those that are mine. When the Lord speaks of knowing certain things, it is not in contradistinction from things with which he is not acquainted, or of which he is not informed, but sometimes in contradistinction from things which he has not made known, and sometimes things which he has not approved. When God looked down on the works of creation, he saw that they were good, or approved them, or rather made known his approval in pronouncing them "very good."

It is, therefore, very clear that when the Scriptures speak of "the foreknowledge of God," they do not mean simply that with which he was before acquainted. This falls far short of the meaning. They mean more than this. Let reference, then, be made directly to the law and to the testimony. "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and

foreknowledge of God, you have taken, and, by wicked hands, have crucified and slain." Acts ii: 23. In this passage there are two of the strongest expressions of this kind found in the Bible, viz., "the determinate counsel" and "the foreknowledge of God." What is the import, or what did the apostle mean by these terms? The following passage, from the same apostle, on the same subject, is a clear and complete explanation of the words just quoted: "But those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all his holy prophets, that Christ should suffer, he has so fulfilled." Acts iii: 18. It will be readily seen that what is called "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," in the second chapter, is here called "those things which God before has shown by the mouth of all the holy prophets," in the third. This defines the foreknowledge of God to be that which he had before shown by the prophets, in contradistinction from that which he had not before shown by the prophets. The following, from Paul, throws some additional light on the same point: "The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel to Abraham, saying, 'In thee shall all nations be blessed.'" Gal. iii: 8. Now, it is self-evident that precisely the same that is meant by "foreknowledge," in the passage previously referred to, is meant by "foreseeing" in the one last quoted. What is meant, then, by "the Scripture foreseeing?" Is it not God foreshowing in the Scripture, or showing by the mouth of the prophets? Another Scripture, of the same nature, says: "He has concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. iii: 22. This conclusion is foreknowledge of God, or God's conclusion before made known, through the prophets, that all are under, and that the promise to Abraham, by the faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe.

The eternal purpose of God contained Christ, the Gospel, the plan of justification for the heathen through faith. The same was embodied in the promise made to Abraham, and confirmed by an oath. This was followed in after ages by many predictions, all, in one way or another, bearing on the great purpose of God to give this glorious system to man. In the New Testament frequent reference is made back to the purpose, the promise, the predictions of the prophets; and the knowledge thus communicated before is called the foreknowledge of God, in contradistinction to what was afterward fully unfolded and developed to the world by the apostles. This foreknowledge, determinate counsel, mystery, or secret, had in it Christ, the Gospel, the Church, justification of the heathen through faith, making the Gentiles members of the same body and partakers of the promise in Christ by the Gospel. This was the grand secret, hid in God for ages, and not made known to the sons of men as it is now revealed to the apostles and prophets by the Spirit. It was concerning this the prophets "inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come to us: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. To whom it was revealed, that not to themselves, but to us they did minister the things that are now reported to you by them that have preached the Gospel, with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into." 1 Pet. i: 10, 12. It was this same great secret that was before the mind of the apostle to the Gentiles when he concluded his letter to the Church in Rome in the following words: "Now to him who it of power to establish you according to my Gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made



manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Rom. xvi: 25, 26. The Gospel preached by Paul, the preaching of Jesus Christ, and the revelation of the mystery are the same. It was a secret, but is now revealed; it was hid, but is now brought out; it was in the purpose of God, the promise, in prophecy, or foreknowledge, but is now embodied in a complete revelation of the Gospel to the world. The eternal purpose of God was to publish the Gospel of Christ to the nations of the earth. The promise contained the same thing--the Gospel in promise. The prophecies contain the same, with much more said about it, and the Gospel now contains the same, fully developed and published to the world.

The next thing in order will be to decide who the persons were, spoken of in the text, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. They were elect; God's elect. There is no use in caviling; the word "world," here, is not age. It is the material world. These persons were chosen in Christ before the founding of the material world, or before bringing order out of chaos. There are two questions to decide concerning these persons: Who were they? What were they chosen or elected for? They are not named in the whole passage, but simply referred to as "us," and "we." These pronouns occur a number of times between the third and thirteenth verses. No man understands the reading who does not know who is meant by these words. The matter in hand, then, is to find out who is meant by these two little words "us" and "we." Four different theories have been advocated, as now recollected. These must each, in return, receive attention.

1. Some Universalists have maintained that the words "us" and "we," here, mean all mankind, and that all mankind were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the

world. But this can not be, for certain things are said of them that can not be said of all mankind. It will not do to say that he "has made all mankind accepted in the Beloved." Universalists do not believe this themselves. They only claim that he will do this and not that he has done it, much less that he has "predestinated all mankind to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," or that "all mankind have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." It is not true that he had "abounded toward all mankind in all wisdom and prudence," nor that he had "made known to all mankind the mystery of his will." It is not true of all mankind that they had, in Paul's time, "obtained an inheritance," nor that all mankind "should be to the praise of his glory who first trusted in Christ." If all mankind first trusted in Christ, who trusted in Christ last, or afterward? At the thirteenth verse, the apostle says, "In whom you also trusted, after that you heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that you believed, you were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." How could the apostle say that all mankind had "first trusted in Christ," and, in the next breath, addressing the disciples in Ephesus, say, "In whom you also trusted?" "Also trusted," as well as whom? The saints in Ephesus also trusted in Christ, as well as all mankind. According to this, the saints in Ephesus were no part of "all mankind," but all mankind first trusted in Christ and then the saints in Ephesus also trusted in Christ. This is simply absurd.

2. Some have supposed that the words "us" and "we" mean the Jews. But this is equally absurd. It will not do to say that "he has chosen the Jews in him before the foundation of the world, that the Jews should be holy and without blame before him in love;" nor that "he has predestinated the Jews to the adoption of children by Jesus

Christ to himself;" nor that he "has made the Jews accepted in the beloved;" nor that "the Jews have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins;" nor yet that "he has made known to the Jews the mystery of his will;" nor had the Jews "obtained an inheritance" at the time Paul wrote this letter. Yet these things were true of the persons of whom the apostle was speaking.

3. The Calvinists think the words "us" and "we," from the fourth to the thirteenth verse, mean all the saints--their elect. Can what Paul says here be said of all the saints? Certainly not. Were all the saints "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ" when Paul wrote this? Certainly not, for millions of them were not yet born. Nor were all the saints "predestinated to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," nor had all the saints received "forgiveness of sins" at the time of this writing, nor were they "accepted in the beloved." It is not true that he "abounded to all the saints in all wisdom and prudence" at the time of this writing, nor that he "had made known to them the mystery of his will," nor that they had "obtained an inheritance," but all these statements were true of the persons of whom Paul was speaking. It is not true that all the saints "first trusted in Christ," but these persons "first trusted in Christ," and the apostle adds, verse thirteenth, "In whom you also trusted after you heard the word of truth." In whom you also trusted as well as whom? If he meant all the saints before, he means now that the saints at Ephesus also trusted in Christ, as well as all the saints. This makes nonsense of it.

4. Who, then, does the apostle mean by the words "us" and "we," from the fourth to the thirteenth verse? We have seen that the language can not apply to the Jews, to all mankind, or all the saints. To whom, then, can all this language be applied? It can be applied to the apostles and

prophets of the New Testament, and nobody else. The apostles and prophets were "blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." They were "chosen in him before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and without blame before him in love." He had "predestinated them to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself," and he had, when Paul wrote, "made them accepted in the beloved." They had, when Paul wrote, "redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," and he had "abounded toward them in all wisdom and prudence." He had, when Paul wrote, "made known to them the mystery of his will," and they "had obtained an inheritance." They did "first trust in Christ;" and when the Ephesians heard the word of truth, the Gospel of their salvation, they "also trusted" in him, as well as the apostles and prophets. The apostles and prophets were chosen in him before the foundation of the world, and are the "us" and "we" of whom the apostle speaks, from verse three to verse thirteen--the elect of this passage.

As further evidence of the correctness of this, refer to the ninth verse. Here the apostle says, "Having made known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he had purposed in himself." The word "us" here means the same persons of whom he had been speaking all along, and says, "Having made known to us the mystery." The mystery was made known to the same persons "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world." Who, then, were these persons to whom he made known the mystery? Turn to Ephesians iii: 3-5, where he says, "By revelation he made known to me the mystery, as I wrote before in few words, whereby, when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ; which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." The

"us," then, of chapter 1, verse 9, are the "apostles and prophets," chap. iii: verses 3-5. These apostles and prophets, then, to whom he made known the mystery, are the elect--the persons chosen in him before the foundation of the world.

Having now ascertained who these elect persons were of whom the apostle had been speaking, the next thing in order will be to ascertain what they were elected, or chosen in him, for. Were they elected for their own happiness and glory or for the benefit of others? Were they elected simply to eternal life themselves, or as instruments through whom others were to be benefited? The ground here maintained is, that their election had no more in it for them, in the world to come, than for any other persons of their time or any future time. They were not elected simply for their own sakes, but for the benefit of the world. What, then, were they chosen or elected for? Paul answers: "For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if you have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which was given to me toward you." What was this dispensation given to Paul? It was the dispensation belonging to this election. He proceeds: "How that by revelation he made known to me the mystery, as I wrote above (chapter i: 9), in few words, whereby, when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel." What was all this for? He proceeds "Whereof," or, for this purpose, "I was made a minister," or one of the elect, "chosen in him before the foundation of the world." "To me," says he, "who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given." What grace? The

grace of election, of being chosen in Christ, to the apostolic office. What was this given for? He proceeds: "That I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of time has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." He still proceeds further, unfolding the purpose of this election to the apostolic office: "To the intent," or for the purpose, "that now to the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Jesus Christ our Lord." This passage most clearly and explicitly sets forth the object of the election of which the apostle had been speaking. The grace of election, of being chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, was to preach the Gospel; to unite the Jews and Gentiles in one body, and to make all men see, or to make a revelation to the world. They were chosen in Christ, as the agents or instruments, through which God would reveal his will to man and found the new institution. This election had something in it, not merely for the elect themselves, but for all mankind. They were "chosen in Christ," "predestinated," and the "grace given them," that they should be instrumental in blessing the world with a full revelation of the mystery--the Gospel.

"But," says a man, "I will go to the seventeenth chapter of John, and find the persons that were given to Christ; they were the elect." That is so. But the same two things must be ascertained, as in the other case: 1. Who were the elect? 2. What were they elected for? Who, then, were the persons given to Christ, as set forth in John xvii: 2-20? Were they all mankind? Certainly not; for in verse sixth he says he gave them "out of the world." They were not all the world, but out of the world. Were they all the

saints? Manifestly not, for he says, verse 11 and 12: "Holy Father, keep through shine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name." They were not all the saints, for he "was with them in the world," and he was not with all the saints in the world. But he proceeds: "Those whom thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." From this passage, it is learned that one of those given to him, or one of the elect, was lost. The Calvinistic idea of the elect is, that they can not be lost; but here we have the clear concession that one of them was lost. This one was Judas. He was one whom Jesus had chosen, and one whom the Father gave him, and was lost. Why was he lost? On what ground was he lost? The following passage informs us: "And they prayed and said, Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show which of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he may go to his own place." Acts i: 24. This settles the question, touching the ground on which he was lost; he was lost, or he fell by transgression. But now the question rises, What was he given to Christ for? Was it for his own happiness, for his eternal glory? Certainly not. What, then? For the ministry and apostleship?? "This ministry and apostleship" from "which Judas by transgression fell." Matthias was elected to take "part of this ministry and apostleship." No doubt, from other considerations, he was finally lost, but that is not what is meant here. He was given to Christ; was one of the chosen to the ministry, the apostleship, and from this ministry and apostleship he fell and was lost. Paul was also one of the elect, was under the necessity of having an eye to his conduct, lest having "preached the Gospel to others, he himself should be a

castaway." 1 Cor. ix: 27. If, then, one of the elect, one of the chosen, one given to Christ, "by transgression fell and was lost" from that to which he was elected, and another one of the elect had to labor to keep his body in subjection, lest having "preached the Gospel to others, he himself should be a castaway," it would be well for others, even if they could prove that they are elected, not to rely too confidently on their election to save them. They, too, might fall by transgression and be lost.

But to return to John 17, please examine carefully and see if you can decide who were given to Christ. The Lord proceeds, verse 20: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one; as thou? Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." This passage refers to three classes: 1. Those given to Christ, to whom he here does not confine his prayer, and through whose word others are to believe. 2. Those who should believe through their word. 3. The world, whom he desired to be convinced, by the union of the believers. The first class are the elect, the chosen, or the apostles, who were to preach the Word. The second class, the saints, or those made believers by hearing the words of the apostles. The third class, the unbelieving world, whom he desired to be influenced to believe by the union of the saints, or the believers.

The position is not here taken, and will not be anywhere in this discourse, that no elect is mentioned in Scripture but the apostles and prophets of the New Testament. The position here taken is, that the apostles and prophets of the New Testament are the elect of Eph. i: 4-12 and John xvii: 2-20. Having now determined, beyond dispute, that the apostles and prophets are the persons here spoken of as given to Christ, chosen in him before the foundation of the world--the



elect; and that this choice of God, or election, is to the prophetic and apostolic office, not for their own benefit or happiness, but as the instruments through whom God would reveal his will, make known the unsearchable riches of Christ, make all men see the wisdom and goodness of God are exhibited in this election, and none of that crude theory called Calvinism, or Augustinism, is found in it, or having any footing. It was a wise and benevolent purpose of God to elect those persons, or choose them in Christ for this great and good object, and all men have reason for thankfulness and gratitude to God for this election, but not for the Calvinistic theory of election. In view of all this, the apostle exclaims: "O, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who has known the mind of the Lord? or who has been his counselor? or who has first given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever." Romans xi:3 3-36.

But other important passages must be considered. Some man exclaims, "Does not the Scripture say, 'Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated?' and was not this written before these two sons were born, and consequently before they had done any good or evil?" The words "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," are Scripture, but they were not written before Jacob and Esau were born. This passage is found in Rom. ix: 13, as quoted by Paul from Mal. i: 2, 3, and was written only three hundred and ninety years before Christ. The language "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," as we have it in the old English style, does not express the meaning of the original well. The full force of the original, as may be shown by any amount of authority, is, "Jacob have I respected, and Esau have I slighted." In what, then, did the Lord respect Jacob and slight Esau?

Did he elect Jacob to eternal glory and reprobate Esau to eternal damnation? Certainly not. There is not a word of this kind in the language of the prophet, nor in the comment of Paul on it. It will be seen by reference to the genealogy, as recorded by Luke, that the Lord's genealogy is traced from Joseph up, through Jacob, to Abraham, or, indeed, to Adam; and, by reference to Matt. 1, that the genealogy is traced down from Abraham, through Jacob, to Christ. Esau being the first-born, or the elder son, it was his right by birth, or he had the birthright to be enrolled in the lineage, which was the lineage of Christ. But the Lord slighted him in striking his name out of this lineage, and respected Jacob in enrolling his name in the sacred line, in which the blood of Jesus was to flow. But this was not done by an immutable and an arbitrary decree. Esau was free, and acted as freely and voluntarily as any man ever acted in bartering away and selling his birthright to Jacob. This is clear from Heb. xii: 18, where Paul says, "Lest thereby any fornicator or profane person, as Esau, who, for one morsel of meat, sold his birthright." The birthright, to be enrolled in the genealogy, was his; but he sold it, lost it, and could not get it again, not on account of any previous immutable decree, but by his own free and voluntary act. It was not eternal life he had lost, nor was the birthright lost by an unconditional, immutable, and an eternal decree, but by his own voluntary act. The very first sight of this case, as set forth in Scripture, demolishes a principal item in Calvinistic election. Their idea is, once in election, or, which is the same, in grace, always in grace. Esau was born elect, or with a birthright, and Jacob was born non-elect, or without a birthright; and Esau, born elect, lost the election, and Jacob, born non-elect, gained the election, retained it, and his name stands enrolled, and will so stand, among the elect in the genealogy of our Lord till the last trumpet shall sound.

But it was said to the mother of these children, before they were born, "the elder shall serve the younger." Rom. ix: 12, and Gen. xxv: 23. This did not mean that the elder shall be eternally lost, nor that the younger shall be eternally saved, nor did this find its fulfillment in the persons, or in the life-time of these two children, nor for hundreds of years after their day. As an evidence. of this, you will notice, that after Jacob had served his twice seven years for Rachel, and become quite wealthy, and when he was on his return to his own country, he learned that he was about to meet Esau, at which he was alarmed, and sent presents to appease Esau's wrath, for fear he might suffer from him. He feared that Esau might remember the little transaction about the birthright when they were boys. This circumstance shows that Esau was no servant of Jacob at the time they here met, but was the more powerful man, and that Jacob feared him. But, by attention to the language, it will be seen that the language does not say, nor imply, that the servitude was to be in Esau's own person. The Lord said, "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thee; and the elder shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." Gen. xxv: 23. This was a prediction to ancient Rebecca touching two nations and two manner of people that were to descend from her, or from her twins, not yet born--Jacob and Esau--the descendants of the latter designated "the elder," and the descendants of the younger designated "the younger," in the brief and very elliptical prediction.

These two nations were, in course of time, respectively called Jacob and Esau, or Israel and Edom; and when the Lord uttered the words, Mal. i: 2, 3, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," he alluded to the two nations, called Jacob and Esau, or Israel and Edom, and not to the two men, Jacob and Esau, in their own persons. Israel

he had respected, in making them the elect, through whom the Messiah was to come, and passing the sacred genealogy through them, and slighted Edom in not passing the sacred line through them, and they finally became servants of Israel. The transaction about selling and purchasing the birthright is not merely an amusing story, about two boys, to entertain children, but apparently an unimportant transaction between two boys that had a divine purpose in it, and turned the line of our Lord's genealogy from the course it was apparently about to take through the nation of Edom, and running down through long and eventful centuries, in the nation of Israel, from whom our Lord came. This is the election here, and there is no other in this transaction.

"But," says a man, "the Scripture says, 'Has not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel to honor and another to dishonor?' Are we not clay in the hands of the potter? Is not the Lord the potter? Are we not merely passive in his hands? Will he not make us, then, as seems good in his sight? Paul, Rom. ix: 21, alludes to this figure, as found Jer. xviii: 1-10. The Lord is the potter. The people of whom he is speaking are the clay in his hands, and he has power to make them vessels of wrath or of honor, as seems good to the potter to make them. The prophet says: 'The word which came from the Lord to Jeremiah, saying, Arise, and go down to the potter's house, and I will cause thee to hear my words. And I went down to the potter's house, and, behold, he wrought a work on the wheels. And the vessel he made of clay was marred in the hands of the potter; so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it. Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying, O house of Israel, can not I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are you in my hand, O house of Israel.'" Jer. xviii: 1-4. It occurs

sometimes, when the potter is turning a vessel on the wheel, that it mars or breaks in his hand. When it does this, what is the cause of it? Is it because he wills or decrees it? Is it because he desired it to break in his hand? Surely not. It is contrary to his will. Why, then, does it break in his hand? Because the clay is not good. The failure is not in the will or decree of the potter, but in the bad clay, that can not be made into a good vessel. But the potter has the power, when the clay is bad and breaks in his hand, to make it over again, as seems good to the potter to make it, into another vessel, a coarser and rougher vessel, for some less honorable purpose. With this explanation, please hear the words of the prophet, and try to learn the reason why the Lord makes some vessels to honor and others to dishonor; for he has the power and will make some vessels to honor and some to dishonor. The Lord says, "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do to them." Please, notice this language carefully. If what? "If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do them." It turns on their behavior. The Lord has the power, and if they turn from their evil, he will turn away his wrath. But, now, hear the Lord state the other side: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." What is the ground here on which he will refuse to benefit them? What is the contingency? If what? "If it do evil in my sight, that obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." What does the whole matter turn on? On

the obedience or disobedience of a nation. If it disobeys the voice of God and does evil in his sight, he will make it a vessel to dishonor, or utterly overthrow it. If it shall do good, obey his voice, he will raise it up, and make it a vessel to honor.

From all this, it is clear that it entirely depends on the clay, the house of Israel. Unless wicked nations turn from evil and obey the voice of God, they will be overthrown and made vessels to dishonor. The same is true of individuals as well as nations. This teaching is confirmed by Paul, 2 Tim. ii: 21: "If a man, therefore, shall purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel to honor, sanctified and fit for the Master's use, and prepared to every good work." This is as clear as language can be, showing that the whole matter of being a vessel to honor is conditional--that if a man shall purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel to honor. Men are not wicked because God makes them vessels to dishonor; but he makes them vessels to dishonor, because they are wicked, as a punishment. When God speaks to men, nations, and kingdoms, to pluck up and pull down, if they repent, obey his voice, turn from their evil, he will make them vessels to honor and fit for the Master's use. Let men, nations, and kingdoms, then, tremble before the majesty of heaven and earth.

But the Scripture says, "He will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens." Certainly, the Scripture says so, and it is as unquestionably true as any thing ever uttered. The Lord will have mercy on some and harden others. This is divinely true. But there are several things not explained in this. 1. It is not explained whom God will have mercy on, and whom he will harden. 2. It is not explained why God will have mercy on some, nor why he will harden others. These are matters to be inquired into. On whom, then, will the Lord have

mercy? Turn to Exodus xx: 5, 6: "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them (images), nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children to the third and fourth generations of them that hate me; and showing mercy to thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." On whom will he have mercy? On them that love him and keep his commandments. Why will he have mercy on them? Because they love him and keep his commandments. On whom will he visit iniquity? On them that hate him. Why will he visit iniquity on them? Because they hate him.

Turn to Neh. i: 5, and hear the word of the Lord: "I beseech thee, O Lord God of heaven, the great and terrible God, that keepeth covenant and mercy for them that love him and observe his commandments." On whom will he have mercy? On them, that love him and keep his commandments. Why will he have mercy on them? Because they love him and keep his commandments. The whole matter turns on the character of men, and not on any immutable decree of God. Listen to the Savior, Matt. v: "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." They who are merciful themselves shall obtain mercy. The holy apostle says, "For he shall have judgment without mercy, who has showed no mercy." Jas. ii: 13. The man who is himself merciful, shall have mercy, and the man who has showed no mercy, or is unmerciful, shall have no mercy. The Lord will not have mercy on him. The Lord will have mercy on whom he will have mercy. This is decreed. When he tells whom he will have mercy on, it is on those that love him and keep his commandments; and when he explains whom he hardens, or makes vessels to dishonor, it is clearly seen that they are those who hate him and disobey his voice.

It should also be distinctly understood, that there are two

senses in which God is said to do things: 1. When he does things directly, without any contingency. 2. Where he permits them to be done. In this latter sense he hardens men. In that sense he hardened Pharaoh. Hence you read in the Bible of Pharaoh hardening himself and of God hardening him. God only did by permitting it. Pharaoh did directly, by his own acts.

Listen to the word of the Lord once more: "The righteousness of the righteous shall be on him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be on him. But if the wicked will turn away from all his sins that he has committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live; he shall not die. All his transgressions that he has committed, they shall not be mentioned to him; in his righteousness that he has done he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God; and not that he should turn from his ways and live? But when the righteous turns away from his righteousness, and commits iniquity, and does according to all the abominations that the wicked man does, shall he live? All his righteousness that he has done shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he has trespassed, and in his sins that he has sinned, in them shall he die." Ezek. xviii: 20-24. If any thing can be clearly stated, this passage states the case clearly, showing whom God will have mercy on, and who shall surely die. The man who turns from his sins shall surely live; he shall not die; but the man who turns away from his righteousness shall not live; he shall surely die. Such is the immutable decree of God touching those on whom he will have mercy, and those whom he will harden.

Does any one desire a fuller explanation touching the question whom the Lord will harden? Listen to the following: "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and



with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe the lie: that they all might be condemned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. ii: 9-12. The decree of God, then, is that he will have mercy on them who love him and keep his commandments, and harden those who hate him and receive not the love of the truth. Men are not, then, vile and sinful because God hardens them; nor do they refuse to receive the love of the truth because he hardens them, but he hardens them because they receive not the love of the truth--because they are vile and sinful. On the other hand, men are not good because God has mercy on them, but he has mercy on them because they love him, obey his voice, do those things that are pleasing in his sight.

"But I do not believe that men can fall from grace," says one. That may be. Men do not believe things that are true, in some instances. What say the Scriptures? "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame." Heb. vi: 4-6. Certainly none but Christians, saints, those in Christ, in grace, have tasted the heavenly gift, partaken of the Holy Spirit, tasted the good word of God or the powers of the world to come. Yet Paul speaks of such, and of their falling away, as well as the impossibility of renewing them again to repentance.

Hear the apostle again: "For if we sin willfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remains no

more sacrifice for sin." Heb. x: 26. Surely none but saints ever received the knowledge of the truth, and if such sin willfully, there remains no more sacrifice for sin. This shows that saints may sin, and that, too, so greatly as to lose their interest in the only sin-offering--the Lord from heaven.

The theory that men can not fall from grace is clearly contradicted and refuted by the closing words of the Book of God: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book." Rev. xxii: 19. Certainly none but saints ever had a part in the book of life, and in the holy city, and most indisputably, if a man has his part taken out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, he is fallen and undone forever. But hear the apostle once more: "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of none effect to you, whoever of you are justified by the law; **YOU ARE FALLEN FROM GRACE.**" Gal. v: 3, 4. Here is an end to the controversy--a final settlement of the question.

Do you desire, then, the Lord to have mercy on you; that he may not harden you; send you strong delusions, and make you vessels of dishonor? Then remember his word, that he will have mercy on them that love him and keep his commandments; on them that are merciful, and that he will send strong delusion on those who receive not the love of the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness. As you desire that he may not make an example of you, as he did of Pharaoh of old, harden not your hearts against him, but receive the love of the truth, obey his voice, and he will have mercy on you. You may run and will, as Esau did, after he sold his birthright; but you must remember that

it is God who shows mercy, and he has clearly defined that he will have mercy on the merciful--on them who love him and keep his commandments, and not on them who hate him and obey not his voice. You may will and run, argue and contend that God will save you; nay, more, that he will save all; but if you do not love God, and keep his commandments, he will not have mercy on you.

God has made you free, and says: "To whom you yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants you are to whom you obey; whether of sin to death, or of obedience to righteousness." Rom. vi: 16. "If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." Again says the Lord: "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now have they both seen and hated me and my father." John xv: 22-24. The Lord does not say, "You could not come to me," but "you would not come to me that you might have life." The light has come into the world, and men choose darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.

"But," says a man, "does not Jesus say, 'No man can come to me, except the father who has sent me draw him?'" Yes, sir, he so says, and proceeds at once to tell how the father draws them. The next verse says: "It is written in the prophets, they shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that has heard, and learned of the father, comes to me." John iv: 44, 45. The father taught them by the prophets; they heard and learned this teaching of the father by the prophets, and were thus drawn to the Savior.

"But, I do not believe any man can come till the Lord gives him power," says a man. To whom does the Lord give power? "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 i: 12. To whom gave he power? "To as many as received him"--"to them that believe on his name." He did not give to them the power to enable them to believe, or to receive him, but he gave those who received him and believed on his name power to become the sons of God.

The Lord cried over the devoted city: "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets and stonest those who have been sent to thee; how often would I have gathered thy children as a hen gathers her brood, but you would not." Here is the true reason why men are not gathered to the Lord: they will not be gathered.

# Debate.

## MR. MATTHEWS' FIRST ADDRESS.

*Wednesday, May 26, 1852, 10 o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

*Fellow Citizens*—It is with some degree of embarrassment that I present myself before you on this occasion. This embarrassment arises from the novelty of the position in which I stand. For the first time in my life, I am called upon to defend, in public debate, the doctrines which I believe and teach.

If the motive of your assembling to-day were to witness some gladiatorial exhibition, to see with what agility and address a thrust could be given, parried, or returned, I should feel deeply mortified and humiliated at the position which I occupy, and the part which I am to sustain in the proceedings of this occasion. A minister of Christ has higher duties—and ought to have higher aims—than to enter the field of controversy for the purpose of gratifying a love of notoriety, displaying partisan zeal, or ministering gratification to the love of novelty and excitement prevalent in a community. The study, the pulpit, the bedside of the afflicted, the Bible class, and the prayer meeting, are his appropriate scenes of labor; and no ordinary circumstances will justify him in turning aside from these to occupy the rostrum and engage in the exciting scenes of a public debate.

I have, however, no sympathy with those who think, or feign to think, that public discussions are never allowable for a Gospel minister. The teaching of the prophets, of our Savior himself, and of his Apostles, was often controversial. No man, in any age of the church, has distinguished himself as a fast friend of truth, and a foe to pre-

vailing errors, without wielding the weapons of controversy. The same volume which enjoins love to all, and, as far as possible, peace with all, also commands us to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," and to "hold fast the form of sound words which we have heard;" and teaches that it is part of the work of a bishop, "by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers," and to stop the mouths of "vain talkers and deceivers."

Entertaining these views, therefore, I have no apology to offer for the position in which I stand to-day. I love peace, but I love truth more. There can be no lasting peace, no real union, except upon the basis of truth. But how discover truth when opinions are jarring and conflicting? How have the truths of science been elicited from the map of erroneous theories under which they long lay buried? How are great political principles established? How, amid masses of confused and contradictory testimony, is truth arrived at in our courts of justice? By discussion: by the comparison of different views, and the consideration of opposing arguments. Is there any other mode of learning the truth in matters of religion? Or is truth here of less importance than on other subjects of investigation?

I grant that many religious controversies are so conducted as to wound the cause of religion, and cover the parties with disgrace. But this is by no means a necessary result, and I trust it will not be so in the present discussion. If the moderators will pardon me the remark, I will say that the character of this discussion depends greatly upon them. There are certain specific points which we have agreed to discuss, and certain rules of order and decorum which we have bound ourselves to abide by. If, then, *I* shall at any time deviate from the subject of discussion, or be so far forgetful of my character as a Christian and a gentleman as to indulge in personalities and abuse, I invoke the timely interposition of your authority, to which I shall most cheerfully bow. What I ask for myself, I shall expect you to award to my opponent. Conducted in this way, our discussion will be something more than a petty dispute, and may result in benefit and instruction to all. May God grant so to order it, and

lead us all to see, acknowledge, and obey the truth; and to his name be glory!

I shall not spend time in giving a history of the circumstances out of which this discussion originated. These are well understood in this community, and are fully set forth in the preliminary correspondence between the parties. I simply remark here, that I understand "my opponent claims, as I most explicitly disclaim, the honor of originating this debate. Whatever of pleasure or profit any one may derive from it will be due to him, not to me. Let honor be given where honor is due. With these preliminary statements, I address myself at once to the proof of the proposition before us. That proposition is a compound one, having for its subjects, first, four points of doctrine; secondly, sundry interpretations of Scripture; and thirdly, an assertion that the Predestination of the Confession of Faith is not the Predestination of the Bible: all taken from a printed Sermon of my opponent on "Predestination and the Foreknowledge of God." To the four points of doctrine, in their order, I first invite attention.

The first point of doctrine is thus expressed: "When God speaks of knowing certain things, it is in contradistinction from things which he does not make known, or approve as his." Sermon, p. 5. Stripped of its redundant verbiage, and put into a direct form, the meaning of this sentence is: "*When God speaks of knowing certain things, he means that he approves them, or makes them known as his.*"

This proposition, observe, is *a general* one. It is without qualification or restriction. It is not said that *sometimes* the word "know," when used with reference to God, means, to approve or acknowledge. This I do not deny. Nay, more: if passages in point, where the word "know" has this meaning, would be of any service to the gentleman, I will furnish them to him. But his proposition has no such restriction. In the most unqualified manner, using the most general terms, and giving no intimation that those terms are to be taken in any other than their ordinary import, he asserts that, "*When God speaks of knowing certain things,*" he means thus and so. As there is nothing in the *language*, so there is nothing in the *connection*, to

indicate that this proposition is to be restricted. *Just the reverse.* The argument intended is, because "know" means so and so; "foreknow" must mean thus and so. Now if "know," when applied to God, only *sometimes* has the meaning "approve," etc., no certain inference could be drawn respecting its meaning in the compound word "foreknow." Beside, an argument is attempted (p. 4) to show that the word "know," in its ordinary import, cannot be applied to God, "When God is said to know certain things, it does not imply that there are certain other things which he does not know, or is not acquainted with." Now if this argument be good for anything, it proves that God can *never, in any case,* use the word "know" in its ordinary import; for that would imply, according to the argument of this Sermon, that "there were certain other things which he was not acquainted with," Three passages of Scripture are quoted in illustration and confirmation of this argument, and to show that the word "know," when applied to God, has not its common signification. Then follows this proposition, on which I am commenting as an *inference* from the preceding argument. This inference is expressed in *general* terms: the connection demands that it should be a *general* one; and the argument by which it is sustained is a *general* argument. We must understand the inference, then, as a *general* one; and as such, I maintain.

1. It is bad philosophy. It is a most striking example of false induction. I know of no instance exactly parallel, unless it be the case mentioned by Dr. Watts. Niveo had observed that, for three years in succession, it had snowed on Christmas; he, therefore, sagely concluded that it would *always* snow on Christmas. Had he written a Sermon on the subject, he doubtless would have observed, in general terms, such as those employed here: "*When* Christmas comes, it will snow:" and the conclusion would have been just as philosophical as that of this Sermon. Inductive reasoning is a source of a great part of our knowledge; but when the number of instances observed is not sufficient to bear out the conclusion, it is the prolific source of error. I object, then, to the doctrine of this Sermon, that it is wretchedly bad philosophy. The foundation is



exceedingly narrow; the superstructure lofty and extensive. The consequence is, the whole must topple down in confusion and destruction dire!

2. If the philosophy be bad, the philology is no better. We are told that, when applied to God, the word "*know*" means to approve or make known as his. What evidence is given of this assertion? There are various ways in which we may ascertain the meaning of words. If the word be derivative, we may refer to its root, or we may consult lexicons, or we may appeal to general usage, which, after all, is the tribunal of last resort. Says an ancient critic:

"Usus,

Quern penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi."

"Usage, with which rest the decision, the law, and the standard of language."

But what authority is given for this meaning of the word "know," when applied to God? Is etymology appealed to? No. Is the authority of lexicographers adduced? Not one is quoted or referred to. Is an appeal made to the usage of the inspired writers, and is it shown, by an induction of all the passages, where the word "know" is applied to God, that, when so applied, it means to *approve*? Nothing of the kind is attempted. The verb "to know," in its various inflections, is used nearly a hundred, times in relation to God in the Scriptures. Three passages only are referred to in the Sermon, and one of these is with reference to Christ: and because it is fancied that in these cases the verb "know" means to approve, by a sweeping generalization, the conclusion is reached, that, "WHEN God speaks of knowing certain things," it is meant that "he approves or makes them known as his." Neither etymology nor lexicons, nor general usage, has been appealed to in support of this conclusion, and for the best of reasons.

But let us apply this definition of "know" to a few passages, and see what beauties it will educe from the word of God. "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." Gen. iii, 22. *I. e.*, to *approve* good and evil. The persons of the Godhead, then, approve good AND EVIL! "The Lord God of gods, he knoweth, and Israel, he shall know, if

it be in rebellion, or if in transgression against the Lord; (save us nob this day); "*i. e.* according to the new reading, the Lord God of gods, he approveth, if it be in rebellion and transgression against the Lord. Does God *approve* rebellion and transgression! "They that eat the swine's flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse, shall be consumed together; saith the Lord: for I know their works and their thoughts." Is. lxvi, 17, 18. That is, God approves, or makes them known as his, who violate his laws by eating unclean animals; and, in proof of his high approbation, he will consume them together! "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?" *i. e.* who can *approve* it? "I, the Lord, search the heart" Jer. xvii, 9, 10. "Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men." Acts i, 24. *I. e. approvest* the hearts of all men, though "out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false-witness, blasphemies." In the light of these passages, I ask every rational man, can the doctrine be true which teaches that, when God speaks of knowing certain things, it is in contradistinction from things which he does not approve or make known as his? Philosophy repudiates the doctrine. Philology will none of it; and it makes sheer nonsense, or shocking blasphemy of the Scriptures of truth.

But I am not yet done with this doctrine. There are passages in the word of God, the whole context of which shows that the words "know," "knowledge," etc., used with reference to the Supreme Being, are to be taken in their common signification. True, it is impossible, by any form of speech such as men or angels use, to convey an idea of Jehovah as he is. Yet, when God himself, in condescension to our weak capacity, makes use of human language, it is rash, it is presumptuous, to reject the usual signification of words, and fly off to fanciful meanings, better suited, in our weak judgment, to the Divine Majesty. Let us turn to the passages alluded to.

"Understand, ye brutish among the people: and ye fools, when will ye be wise? He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see? *He that teacheth man knowledge, shall he not know?* The Lord knoweth the thoughts of man that they are

vanity." Psalm xciv, 8—11. Here the existence of certain attributes in the Creator is argued, from the fact that they exist in the creature; and among these the attribute of *Knowledge* In this passage, then, whatever "knowledge" means when predicated of man, it must have the same signification as referring to God. The very structure of the argument requires this. So in another passage: "O Lord! thou hast searched me and known me. Thou knowest my down-sitting and mine up-rising: thou understandest my thoughts afar off. Thou compasses my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways: for there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo! O Lord! thou knowest it altogether. \* \* \* Search me, O God! and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts, and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting." Psalm cxxxix, 1—4, 23, 24. That the word "know," applied to God, in this passage, is to be taken in its common acceptance, is evident: first, from the fact that this knowledge is the result of "*Marching*," of "*compassing the path*" of "trying;" and, secondly, because the terms "understandest" and "acquainted with," used as synonymous with "know," fix upon it its usual meaning. Indeed, the whole scope of the passage forbids any other interpretation.

When these arguments are pondered, I hope we shall have no repetition, on this occasion, of the question of some of old, "How doth God know, and is there knowledge in the Most High?"—[*Time expired.* ]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

*Respected Hearers*—I heartily concur with the remarks of the worthy gentleman touching the propriety and importance of religious investigation. Truth is always fearless of the light and free to be brought into discussion. Error has everything to lose, and, therefore, is frequently opposed to such close contact with light and truth as is necessarily expected in public Debate. The holy prophets were frequently engaged in important controversies. The Lord himself withstood his opposers to the face. The inspired Apostles not only "contended earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," but enjoined it upon others

to do the same. The great Martin Luther, to whom we are more indebted for the light and the privileges we at this day enjoy than any man since the great Roman apostasy, spent the vigor and best energies of his life in Debate. Calvin and Wesley were controversialists. The same, is true of every man who has thrown any great amount of light upon the world.

It is not, I presume, *controversy itself*, when the matter is understood, that any lovers of truth are really opposed to, but the *abuse* of it. *I* then heartily unite with the gentleman, in the hope that we shall remember the position we occupy, as ministers of the word of God, and that we shall descend to nothing low and unworthy. If I know anything of my own heart, I would not leave my home and travel nearly a hundred miles with the thought of a mere victory over a fellow-mortal. I have an aim higher—transcendently more elevated. My object is that *truth* may gain a victory over *error*. If truth may gain a triumph, we all may rejoice, for we all shall thereby be benefitted. This, then, is the victory I aim at, and pray for—the victory of *truth over error*.

Respecting the remark, that this controversy originated with myself, I feel no disposition to dispute. This matter will all fully appear for itself in the correspondence. Without further remarks of a preliminary nature, I shall proceed to reply to the speech you have just heard.

I am sorry to have to say, touching the first point of attack made by my worthy friend, that his labor is in vain. He first strives to show that I have taken such a position as I never have taken, and then, having assumed a position for me, enters into the work learnedly and systematically to demolish that position. In this, he is not combating my Sermon, or myself, but a position he has assumed for me. I have not said in the Sermon, or anywhere else, or even thought that the word "know," *universally* means *approve*; nor have I said, or thought that the word "know" *generally* means *approve*. Yet this much, at least, must be assumed for me, or the speech you have just heard has not the semblance of an argument in it. I have said, that "when God speaks of knowing certain things, it is not in contradistinction from other things which he does not know, or is not acquainted with, but in

contradistinction from things which he does not make known, or approve as his." Ser. p. 5.

It is then, so far from true, that I have said that the word "know" *always* means *approve*, that I have restricted it by the words: when *God speaks* of knowing." This cuts off all those passages where *man* is said to *know*. But I have restricted even more than that, by adding the words "certain, things." The whole remark then, relates to where God is said to know certain things. Nay, more, I am still more explicit, for I give in the same connection, the certain things I have in my mind.

I ask then, by what kind of fairness, or consistency the gentleman proceeds upon the hypothesis, that I have said that the word "know" *always* means *approve*? He admits that in some cases it means as I say, and kindly offers to specify instances of that kind. In this he concedes all that I have claimed and has virtually given up the argument on that point. When I say, that "when God speaks of knowing certain things," my meaning is precisely the same as if I had said, "when God speaks of knowing *some* things." I have never said, or thought that the word "know," could not, in *any case*, have any other meaning, than *approve*. I know that it has most usually another meaning. But I have said, now say, and my opponent has admitted, that "when God speaks of knowing certain things, it is that he approves them; " but this is not always the meaning of the word know.

In the discourse, I refer to some of the "certain things," in reference to which the word "know" is used in this sense, and the gentleman has not undertaken to show that I am mistaken in either of the instances given. But he sagely thinks of other instances, in which the word cannot have that meaning. In all this he is but fighting a man of straw of his own creation. But that he may not spend his strength in demolishing an imaginary position, I now invite his attention to my real position.

In the introduction of the Sermon, I have endeavored to ascertain the meaning of the words, "foreknowledge of God." Being satisfied that foreknowledge is, in some cases, used in the sense of *before approved*, I went back to the word "know" first, to show that it is used in the sense of *approve*, but not to show that it is always used in that sense. I will now give the specimens given in the Sermon. "Known unto

God are all his works." Acts xv, 18. Does this mean that God is *acquainted* with all his works? If so, these words state nothing only what is true of all other works, as well as the works of God. He is acquainted with everything. The passage evidently means more than this; states something of his works that cannot, in truth, be stated of other works, viz: that God *approves them*, as he does not other works, and not merely that he is *acquainted with them*, as he is with everything else.

The next specification is, "The Lord knows them that are his." 2 Tim. ii, 19. Does the Apostle simply mean that the Lord is *acquainted* with them that are his? If so, there is no force in the expression, for the Lord is acquainted with everybody. This cannot be the meaning of the Apostle. He evidently states something of the children of God that cannot, in truth, be stated of all others, and that something is, that he approves them as he does not them that are not his. The third passage reads as follows: "Depart, ye workers of iniquity, I never knew you." Mat. vii, 23. Surely he did not intend to say "I never was acquainted with you?" Are there any with whom the Infinite Being is not *acquainted*?

That I am entirely correct in the meaning of these passages, I entertain not a single doubt, and I hope that if my worthy friend thinks he can show the incorrectness of any position I have taken, he will assail what *I have said* and not what *I have not said*. We shall see, in future, whether he will continue to fasten upon me the position he has imagined for me, or assail the one I have taken. If he shall choose the former, he is beating the air; if the latter, I shall expose him.

I am fully aware, that had I been writing a proposition for debate, in the place of introductory and incidental remarks in a sermon, I could have so restricted and guarded my remarks, that even the worthy gentleman would not have attempted the deductions he has made. But this, I was not doing, and I am surprised that my language, written without any thought of such a play upon it, should be found as guarded as it is. In my replies it shall not be my purpose to form issues such as my opponent did not intend, but I shall aim to meet the precise issues he may intend. It is no reply to, or refutation of, any man, to make for him an issue that he did not make or intend, and *refute that*.

I shall now give you a passage in which "foreknow," means before *approve*. "For whom he did foreknow, he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren." Rom. viii, 29. The meaning of the word "foreknow," in this passage, cannot be *before acquainted with*, for this would make the Apostle assert, that "whom he was *before acquainted with*, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." This would be a much larger elect than is generally claimed, for, if God predestinates all to be conformed to the image of his Son, with whom he is *acquainted*, there will be none left out of the predestination, for he is *acquainted with all*. But the evident import of the passage is, "whom he did before *approve*, he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son."

This brings us at once to the Foreknowledge of God. I maintain that Peter has used this term and defined it, and I shall now show the passages. "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and Foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and, by wicked hands, have crucified and slain." Acts, ii, 23. Now I maintain that the Apostle expresses precisely the same idea in different words, Acts iii, 18, as follows: "But those things which God hath shown before by the mouth of all his holy prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled." Now that Peter means the same by each of these passages cannot reasonably be doubted. What he calls, "the determinate counsel and Foreknowledge of God," in the second chapter, he calls "those things which God has before shown by the prophets," in the third chapter. The Apostle's own definition of the Foreknowledge of God is then, those things which he has before remarked as shown by the mouth of his holy prophets.

This beautifully corresponds with Paul, in the following: "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the hen then through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Gal. iii, 8. Now it is evident, that the "Scripture foreseeing," can be nothing different from *God foreseeing* or foreshowing thorough the Scriptures. This is then, an evidence that what is called the "Foreknowledge of God, "

in the Scripture is that which God has before *shown* or *set forth in the Scriptures*. The expression amounts to the same as if the Apostle had said, "God foreshowing that he would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed" This Foreknowledge of God differs from the creed of the worthy gentleman, for the decree set forth in it, is "without any foresight of faith," while God foresaw that he would justify the heathen *through faith*.

The Apostle uses another expression, in the same chapter, of similar import. "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. iii, 22. This is the conclusion of God recorded in the Jewish Scripture. It is indeed, nothing different from the Foreknowledge of God, or the previous conclusion of God, set forth in the Scripture. This is the same kind of an expression as that of Peter, Acts, ii, 25: "For David speaketh concerning him, *I foresaw the Lord* always before my face, for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved." On this, Peter remarks, Acts, ii, 31: "He *seeing this before*, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." Now what does David mean by "*foreseeing* the Lord?" Did he foreknow all things, whatsoever comes to pass? or did he simply foreshow what the inspiring spirit of prophesy spoke through him? Indeed, Peter begins, verse 23, "with the determinate counsel and Foreknowledge of God." This refers to the crucifixion of Christ, and to show that Christ was risen from the dead, he proceeds to tell the Jews what David *foresaw*, and then in a few words below he changes the expression to the words: "He *seeing this before*," and in Acts, iii, 18, he calls the same "that which was before shown by the prophets." Paul calls the same thing, "the Scripture *foreseeing* that God would justify the heathen through faith."

These expressions show, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that what is called the foreknowledge of God, in the Scripture, is that which God has before shown by the prophets, concerning Christ and the gracious system he



came to reveal to the world. With this before the mind, there is but little difficulty in harmonizing the following expressions: Foreknowledge of God, Determinate Counsel, Eternal Purpose, Predestination, Mystery of his Will, Election, etc., etc. God had a purpose. He made a promise. Through the prophets he made numerous predictions. The New Testament writers frequently refer back to the original intention or the purpose of God. This they sometimes simply call "the purpose." They also frequently refer to the promise to Abraham, by simply calling it "*the promise*." In many instances they make references to the predictions of the prophets. In connection with these references, in the New Testament, to the eternal purpose or original intention of God; to the promise to Abraham and to the predictions of the prophets, in some of their bearings upon the mission and death of Christ, and the revelation of Christianity to the world, with the calling of the gentiles, we find every one of the expressions before enumerated and others of the same kind. This accounts for the fact that they are mostly New Testament expressions. —[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' SECOND ADDRESS.

*Wednesday, 11 o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

WHEN a man has taken a position which he finds it impossible to sustain, there are two courses open for him to pursue: either nobly and magnanimously to confess his error; or, adroitly to attempt to change his ground, and to make it appear that he never took the position which he finds himself unable to defend. The gentleman has chosen the latter course. We ought not, perhaps, to attach very great blame to him; but make allowances for the weakness of human nature, and the pride of human opinion. It is an effort, and a stretch of magnanimity too great to expect of him, that in the very opening speech he should renounce a doctrine set forth in his Sermon, though he finds it utterly indefensible. He therefore does the next best thing in his power under the circumstances, he denies that *he meant* what his Sermon most assuredly *says*.

Well, I regard this maneuver as virtually "confessing judgment," and I would not add a single word upon this point, were it not that the gentleman, in order to extricate himself from the ruins of his demolished theory, brings against me the charge of misrepresentation, and of forming false issues. *I deny the charge.* If the gentleman has been misrepresented at all, his own words in the Sermon have misrepresented him. I quoted his very language, and showed that both the form of expression, the connection of the words, and the necessities of his argument, required the construction that I put upon it.

He says that I have assumed for him that the word "know" *universally* means *approve*, I have assumed no such thing. Nor have I said or intimated that he gives this as the *general* meaning" of the word. I have said that it is the doctrine of the Sermon that "*know,*" *when predicated of God,* means approve. This I repeat; the Sermon means this, or it means nothing—the arguments of the Sermon prove this, or they prove nothing,

But he says that he has limited his proposition by the words "certain things"—"When God speaks of knowing *certain things.*" *Very well:* without noticing the accuracy of the gentleman's logic, by which he limits a proposition by *limiting the predicate,* instead of the *subject,* let us apply" it to the passages quoted in my former speech—"God speaks of knowing *certain things,*" in Gen. iii, 22, viz: "*good and evil.*" Does God approve good and evil? "God speaks of knowing *certain things,*" in Joshua, xxii, 22, viz: "rebellion and transgression." Does God *approve* these crimes? "God speaks of knowing *certain things,*" in Isa. lxvi, 17, 18; Jer. xvii, 9, 10; Acts, i, 24, viz; the works, the thoughts, the hearts of men. Does God *approve* the works, thoughts, and hearts of the wicked? Let the gentleman either manfully avow the consequences of his teaching, or magnanimously renounce his whole theory.

The gentleman, in his reckless style of assertion, says that "I have admitted that when God speaks of knowing certain things it is that he approves of them." Now I beg leave to say, in all kindness, I have admitted no such thing. I have said that *sometimes* know means "approve; " but *I* can see, if the gentleman cannot, a vast difference

between this proposition and the *unrestricted* one that, "When God speaks of knowing certain things, he means that he approves them."

The gentleman says that my creed differs from the Scriptures, "for the decree set forth in it is 'without any foresight of faith, ' while God foresaw that he would justify the heathen *through faith*." I must admonish the gentleman in the outset, to be careful in quoting our Confession. He is guilty here of a gross misrepresentation. Our Confession does *not* teach that God's decrees are without foresight of faith. No act that God performs is without a full and perfect foresight of the faith and good works of his chosen ones, and of every other event and action that will ever occur. What the Confession *does* teach is, that the election of men to glory was "without any foresight of faith, or good works, etc., *as* CONDITIONS OR CAUSES MOVING HIM THEREUNTO." Foreseen faith and good works were not the CAUSES of God's decree—they were foreseen as the *effects* of it. It is a vice of the gentleman, which seems to have settled into a confirmed habit, in quoting the Confession, to take but *a part of a sentence*. Is he aware that by his method of quotation the atheist can prove his doctrine from the Bible? It is expressly said in the Psalms, "There is no God."

The gentleman invites my attention to three passages of Scripture which he quoted in his Sermon, and which he has quoted over again in his speech, to prove his position with respect to the word "know," when applied to God. Suppose that the word know in these passages *does* mean approve, will that sustain the gentleman? not at all. I have stated that there are nearly one hundred instances in which this word is used with reference to God—out of these he quotes but three. Now, even if correct in his opinion respecting these three, it only proves a proposition which I have never denied, viz: that *sometimes* "know" means approve, but falls far short of establishing the doctrine that "When God speaks of knowing certain things it is meant that he approves them."

But even these three texts are misinterpreted. The first is, "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." Acts, xv, 18. On this passage the Sermon makes the sage remark that "the import is not simply that

God is acquainted with all his works, for the Omniscient is acquainted with everything." P. 4. I presume that this is the first and only instance in which objection is made to a statement of the Bible, *because it is true!* On the same ground I might object to the statement that God created man, for God created everything! It cannot be said that Christ will raise believers at the last day, for he will raise all men! It cannot be said that white is the color of snow, for it is the color of a great many substances beside! The whole force of the argument to show that the word "known," in the passage cited, must mean *approve*, "hath this extent; no more."

Now, I maintain that the word has its usual signification in this passage; because,

1st. No argument to the contrary has been given. To call such statements as I have read from this Sermon *arguments*, is to mock our reason, and cruelly to abuse an inoffensive word.

2d. Because "The received signification of a word, is to be retained, unless weighty and necessary reasons require that it should be abandoned or neglected." Home's Introduction, Vol. 1, p. 324. I do not know whether the gentleman is acquainted with the original Scriptures; I should be glad to be informed: for if he is, I will feel more free to refer to the original, when I think we can fix upon the meaning of a passage more certainly. If the gentleman reads the Greek, he will see that the word translated "known" is *gnosta*. This word is an adjective; the verb from which it is derived, has sometimes the meaning of approve, as I have already stated; but I can find no instance in which the word used in this verse has this meaning. A strong argument to show that it does not have it 3) ere.

3d. Because the context *forces* us to give the word "known" its common signification. The Gentiles had begun to embrace the Gospel; and some of the Jewish converts insisted that they must be circumcised according to the Levitical law. The question produced considerable discussion, especially at Antioch; and at length was referred for decision to the Apostles and elders, in synod assembled at Jerusalem. The matter was discussed—Peter told what God had done for the Gentiles by him—putting

them on a footing of equality with the Jews. Barnabas and Paul declared what wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them. After they had all ceased, James, who presided—*primus inter pares*—concluded the deliberations. He alluded to the facts already narrated respecting the conversion of the Gentiles. He showed that the calling of the Gentiles was predicted by the prophets. It was not then a *new* plan or purpose of God; he had given intimation in prophesy, which James quotes, that he would act just as he had acted. The existence of the prophesy centuries before its fulfillment, showed that the conversion of the Gentiles was no *afterthought*, on the part of God. He had merely done what he *knew* he would do, and what he had promised to do centuries before. In fact, all that God will do in time, *is known* to him from eternity.; "*Known* unto God are all his works from the foundation of the world."

Giving the word its ordinary meaning, there is force and pertinency in the passage; but giving the word "known" any other meaning, the connection is totally destroyed. For these reasons, I insist that Acts, xv, 18, is not an instance where the word "know" has the sense of *approve*. The broad conclusion of the Sermon *rests* now on the narrow basis of two solitary texts. One of these is, "The Lord knoweth them that are his." 2 Tim. ii, 19. This also must be taken away. The reason assigned in the Sermon for interpreting this, "The Lord *approveth* them that are his," is this: "If the word know were here used as we use it among men, it might be responded, the Lord knows them that are not his also," pp. 4, 5. Yes! and if a man says he knows the road to Lexington, "it might be responded," that he knows the road to Maysville also! Therefore, when he says he *knows* it, he don't mean what he says, but he means that he *approves* the road to Lexington!! When God says, "I know all the fowls of the mountains," "it might be responded," that God knows all the fish of the sea also! Therefore he means I *approve* all the fowls of the mountains!! In fact this *must* be the meaning, for "*When God is said to know certain things*, it is in contradistinction from things which he does not make known or approve as his." P. 5. What rapid advances the science of exegesis is making!

But we must try and be serious, for this Sermon is not joking, but is in good solemn earnest. I argue then that the word "know," in this passage, *is* "used as we use it among men."

1. Because there is no reason to the contrary.

2. Because "The received signification of a word is to be retained, unless," etc.; Home, *ut supra*.

3. Because the connection requires the usual sense to be given. Hymenaeus and Philetus had erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection was past, and overthrew the faith of some. But the foundation of the Lord standeth firm; though some may apostatize, and others be deceived, God's own chosen people can never perish. *He knows them*; their names are graven on the palms of his hands, and inscribed in the book of life. He will keep them, by his mighty power, through faith, unto salvation.

4. Because Alexander Campbell has said that "the fact that God has clothed his communications in human language, and that he has spoken by men to men, is *prima fade* evidence that he is to be understood as one man conversing with another." Chris. Res., p. 22.

The author of the Sermon says that the word "know" is *not* used by God as we use it among men. Mr. Campbell says that God *is* to be understood as one man conversing with another. "Who shall decide when Doctors disagree?" Every man to his taste, of course, but in this case *I* go with the Bishop of Bethany.

The theory of the Sermon has but one prop remaining. "I never knew you, depart from me, ye workers of iniquity." Matt, vii, 23. In this case the gentleman has some authority for the interpretation he has given. Heretofore he has disdained to confine himself to the interpretations given by any critic, ancient or modern, Romish or Protestant. In dealing out his expositions he has one authority which with him avails more than all translators, critics, lexicographers, or commentators. This authority he employs on all occasions—his name is IPSE DIXIT. But for the interpretation given to Matt, vii, 23, he has some authority; but whence is it derived? It is *Trinitarian* authority. It comes from those who, jealous of the doctrine of Christ's supreme divinity, give such an interpretation of the passage as shall not even *seem* to favor the heresy

of those who deny that he is God over all. Indeed, unless Christ be truly God, the passage has no pertinency in this discussion. It is the meaning of the word "know," *when applied to God*, that is in dispute. And unless the gentleman belongs to that wing of the "Reformation" army who admit Christ's supreme deity, he has no right to quote the passage in this connection. But I am by no means clear that even this passage is an instance in which "know" means *approve*. The parallel passage in Luke reads, "I know ye not *whence ye are*;" which would seem to fix upon "know" its common signification. Thus the props of the gentleman's theory are all gone; the theory itself has vanished, "And like the baseless fabric of a vision, left not a wreck behind."

I proceed now to the SECOND *point of doctrine* in the Sermon, which is thus expressed. "*The Foreknowledge of God is the knowledge which God has before given by the prophets respecting Christ and his sufferings.*" P. 6.

There is an inseparable connection between the doctrines of Predestination and Foreknowledge. The discussion of the one necessarily involves the consideration of the other. This the gentleman felt, and so his Sermon is devoted to both topics. It is, according to the title-page, on "Predestination and the Foreknowledge of God." *The sentence I have quoted gives complete, his entire theory of Foreknowledge.* This shall now call our attention.

Whether the statement of the Sermon be intended as a definition of the word "Foreknowledge," or a statement of the *doctrine*, it is radically faulty and defective. If it be intended as a definition of the word, I object to it—because:

1st. *It is without authority.* It is mere assertion. If we receive it at all, it must be on the authority of *Dr. Ipse Dixit*. Now no man has the right to juggle with the meaning of words, and to affix new, arbitrary, and unheard of meanings to them, as may suit his caprice, fancy or creed. We must have authority—not assertion.

2d. It contradicts the author's previous deduction as to the meaning of "know." He sets out to define Foreknowledge, and proceeds to ascertain the meaning of the simple words of which it is compounded. He declares that "know," when applied to God, means to *approve*; well, if

this be correct, we would expect to hear that "*foreknow*" means to *approve before*. But instead of this, we are told that Foreknowledge means to impart knowledge beforehand. The Sermon is here involved in hopeless self-contradiction.

3d. It confounds the word "foreknow" with the word "foreshow," from which it is radically distinct.

4th. It is contradicted by the etymology of the word itself. If Foreknowledge does not mean the knowledge of events before they happen, then words have no meaning, and language is a mockery. I speak now of the English word Foreknowledge. As respects the original word, which is translated "foreknowledge," I shall reserve my remarks until I come to speak of the passages in which it occurs. —[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I LOOK upon the speech you just heard, as virtually giving up the dispute on the first point. All the argument of the speech was directed to two points, viz: 1. To prove that I have taken the position, that where God is said to "know," it invariably means to *approve*. 2. To demolish this creature of his own imagination. In the former he failed; in the latter he succeeded admirably. He saw that he could not refute anything I have said, and he must, to make even a *show of argument*, refute something; he therefore refutes a position I have not taken. He has not said anything deserving the name of argument, unless it can be shown that I have taken the position that where God is said to "know," it *always* means *approve*. This he has not, and cannot do, for I never thought or wrote it. My statement, and a mere incidental statement, in the introduction of my Sermon, upon which nothing in this argument of importance depends, was that, "when God is said to *know certain things*," it is, that he *approves* them. This the worthy gentlemen admits, and kindly proposes to find instances not specified in the Sermon! Here then, the argument on this point is given up. Yet, he goes on and attempts to show, that in two of the instances given in the Sermon, the word "know" cannot mean *approve*. Suppose



he could succeed in tills, what does he gain by it? nothing, only that I was mistaken in saying it had that meaning in these instances; for he admits that it has that meaning in other places; in doing which, he admits the correctness of the position he has assailed, and no effort can get him out of the difficulty.

The worthy gentleman denies attributing to me the position that the word "know," universally means approve. He has then become ashamed, and even refused to repeat one of his proof-texts used in his first reply to my Sermon. On that occasion he quoted the words, "Cain *knew* his wife," to show that the word "know," could not mean *approve*. What was this quotation for, if he did not represent me as taking the position that the word "know" universally meant approve? Upon no other hypothesis can he show that referring to this passage could prove anything to the point.

But I have not admitted, and have not the least notion of admitting, that the word "know," in either of the three instances given in the Sermon, means *acquainted with*, nor is this the first instance, or an instance at all, in which an objection is made to "a statement of the Bible, *because it is true*." I object to the gentleman's interpretation, not because it *is true*, but because it *is not true*. His interpretation represents the holy writer as slating a truth, but one of no force and of no importance; but the interpretation I have given, represents the Divine writer as stating a very important truth, with great force. "The Lord *acknowledges* or *approves* them that are his," as he does not *approve* them that are not his. There is some Christian comfort and consolation in this; but to expound it, "the Lord is *acquainted with* them that are his," has not a particle of Christian consolation in it; for there is nothing in it that is not equally as true of the wicked—the Lord is acquainted with them also. "*Approved of* God are all his works," has some force in it, for it makes a striking distinction between the works of God and other works; but to say, "the Lord is *acquainted with* all his works," makes no distinction between his works and other works. On these two passages I shall not spend time, since the gentleman has granted the principle that the word "know" does, in some instances, mean *approve*; which was all I was aiming to show in these refer-

ences. But his unenviable position on the words, "Depart, ye workers of iniquity, I never knew you," must be exposed.

After much parade about authority, he admits that I have authority *on* this, my "only prop," as he is pleased to style it. But, he informs us, it is *Trinitarian* authority, and I have no right to it, unless I am Trinitarian! Indeed! and have Trinitarians been under the necessity of perverting the words of Jesus, to favor Trinitarianism? Is this the representation he gives us of their pious efforts to sustain their doctrine? Does he doubt their position on this point? If he does, he is no Trinitarian. This he has done, and quoted the words, "I know you not *whence ye are*—which," he says, "would seem to fix upon know its common signification." He then doubts whether Jesus was *acquainted* with the wicked! This is a strange position for a Trinitarian! Does he deny the omniscience of our adorable Lord and Savior Jesus Christ? If he does, I object to him as not orthodox—a heretic. The Savior I believe in is acquainted with everything. In this sense, he knows all things. I object to his position, then, because it denies the supreme divinity of the Christian's Lord and Savior.

If my memory is not at fault, I have quoted another passage to which he has given no attention. "Whom he did foreknow he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." Does this mean, whom he was before acquainted with, he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son? If so, the gentleman will have a large elect; for he was certainly acquainted with *all*. Are *all* predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son? If the word "foreknow" means, *before acquainted with*, such is the true state of the case. But this is evidently not the meaning of that word; but whom he did *before approve*, he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son. I should like to get his attention to this passage.

My worthy friend is already seeking to hide behind a Greek word. But in his preamble to it, he informed us, that he did not know whether I could read Greek. I was somewhat surprised at this. I at once commenced reflecting how it could be that he did not know as much now as he did three or four months ago; for, in our correspondence, he informed our readers that I could not read a page of all

that was written in the first century. Now I am unable to see how he knew this at that time, but does not know it now! In this I have the advantage of him: I do know that he can read Greek—that he is "learned and talented—that he is a great man. But *he* is fighting in the dark; he knows nothing about Ins opponent.

I am admonished that I must be very careful how I quote the Confession of Faith! I must handle it with as much care as you would edge-tools, or I shall cut my fingers. For this timely admonition, I would be truly ungrateful were I not to acknowledge my obligations; for without some hint of the kind, I might have handled and quoted it without any higher regard or veneration than is shown to an uninspired work.

But in what have I misquoted or misapplied the Confession? I have said that his creed differs from the Scriptures, for the decree set forth in it, is without any foresight of faith, while God foresaw that he would justify the heathen through faith. If I have done his creed any injustice in this, I did not intend it, and cannot now see it. But I now take the gentleman's correction and find the same fault with it. He says, that "the election of men to glory was without any foresight of faith or good works," etc., whereas Paul says, "The Scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the heathen *through faith*." He explained further, that "foreseen faith and good works were not the CAUSES of God's decree—they were foreseen as the effects of it." This is genuine Calvinism, most explicitly stated. Believers are such, because God unchangeably decreed them to be believers; and unbelievers are such, because God decreed that they should never have the power to believe. If they are damned, then, for *unbelief* they will be damned for what they never had it in their power to avoid. The gentleman now is into the merits of the case. This is the doctrine I came here to oppose. I deny and shall successfully deny that the holy God ever did or ever will, damn any man for what he could not avoid. Against this imputation of the holy character and attributes of God, I take my stand, and challenge the utmost scrutiny and investigation.,

My worthy friend objects to my interpretation of Foreknowledge; because "*it is without authority*." In this lie

is only mistaken, for I gave him high authority; but I did not succeed in getting his attention to it. I gave a definition of Foreknowledge, not from "*Dr. Ipse Dixit*," or assertion, but from one Dr. Peter, whom I hope he does not regard as "*no authority*." To this high authority, I call his attention once more, and hope that, in the place of passing it as "no authority," he will give it his especial attention. "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Acts ii, 23. Now I have shown that Peter has explained the same, in another place, in different words, which is an inspired definition of the foreknowledge of God. Here is the passage: "But those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled." Acts iii, 18. Now I leave it to the good judgment of this audience, if the "Apostle is not speaking of precisely the same thing in both of these passages, and if what he calls "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," in one place, is not the same called "those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets," in the other. This then, is authority of the highest kind, for calling "the foreknowledge of God," "that which God has before shown by the mouth of all his prophets." I have also shown that "David foresaw the Lord," and that Peter ascribes this to the fact, that he was a prophet, and says, "he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ," which is, beyond all dispute, the same as God before-showing through David, a prophet, that He would raise Christ from the dead. This is the foreknowledge of God. This is the same as the "Scripture foreseeing"—it is God *foreshowing* through the Scripture. If this is not what is called the foreknowledge of God in the Bible, let him show that anything else is so called. He has assumed a certain kind of Foreknowledge of God, for that mentioned in the Bible, and the same has been assumed a thousand times, but never once proved to be what the Bible means by that expression, and never can be. His own bare assertion for the application he makes of the Bible term, "foreknowledge," or the assertion of some other man, is the highest authority he will ever find. To show that his

application was what was intended, in a single instance, from a single intimation in the Bible, he has not, and cannot do.

"Foreknowledge" is a New Testament term. It is not found in the Old Testament. In every place where it occurs, we find reference to something said by the prophets. This is a strong evidence that my interpretation is the correct one. The reason why we do not find the word "foreknowledge" in the Old Testament, is clear. There was no knowledge, communicated by prophets, before the Old Testament; hence, in all that part of the sacred writings, we have not one word about Foreknowledge.

Having now replied to my worthy friend's remarks, as far as I think they demand, I shall proceed to introduce an independent argument, upon which I intend to rely to refute Calvinism throughout this controversy. In order to accomplish this object, I shall go back to the beginning—to the original intention—the "eternal purpose of God," in creating man. What was the design of God, in creating man? To get an answer to this question, I open the Confession, page 167, Larger Catechism, and I confess, I cannot feel as much awe in venturing to open this high authority, as the admonition of the gentleman seemed to indicate I should. I therefore venture the following quotation on the design of God in creating man: "Man's chief and highest end is to glorify God, and fully to enjoy him forever." *Man*, in this passage, means the *race*. It is then, asserted of the race, that the chief and highest object of their being, is to glorify God and enjoy him forever. This *is* true, if it does contradict the part of the Confession the gentleman appears upon this stage to prove; and if it is true, it was not in the original intention to reprobate any part of the race, without any offer of mercy, to eternal damnation.

This authority is not, however, sufficient, for many in this assembly, and, I fear, on this point, will not be sufficient for the worthy gentleman himself. I shall therefore appeal to higher authority. What did God create man for? David says, of the creation of man: "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet." Ps. viii, 6. This is expressive of the intention of God in the creation of man.

Paul throws some light on the eternal purpose of God in the following: "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord," Eph. iii, 9—11. If I understand the import of this passage, it asserts that Paul's preaching among the gentiles, "to make *all men see* what is the fellowship of the mystery," was according to the eternal purpose of God. If this is correct, then, it was not in the eternal purpose of God to "pass by" and "*blind*" some men, and never give them the power to see, but it was his intention to give them the light of the Gospel, that they might see, that they might justly be held accountable for *not seeing*. No man can be accountable for not seeing, who never had the power of seeing, nor could such a one be reprimanded for not seeing, any more than a dumb man can be reprimanded for not speaking.

Let us hear Paul tell what God created man for. He says, "He hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us." Acts xvii, 26, 27. Now, if God made all men, as is here asserted, that they *might seek* the Lord, feel after him and *find him*, he must have anticipated the fall, the alienation that would follow, and the system of grace he designed to give, through which all men that dwell on all the earth might seek the Lord and find him. This undoubtedly was the benevolent purpose of God in creating man, drawn not from fancy, but from the infallible oracles of God. This gracious purpose saps the foundation of Calvinism, and shows that Almighty God, when he created man, had in his eternal purpose grace, mercy and truth, which he intended to give the world, that they might seek him and find him. I put this down as my argument, No. 1, against Calvinism, as taught in the Confession. —[*Time expired.*]

**MR. MATTHEWS' THIRD ADDRESS.**

*Wednesday, 3 o'clock, P. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: —

DURING the forenoon's session I have had some opportunity of observing my opponent's method of discussion; and there is one matter which I wish to mention now, that we may be spared the recurrence of it in future—I refer to loose statements, and unguarded forms of expression, which, whether so intended or not, convey false impressions: and which I shall feel bound, in every instance, to expose. For example: he asserts that on a certain occasion I quoted the words "Cain knew his wife," thereby representing him as saying that "know" always meant approve. This is an entire mistake—I quoted the passage to show that a man might make blasphemy and nonsense of the Scriptures, by taking a peculiar meaning which a word sometimes has, and applying it to the word in other places where it ought to have its common signification.

He represents me as holding that Trinitarians "perverted" Matt, vii, 23 "to favor Trinitarianism"—I said no such thing. I have no doubt of the honesty of those who give the interpretation alluded to of this passage; but I attributed their interpretation to an honest, though mistaken idea, that the passage, in its common signification, derogated from the honor of Jesus. The gentleman seeks to make a little capital out of my interpretation of this passage. He exclaims, with well feigned horror, "Does he deny the omniscience of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ?" It is said that sometimes Satan reproves sin. I have no idea how a poor transgressor would feel if taken to task by the author of all evil; but I confess, my feelings are somewhat "peculiar," when reproved by a person whose ecclesiastical associations are those of my opponent, for denying the omniscience of Jesus Christ! Who it is that really denies the omniscience of God, or at least seeks to *put the doctrine out of the Bible*, has already begun to appear, and will be yet more manifest before we are done with this "Sermon on Predestination and *the Foreknowledge of God*." I believe that the Lord Jesus was very God, and very man: that he united *two natures*, the divine and human, in the same person. Many things are true of him as GOD, which

are not true of the *man*. Many things are true of him as MAN which are not true of him as GOD. As Goo he upholds the universe: as *man* he fainted under the cross. As GOD he "knows all things: " as *man* he himself declares he knows neither the day nor the hour of the judgment. Mark, xiii, 32. But why does not the gentleman notice my argument from the parallel text of Luke against his version of Matt, vii, 23? Would he read it "I approve you not WHENCE YE ARE?" Will he inform us? Another of the gentleman's loose statements is the assertion that I published him as unable to read a page of the writings of the first century. I did no such thing, as the correspondence will show. I published that, *when satisfied* that he was competent to read those writings, I would listen to his statements respecting their contents; but having *no proof* of his competency, I objected to his testimony. But will the gentleman condescend to enlighten me on this point. I am inclined to think him a person of vast erudition. The airs he puts on, when I, as respectfully as I could, requested him to state whether he read the Greek, are such as a PERSON might have assumed if asked whether he could conjugate *tupto*.

In my last speech I showed how the gentleman had misrepresented the Confession by a garbled quotation. Instead of owning his mistake, he repeats his garbled and dishonest quotation, and even represents me as quoting the passage in the same way! I found out, long ago, and this audience will soon find out, that "courage to defend a false position," is, in the estimation of the gentleman, essential to a debater.

I shall not reply to so much of the gentleman's speech as is mere repetition of former arguments, already refuted; nor shall I follow him in his flight, from the points now before us, to another portion of the field, hereafter to be passed over. In my own dull, plodding way, I will proceed regularly with my argument; and if the gentleman shall find it more comfortable to be somewhere else, than on the ground that I, for the time, occupy, he must take his own course, and I shall follow mine.

In my last speech I gave some reasons why I could not accept the gentleman's statement respecting Foreknowledge, as a definition of the *word*. But possibly he did not mean,



in the Sermon, to merely define the word. He may have intended to state the *doctrine* of Foreknowledge. "The Foreknowledge of God is the knowledge which God has before given respecting Christ and his sufferings." If this be intended as a statement of the gentleman's *doctrine* of Foreknowledge, I object to it:

1st. That it is a gross *misnomer*. To *know* a thing before it comes to pass; and to *declare* a thing before it occurs, are as different as can be imagined. We all *know* many things which we do not *declare*: and some men *declare* things they do not *know*.

2d. I object to the doctrine, that it is *self contradictory*. Unless we degrade God to the level of some men "who know not what they say, nor whereof they affirm," this very effort to get rid of the doctrine of Foreknowledge, as commonly understood, really presupposes, and implies such Foreknowledge. How could God "*before give*" any "knowledge respecting Christ and his sufferings," unless *he possessed* that knowledge beforehand?

3d. I object that this theory, which sets aside the common doctrine of Foreknowledge, destroys all the prophetic portion of the Scriptures, impeaches the veracity of God, and impairs the evidences of Christianity; destroys the prophecies, by making them but guesses, made without a certain knowledge that they would be fulfilled; impeaches the veracity of God, for he does predict future events, with all possible minuteness, and particularity, as certain to occur, without, according to this theory, being able to know that they would occur; impairs the evidences of Christianity; for take away the prophecies, and Christianity is left without foundation on which to stand.

4th. I object to all tampering with God's Foreknowledge, and all explanations which substitute something else therefor, that *they degrade the character of God*. A being who has to await the action of his creatures before he knows what that action will be; who is constantly liable to be surprised, and disappointed by the occurrence of unlocked for events; who may have his most cherished designs crossed and thwarted by unforeseen opposition; who must therefore be tilled with anxiety and care in proportion to the extent of his possessions, and if they be infinite, must suffer infinite anxiety and care; who is compelled to resort

to temporary expedients in order to carry on his government—*such* a being is not the God of the Bible—such, a being is not a God that I would worship—such a being is unworthy the homage of any intelligent creature.

5th. I object that all teaching, calculated to destroy the attribute of Foreknowledge, as commonly understood, is *Atheistic* in its tendency. If one man may, to gain a particular end, explain away one attribute; another may, for another purpose, deny another. If you may deny his perfect knowledge of futurity; another may deny his almighty power, another his spirituality, another his holiness, until, in detail, all his attributes are taken away. But take away all the attributes of God, and you deny the very being of a God. Beside, a denial of God's Foreknowledge *does necessarily carry with it a denial of other attributes*. If something happen to-day, which God did not foreknow on yesterday, he is wiser to day than he was on yesterday: consequently, on yesterday he was not *perfect*. If events may occur to-morrow which God does not know to-day, his present knowledge will be increased; therefore he is not *perfect* to-day. If in all the coming ages of time, and in all the cycles of eternity, any event shall take place that God does not now know, and which he has not known from eternity, *he is not a perfect being*, and therefore cannot be God. Again: if God's knowledge of events be increasing, he is still *changing*; he is not the same to-day that he was on yesterday. But God is immutably "the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever." Thus a denial of God's Foreknowledge, in the sense of knowing events now future, involves necessarily a denial of God's perfection, immutability, and other attributes: but to deny a perfect, immutable, omniscient Being, is really to deny God. I do not charge that any go to this length; I only assert that, *if consistent*, they cannot stop short of this conclusion. My argument is intended as a *reductio ad absurdum*, disproving a hypothesis from the enormity of the conclusions legitimately resulting from it.

For these reasons I object to the doctrine of the Sermon respecting the Foreknowledge of God. I proceed next to examine the arguments by which the *unique* theory of the gentleman is attempted to be proved: but still it is difficult to know exactly what the author is after. In his first

sentence he says, it is his design to call attention "to the Bible *doctrine* of Foreknowledge," etc. Then on the next page he invites attention, "first to the *term* Foreknowledge of God;" and asks, "What do the Scriptures mean by this *term*? Is he giving the definition of a "*term*," or is he setting forth a "*doctrine*?" Admit that the "*term*" Foreknowledge is not once used in the Bible, in the sense which it now usually bears, is that any proof that the "*doctrine*" is not in the Scriptures? The "*term*" endless punishment is not in the Scriptures, but the "*doctrine*" is taught in various forms. The "*term*" omniscient, which this Sermon applies to God, is not a Bible term; is the "*doctrine*" therefore not a Bible doctrine? I care not, so far as this argument is concerned, whether the Bible ever uses the *term* Foreknowledge in the sense of knowing future events: the *doctrine* that God has a knowledge of *all* things, past, present, and future is just as much a Bible doctrine, as though the term were employed on every page. But let us come to the Sermon. The gist of the whole argument to show that God has not Foreknowledge, in the sense of knowing future events, is, that "all knowledge must be *present* with the infinite Being." P. 5. Now this is a mere metaphysical nicety, which is true or false, just as it is taken. If it mean that God is not subject to time, that his knowledge is not successive, it is true. If it mean that God does not know events that are still future; and knows that they *are* future, it is false. God knows the day of my death; he knows that I am not yet dead: consequently he knows an event that has not yet taken place, or *fore-knows* it. If it be denied that God knows my death *as an event yet future*, it makes God's knowledge inferior to man's. But let us try the theory of the Sermon by scripture usage. The noun "foreknowledge" occurs twice in the Scriptures: the verb "foreknow," twice; but *nowhere*, either as verb or noun, does it mean "*to make known beforehand the sufferings of Christ.*" If any one doubt this assertion, let him put this definition to a practical test by trying to substitute it for the word defined, in all four of the passages where alone the word is found. "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate," etc. Rom. viii, £9. "Whom he did the knowledge which God has before given by the prophets respecting Christ and his sufferings, he

also did predestinate!" etc. Verity, Paul, if *this* be a specimen of your writing, I wonder not that Peter found something in your epistles "hard lo be understood!" Let us try again: "God hath not cast away his people whom he foreknew;" Rom. xi, 2; *i. e.* his people whom he "the knowledge which God had before given respecting Christ and his sufferings!" What force and beauty the new reading gives to this passage! Once more, "elect according to the Foreknowledge of God." 1 Peter, i, 2; *i. e.* elect according to "the knowledge which God has before given by the prophets concerning Christ and his sufferings!" Why, Peter, you are as "hard to be understood" as your "beloved brother Paul!" Again, "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and Foreknowledge of God," etc., Acts, ii, 23; *i. e.* "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and the knowledge which God has before given by the prophets concerning Christ and his sufferings, of God ye have taken," etc. This I would call a practical illustration of the value of this Sermon as a definer of "Bible terms." The definition, substituted for the word defined, makes *sheer nonsense* in every instance where the word occurs.

But the gentleman enters into an argument to prove that in Acts ii, 23, the word Foreknowledge must have the meaning he attributes to it. And what is the argument? He quotes another passage, in which it is said that "what God had shown by the mouth of all his holy prophets, he has so fulfilled, "*—assumes* that whatever words are used with reference to the same subject must have the same identical signification, and then *concludes*, "This *defines* the Foreknowledge of God to be so," etc. This he *calls argument!* this he calls defining a word, on the authority of Dr. Peter!! But is it *true* that what is called "determinate counsel and Foreknowledge of God," in Acts ii, 23, is called those "things which God had shown by the mouth of all his holy prophets" in Acts iii, 18. This *assumption is* not true; for, 1st. There is not a single reason offered for making it: the reader is treated to what composes the staple of this Sermon; sheer, naked, unsupported assertion: nothing more. 2d. The employing of two or three modes of expression, in relation to the same subject, is no proof that those expressions are identical in meaning. If I tell

one man that I saw the moon last night, and tell another that I pointed out the moon to ray child, no sensible man would infer that I used the words "saw" and "pointed out" as synonymous. Neither if it is said, in one passage, that God has "foreknowledge" of an event, and in another place, that he "showed that event beforehand," would it be inferred by any sound critic, that Foreknow and Foreshow are identical in meaning? Yet the gentleman's whole theory of Foreknowledge rests on this blunder. 3d. The highest critical authorities agree in giving the expressions "the determinate council and Foreknowledge of God," the sense of "*the immutable will and DECREE of God.*" I quote Bloomfield as a specimen: "The best of commentators are agreed that *orismene boule* (determinate counsel) signifies the determinate, and consequently the immutable counsel of God: and that *prognosei* (foreknowledge) signifies DECREE; a signification common both to classical and Hellenistic Greek," *in loco*. Bloomfield was a finished scholar, a learned commentator, a member of the Church of England, and *no Calvinist*.

The gentleman refers to Gal. iii, 8, "The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith," to prove that "foresee" means to "foreshow." But I answer:

1st. If this be granted, it proves nothing respecting the word in controversy: that word is not "foresee," but "foreknow."

2d. If, in *this* passage, "foresee" *does* mean "foreshow," it is no proof that in *other* passages it has the same meaning; and still less that "foreknow" has always this meaning.

3d. If in *every* passage in which these terms "foreknow" and "foresee" are used, it could be made appear that they mean, "to show before," it would not prove that the doctrine of God's knowing future events is not a Bible doctrine. That doctrine is not dependent for its proof on these terms. But

4th. The passage quoted is misunderstood. Because the Scripture is said to "foresee," and seeing cannot, in a literal sense, be predicated of a writing, he infers that "foresee" is used in a peculiar sense. I am afraid I shall have to send the gentleman back to school. If he will conde-

scend to recollect his rhetorical readings, he will remember that there is such a figure of speech as prosopopoeia, or personification, by which inanimate objects are represented as possessing the attributes of living beings. But lest he object to go to school to any of the ordinary race of mortals, I again invoke the aid of the President of Bethany College, who with both truth and poetry remarks:

"Prosopopoeia a new person feigns,  
And to inanimates, speech and reason deigns."

"As doth not wisdom cry," etc. —Christianity Restored, p. 49. Now the critics give the very passage on which the gentleman relies, as an example of this figure. Of course, then, there is no occasion for his newly-coined meaning of "foreseeing." *Suck a meaning destroys the figure.*

We have thus examined the theory of this Sermon as respects Foreknowledge; and whether that theory respect the definition of the word, or the exposition of the doctrine of Foreknowledge; or whether it refer to the use of the term in the Scriptures generally, or in the one passage quoted (Acts ii, 23)—in any state of the case, the Sermon is greatly at fault. The theory is contradicted by the laws of language, by the dictates of reason, and by the Scriptures of truth. —(*Time expired.*)

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: —

MY worthy friend, complains of my loose statements and admonishes me that he shall have to "expose them." To this, I certainly have no objection, but invite him to expose what I say to the utmost extent of his ability. That is exactly what I came here for, and I wish him to put on his armor and do the work effectually—light manfully. He should not, however, alarm us with threats. I understand all this, and leave the intelligence of the community where he lives to judge of "loose statements."

The gentleman is in the presence of the same people who heard his reply to my Sermon, and they know what use he made of the words, "Cain *knew* his wife." All I have to say about it is, that if he did not quote it as an instance in which the word "know," could not mean *approve*, he must have been talking to fill up his time, for

there was not the appearance of argument in it. I supposed he would have blushed to have alluded to his ridiculous use of this passage 1

My friend has placed himself in a most singular predicament, on the words "I never *knew* you," and in the place of blaming himself, as he should have done, he seems vexed with the dishonesty of his opponent. What a pity, that he should have fallen into such unworthy hands! But he is not satisfied with complaining heavily of myself, but stigmatizes the Trinitarians for misinterpreting the word "know." It is true, he admits them to be honest, but declares them "mistaken," in thinking that the word, in its common signification derogates from the honor of Jesus. In this, I think, he is mistaken himself, and that the Trinitarians are right. It is fatal to the omniscience of Jesus, to say there is anything he is not acquainted with, and he must give up his interpretation of the word "know," in this passage, or I shall claim that he has renounced the omniscience of our glorious Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Indeed, he has already quoted Scripture to prove that there were some things which the Savior of the world—He in whom all the fullness of the Godhead dwelt bodily, *did not know*, in the common acceptance of the word know. This I do not believe. Those who said to him, "Thou knowest all things," spoke correctly.

You may ask me then, how I get along with the passage quoted, that he knew not the day nor the hour of the judgment. There is not the least difficulty in this, unless you are bound down to my friend's forced construction of the word "know." Trinitarians have a thousand times explained all this, as my friend should have known. It was not for the Son to *make known* the period of judgment. But I do think the distinction made between the Divinity and Humanity the most rare contrivance to escape difficulty I have met with! Not only are his "feelings peculiar," but his doctrine. When our adorable Lord speaks of things which he does not *know* or is not *acquainted with*, he speaks in his humanity, but when he is said to "*know what is in man*," he speaks in his divinity! A peculiar doctrine this! Pray, tell us how we are to know when he speaks as *man* and when he speaks as God! If, when he speaks

as man, he does not know all things, that part of his teaching may contain errors. Will the gentleman favor us with a rule, by which we may determine when he speaks *as man* and when he speaks *as God*.

But we have not come to the worst yet. The words in dispute, Mat. vii, 23, "Depart, ye workers of iniquity, I never knew you," are to be uttered in the last judgment. He would represent Jesus as judging the world in *humanity*, and, as he sits in judgment, before the universe, as saying to the wicked, "I never was *acquainted with you*." If this is not an extremity for a Trinitarian to be driven to, by assuming an untenable position, I do not know where you will find one! Who ever thought that he who will judge the world, when he sits upon the throne in judgment, will not know all things? I would give up any interpretation of mine and humble myself into the dust, before I would thus dishonor Jesus. It will certainly come with an ill grace from his lips, after this, to speak of my interpretations tending to unsettle the minds of any in the Christian faith!

I do seriously allege, that he is not "sound in the faith—"not "orthodox," in contending that He who will sit in judgment, will not *know all things!* To my knowledge, I do not fellowship any, holding sentiments so derogatory to the honor of the Christian's Lord, and I solemnly declare, that I would reprove any one I should find in our communion, who would contend that the Lord, when he sits in judgment, will not *know* all things, in his sense. This is a serious matter, and I hope the gentleman will not tell of his "peculiar feelings," nor compare it to the "devil reproofing sin," which may display his ill-temper, without showing that I am in error or that he is correct.

I have not denied the omniscience of God and have not the least intention of doing so, nor have I made the first effort to "put the doctrine out of the Bible" or the doctrine of the Foreknowledge of God; but have already quoted Scripture, to show that our adorable Lord, knows all things—that he "knew what is in man." Not only so, but the omniscience of God is asserted, in the obnoxious Sermon in dispute. But I have contended that what is called the "Foreknowledge of God," in the Scripture, is not what my friend means by that expression. If it were



not that my opponent is always correct in his statements, it might be insisted that his statement, that I wished to put the omniscience of God out of the Bible, was a "loose statement." When I deny that the Lord knows all things, it will be time enough for this statement.

I never thought of putting the doctrine out of the Bible, but, on the contrary, have gone to the Bible and found the "Foreknowledge of God" there, and shown what it means. Has my worthy friend shown that it means anything else? He has not, and cannot, but applies these words to something else, without any authority but his own unsupported and unsupportable assertion. I defy him to give the first evidence from the Bible, that the Foreknowledge of God has the meaning he attaches to it." I have given" the word "foreknow," where he is bound to admit that it means *before-approve*, or preach Universalism, but can get no reply from him. The connection reads as follows: "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." This cannot mean whom he was before acquainted with, he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, for he was acquainted with all, but certainly did not predestinate all to be conformed to the image of his Son. I then, keep this as a standing passage before the gentleman, where the word foreknow means *before-approve*, and insist that he cannot deny. I give Acts, ii, as an instance where the "Foreknowledge of God," means before-showing by the prophets, as Peter expresses it himself. Acts, iii, 18. I have given Gal. iii, 8, as an instance where the "Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith," is the same, in import, as the Foreknowledge of God, or is the same as God before-showing in the Scripture that he would justify the heathen through faith.

His attempt to insert my definition for Foreknowledge was the weakest effort of the kind I have ever seen. No man, so far as known to me, has ever thought, that an expression containing several words, giving the supposed import of a passage of Scripture, if correct, can, in every case, be inserted, and make good grammar. A word of similar import can be substituted for any word and make good sense, but every one knows, that when an idea is expressed in several words, 'and other words, expressing

the same idea, are substituted, it is not certain to be grammatical. This is what appears ridiculous in the substitution before us. The idea is the same in the substitution. Let him insert his definition of Foreknowledge of God, and he will see something sufficiently ridiculous; for the grammar will be equally bad, find the idea will not be the same. We are opposed to the substitution of a *different idea*, but not to the substitution of different *words expressing the same idea*.

I will now inform the gentleman, once for all, that all his argument to prove that God knows all things, while it may assist in making out a speech, is not demanded on this occasion, for I have stated with all possible clearness, that all things are present with the Infinite Being, and my friend has admitted the correctness of the statement; yet as he found nothing that he could prove, which I had denied, he sets out to prove something that no one denies, viz: that God must have foreknown all things predicted by the prophets, or there is no certainty in the prophecies. In this he is right, for once, for the thing's predicted by the prophets are precisely what is in the Bible called the Foreknowledge of God. I thank him for this unintended admission. Let him now show that anything else is called the Foreknowledge of God in the Bible. He admits all that I claim, but I do not admit all that he claims. I claim that God must have foreknown all things made known by the prophets. My friend admits it; in doing which he admits that which was revealed by the prophets to be Foreknowledge; yet he denies that this is what is called the Foreknowledge of God in the Bible. I insist that it is, and call upon him to show that anything else is so called in the Bible, or even intended. From this, he is welcome to make any legitimate deduction.

If he is not satisfied with this, and feels like swimming in deep water, I can inform him, as an abstract question, that my God knows as much as his God, and has known it as long, but this is not the Bible use of the term "foreknowledge." He may therefore, let all his fears go for what they are worth, about anything I have said, unsettling the evidence of the Scripture.

The gentleman says I am mistaken about his saying, in the correspondence, that I could not read a page in all that

was written in the first century, —that he simply said that he had no evidence that I could. This morning he did not know anything about my attainments, but this evening he proposes to send me to school. This I may need very much, but I have one advantage, viz: that my opponent is both learned and talented, and it is *well known*. He is not an obscure individual, concerning whose ability we have no certain information, but, unfortunately for him, he is engaged in a debate with one of whose learning he knew nothing this morning, and whom he threatens to send to School this evening. Has he not acted unwisely in getting into discussion with one so unknown and so unlearned!

The gentleman claims to stand with the President of Bethany. Let him then, look at the translation of the words, "I never knew you," in his version, and he will find the words, "I never *acknowledged* you." I hold in my hand Thompson's Translation, where the passage reads, "*I never approved* you." Let him produce authority that agrees with him, on this passage.

If there is any such decree in the Bible as the following, I have not found it: "Whom God passes by, therefore, he reprobates, and from no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestinates for his children." Calvin's Institutes, Vol. 2, p. 163. This is the kind of Predestination and Foreknowledge that is not in the Bible, nor anything like it; and which my friend has not, and cannot prove. "Whom God passes by, he reprobates." What for? Not for their sins nor' for the omission of any good they ever had it in their power to do. For what cause then does he reprobate them? "*From no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestinates for his children.*" The Confession, chap. 3, sec. 2, says, "Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass, upon any supposed conditions; yet hath he not decreed anything, because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass, upon such conditions."

This, I think, accords with Calvin; both agreeing that the decree, Predestination or Ordination, is not based upon God's foreseeing it, but upon his sovereign determination to exclude them from the inheritance of the saints. This ends the idea of condemning men for sins, especially when.

we consider the following: "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." Con., chap. 3, sec. 1. Now I am aware, that the assertion immediately follows, that "God is not the author of sin," which is true. But this cannot be true, and the sentence before it true. It cannot be true that God did unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass, and God not the author of sin, for sin has *come to pass*, and if God ordained whatsoever comes to pass, he ordained sin, and is the author of it. This, I do not believe, for it is derogatory to the holy attributes of God.

This is contrary to the attributes of God, sustained in the independent series of argument commenced in my speech this morning. 1. It is contrary to the original design of God in creating man. 2. It is contrary to the promise of the Messiah, that in him all *nations* should be blessed. 3. It is opposed to the predictions of the prophets, and consequently the Foreknowledge of God, for he could not predict anything without foreknowing it, and he has declared in the prophetic Scriptures., that he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked and that his tender mercies extend to all. 4. It is opposed to the testimony of John the Baptist, "*that all men through him might believe.*" 5. It is opposed to the Love of God, "For God *so loved* the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life, for God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him *might be saved.*" 6. It is opposed to the death of Christ, for he "died for all." 2 Cor. v, 34.

My independent argument in favor of the doctrine of my Sermon and opposed to the decrees for which the gentleman contends, and which he has not deigned to notice, stands thus: If it was the intention of God, when he created man, that all men should seek him, that they *might find him*; if when he promised the Messiah, he promised to bless all the families of the earth; if the prophets testified that he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked; that salvation should be to the ends of the earth; if John the Baptist testified that *all men through him might believe*; if the law of God shows "that the

*world through him might be saved,"* and if Christ "*died for all,"* securing to all a resurrection from the dead; thus, the doctrine that he passed by and reprobated any portion of them, "from no *other reason* than to exclude them from the inheritance of the saints," is not true, but in opposition to the whole economy of God. Such I solemnly believe to be the true" state of the case, as I shall show at large before we close.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' FOURTH ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

THE gentleman informs us that he came here for the purpose of being exposed. This accounts for the fact that he habitually indulges in such loose statements and random assertions. His last speech shows, however, that he is disposed to assist me in my task; in it he certainly most effectually exposes himself. Whenever a man is found endeavoring to envelop himself and his real position in a fog, he exposes his conscious weakness. Whenever a man beats a retreat from the main issues in controversy, and attempts a grand display on some me. rely incidental topic, he exposes the fact of his discomfiture. Whenever a man sedulously shuns the arguments of an opponent, and seeks to make a little capital, by catching up some chance expression and forcing a construction upon it that was never intended, he exposes the fact that he is hard pressed, and he knows it. Let anyone compare his last speech with the speeches to which it professes to be a reply, and he will find practical examples of all the expedients mentioned. If any one will now give me their attention for five minutes, he will find that in the task of exposing the gentleman, he himself has furnished me an able assistant.

In commenting on Mark, xiii, 32, which I quoted to prove, *that as a man* our Savior did not know all things, for he himself declares that of the day and hour of the judgment, no man knows, not even the angels, "NEITHER THE SON," but the Father, he says. "Trinitarians have a thousand times explained all this. It was not for the Son to make known the period of the judgment." Now I know of *one* commentator, who gives this interpretation; I have heard that a few others do"; but I never dreamed of its

being done "A THOUSAND TIMES." Will my friend, who is so indignant at my hinting that he is sometimes a little unguarded in his expressions, be good enough to give us instances of a *few* out of these "*thousand*" interpretations. I do not ask him for the whole thousand; I will be satisfied with *five hundred*. Nay, if he is at any loss, I will agree to discount still further, and accept two hundred and fifty in full discharge of the whole thousand.

In the same connection the gentleman remarks, that the distinction I made between the Divinity and the humanity of the Savior, is "a rare contrivance; " that my doctrine on this point is a "peculiar one; " that I am not sound in the faith; not orthodox, etc. Now in all this the gentleman has done one of two things: He has either made a thorough *exposure* of my errors, or he has most liberally and effectually *exposed himself*. Which is it? I will cite a *few* authorities on the verse in Mark, to show that the contrivance of attributing to the *one* person, Christ Jesus, *two* natures, the divine and human, is *not "rare; "* that my doctrine on the point is *not "peculiar; "* that the greatest lights of the church in ancient and modern days, give precisely the interpretation that I gave; and, consequently, that the gentleman did not make his trip, in order to be exposed, altogether in vain.

"There were those in the primitive times who taught from this text that *there were some things that Christ, AS MAN, was ignorant of \* \** and many of the *orthodox* fathers approved of this. "—Matthew Henry. "Christus dicitur ignorare diem judicii, Marc, xiii, 32, non qua Filius Dei, sed qua Filius hominis"—Turretin; i. e. "Christ is said to be ignorant of the day of judgment *not as the Son of God, but as the Son of Man.*" "It is certain that Christ, *as God*, could not be ignorant of anything, but *\* \* his human nature might sometimes not know some things.*"—Tillotson. To the same purport Lightfoot as quoted in Comprehensive Comment. "The union of Divine nature with human, in the person of Messiah, does not involve the communication of omniscience to Christ's human mind, any more than omnipresence to his human body. "—J. P. Smith. "Jesus Christ was really *a man in all respects*, except sin, like his brethren, and *in this man* 'dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead.' If he was a man then was he frail, dependent,

*ignorant.* \* \* It appears, then, that there were some things that the INDWELLING GOD did not communicate to *the man*, Christ Jesus. "—Dr. Jenks. "The precise season of the day of judgment \* \* was not revealed *to his human nature*, by the unction of the Holy Spirit, "—Scott. "This he speaks *in his human nature* and prophetic capacity."—Bishop Porteus. "The passage has no more difficulty than Luke, ii, 52, where it is said that Jesus increased in wisdom and stature. *He had a human nature*; he grew *as a man* in knowledge; *as a man* his knowledge must be finite, for the faculties of the human soul are not infinite. As a man he often spoke, reasoned, inquired, felt, feared, read, learned, ate, drank, and walked. Why are not all these, which imply that he was *a man*—that *as a man* he was not infinite—why are not these as difficult as the want of knowledge respecting the *time* of a future event, especially when that time must be made known by God, and when he chose that the man, Christ Jesus, should grow, and think, and speak *as a man*?"—Barnes. "The *Deity* which dwelt in *the man*, Christ Jesus, might at one time communicate less of the knowledge of futurity to him than at another. "—Clarke. This author, however, on account of difficulties in the text, seems almost disposed to deny its genuineness. He does, however, deservedly denounce the interpretation which the gentleman has borrowed from MacKnight, a very unsound and unsafe guide to follow, as cutting the knot, but not untying it. Watson says, there are two ways of interpreting this passage in consistency with the doctrine of Christ's Divinity—the first is that of MacKnight—which, like Clark, but unlike the gentleman, he rejects; he then remarks, "The second is the *usual manner* of meeting the difficulty, and refers the words 'neither the Son' *exclusively to the human nature of our Lord*." He also quotes Bishop Kidder as holding that "Christ may be said, *with respect to his human nature* and finite understanding, not to know the precise day and hour of some future events." These citations, which might be greatly multiplied, show that I have not been at all "peculiar" in my remarks on this passage. When I select a professor to instruct me in orthodox theology, most assuredly I will not select the gentleman. The orthodox armor which he has donned for the occasion sits more awkwardly upon him than Saul's

armor on the stripling David. He has not proved it. Though assumed as a defense, it has proved an incumbrance.

The gentleman is shocked that I represent Jesus as judging the world in humanity. The *Bible* so represents it. Let the gentleman impeach Matthew, Paul, and the rest, when he impeaches me. It is the "*Son of man*" that will sit on the throne of his glory. Matt. xxv. "God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, BY THAT MAN whom he hath ordained." Acts, xvii, 31. Judging the world is a part of Christ's mediatorial work.

The gentleman says that, to his knowledge, he does not fellowship any who deny Christ's supreme divinity. On some subjects, from his *sneers* at me as an obscure individual, at my learning and talents, one would think him, *the city preacher and editor*, a man of extensive and profound attainments: on other subjects, however, his knowledge is very limited indeed. If *he* does not know any of his sect who refuse to acknowledge Christ as God Supreme, there are others who have the advantage of the gentleman. Mr. Campbell declares that in their body, they have *all sorts of doctrine*, preached by all kinds of men. And history avers that Stone, the Father of the New Lights in Kentucky, denied the equality of Christ with the Father except in name and office. Reply to Strictures, p. 20. He himself confesses that he did not believe in a Trinity of persons in the Godhead. Biography, pp. 13—29. How will the devoted and obsequious followers of B. W. Stone relish the gentleman's declaration of non-fellowship?

The gentleman has abandoned the definition of Foreknowledge given in the Sermon, and *now* insists that in Rom. viii, 29, it means "*before-approved*." I congratulate him on his conversion. This is the Calvinistic interpretation of that text. I had some hopes of making the gentleman see the absurdity of his theory as set forth in his Sermon; and am happy to find him renouncing it, even though he has not the magnanimity to do it openly.

I am happy also to find that the gentleman admits, now, that God knows all things from eternity, though I am curious to know on what authority. he rests this doctrine. Not on a "thus saith the Lord," for, according to the



gentleman, the doctrine of God's Foreknowledge is not taught in the Old Testament; and as taught in the New, it means "the knowledge before given respecting" Christ and his sufferings."

The arguments of the gentleman on the 2d Proposition he had better reserve until that proposition is before us; at present they are out of order; and he ought not to spend them all now, lest he need them worse on that occasion. But I venture to predict, that, by the time I get to the 2d Proposition, he will be back on the first. We shall see.

I advance now to the examination of the Third Point of doctrine taught in this Sermon. It is thus expressed:

### **GOD'S ELECT ARE THE APOSTLES AND PROPHETS.**

This proposition is broad enough. It covers the whole ground. It is without limitation, restriction, or qualification. It is not said that God's elect, mentioned in a certain passage or passages of Scripture, are the Apostles and prophets. This may, or may not be true; but true or false, it is not the proposition of the Sermon. That proposition is *general*, and not restricted to special passages. This proposition has also the merit of being exceedingly *simple*, and very *concise*. It lacks but one meritorious quality; but, unfortunately, that one thing is most essential. It lacks *truth*. Were it not for this single defect it would be worthy of universal acceptance. But this is the very matter now to be tested; and in order to test it thoroughly I shall cite every passage in the Scripture, in which the word "elect," occurs. "Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth." Is. xlii, 1. God's elect here does *not* mean the Apostles and prophets, but Christ himself, as is evident from the context: "a bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench."

"For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect; " xlv, 4. The elect here is Jacob, *not* Apostles and prophets. "And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains; and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there; " lxxv, 9. Here Apostles and prophets cannot be meant, but the Israelites, who shall acknowledge the true Messiah, after

the fullness of the Gentiles has been brought in, and who will once more dwell in their *own* land. So in the 22d verse, "Mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands."

These four cases are the only ones in the Old Testament in which the word "elect" occurs; we come now to the New. "For the elect's sake those days shall be shortened; " Matt, xxiv, 22, and its parallel, Mark, xiii, 20. The days spoken of are the days in which Jerusalem was besieged. But in those days the prophets and Apostles, John excepted, had been gathered to their fathers; and John was at Ephesus, far remote from the dangers impending over Judea. The interpretation of the Sermon would imply that the days of the siege were shortened, for the sake of persons long *dead*, "*lest no flesh should be saved alive I*" The "elect" here, denotes all the faithful followers of Christ who were in Judea, exposed to the calamities of famine and war; for whose sake the days were shortened that they might escape.

Again, verse 24: "If it were possible, they shall deceive the very, elect; " also Mark, xiii, 22. The remarks just made apply here, as the same persons are designated; not surely the prophets and Apostles, now peacefully sleeping in their graves, secure against all the impostors that so abounded at the time of the downfall of Jerusalem; but the *trite Christians* then in Judea, who were exposed to these deceptions, but whom it was impossible to seduce, they being "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation."

Verse 31: "And he shall send his angels with the great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the one end of heaven to the other; " also Mark, xiii, 27. If our Lord still speak of the same time, the elect here denote the same persons—the Christians in Judea. But if the reference be to the final judgment, as is most probable, not the prophets and Apostles merely are to be gathered together; they are to come "from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." It must mean all true Christians in all ages of the world. "For the dead in Christ shall rise first."

"And shall not God avenge his own elect, though he bear long with them?" Luke, xviii, 7. In this passage

our Lord is giving encouragement to persevering, importunate prayer. Was this encouragement for the prophets? They were dead. Did he confine this encouragement to the Apostles? All true Christians need it—it is applicable to all such—*intended* for all such. Here again, therefore, God's elect signifies all true Christians, and *not* Apostles and prophets.

"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" Rom. viii, 33. "The elect" here mean, not Apostles and prophets, but those of whom Paul throughout the chapter had been speaking. He describes them as "those who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit"—as "led by the Spirit of God"—as "the Sons of God"—as "heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ"—as "those that love God, the called according to his purpose"—as "foreknown," "predestinated to be conformed to the image of God's Son"—called, justified, glorified. These marks belong not alone to Apostles and prophets, but to all the people of God, in all places, and at all times. *These*, therefore, are God's elect.

"Put on as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies." Col. iii, 12. The Colossians were neither apostles nor prophets. "I charge thee before the elect angels." 1 Tim. v, 21. The Apostles and prophets are not angels. "I endure all things for the elects' sake, that they may obtain salvation." 2 Tim. ii, 10. Paul did not labor for the salvation of Apostles and prophets; he was sent among the Gentiles to gather out of them a people who would own the Lord to be their God. And these are the elect for whom he labored. "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect." Titus, i, 1. Bloomfield, MacKnight, Scott, and Barnes say, that the meaning of this is, for the promotion of the faith of God's elect. With this the original agrees. But Paul was not an Apostle in order to promote the faith of Apostles and prophets, but of the chosen people of God among the nations to which he preached.

"Elect according to the foreknowledge of God, the Father." 1 Peter, i, 2. The elect here were *not* Apostles and prophets, but "strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galtitia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. Behold I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious;" ii, 6, The

Apostles and prophets were in the foundation of this building, but it is *Christ* who is the chief corner-stone.

"The elder unto the elect lady." 2 John, 1. I humbly submit that this lady was neither of the school of the prophets, nor of the college of the Apostles: nor was her "elect sister," whose children send greetings to her; verse 13.

I have now adduced every instance in which the word "elect" is used in the Scriptures. I own I have performed a work of supererogation. Had I found *one* passage in which the elect of God meant other than Apostles and prophets, it would have sufficed to overturn the theory of this Sermon. But when I have found that the word "elect" designates others than the Apostles and prophets, not simply in *one*, but in *every instance* in which the word is used; when there is not a solitary instance in which the term is used to designate either prophet or Apostle, I think you will agree with me in the conclusion, that not only is the gentleman's theory overturned, but it is swept out of existence; no mark nor trace of it is left.

I may add that the word "elected" is used in 1 Peter, v, 13; and "election," in Rom. ix, 11; xi, 5, 7, 28; 1 These. i, 4; 2 Peter, i, 10; but not in a solitary instance are *these* terms applied to prophets and Apostles. In this matter this Sermon is completely at fault. Its doctrine has no foothold nor foundation in Scripture.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

IT strikes me that the speech you have just heard is a strange refutation of the doctrine contained in my Sermon. The greater part of it appeared more to me like an effort to prove that the worthy gentleman himself, is *really orthodox*; which, by the way, he by no means made clear to my mind. Indeed, I see more reason to distrust his orthodoxy now than ever, since he claims that Christ will judge the world *in his humanity!* I am perfectly astounded at this! He quotes writers who teach that Christ, as man, "was ignorant," and that he, as man, will "judge the world!" I declare to you, my dear hearers, I shrink

to refer to language Urns derogatory to the infallible Judge of men and angels! How shall the Judge of all the world do right if he knows not all things? How shall an infallible decision be made by a fallible judge? How desperate is the position of the man, who, in argument, is driven to such an extremity, rather than acknowledge that he had attacked a position which he had found entirely correct!

Has he given any rule by which we can know when the Lord speaks *as man* and when *as God*? If he has not, and does not, how shall we know when to rely upon what he says as infallible? Now, I do not wish to spend time unnecessarily upon this subject, but I wish it distinctly understood, that I deny that there is one word, in all my Lord ever uttered, that is not infallibly correct, or that there is anything that he is not acquainted with; for "He was before all things, and by him all things consist." "By him and for him all things were made." "He knew what was in man," and some of those who saw him in the flesh, honored him more than my friend, for they said to him, "Thou knowest all things."

I leave those who hear me and heard the speech to which I am replying, to judge of loose statements and misrepresentations. I shall not stop to contradict every misstatement upon irrelevant points, nor shall I suffer a little blustering to divert me from the points to be discussed. I have not selected authorities and shall not spend time now to do it, to show how numerous Trinitarian authorities are, who explain the passage, "know not the day when the Son of man shall come," to mean, "*make known not the day*," etc., as it is remote from the question before us, but leave it for men of reading to decide who is correct. The fact that others have explained it differently, is no evidence, for all who know anything about commentators, know that they differ. I therefore, see no advantage in finding some who agree in his absurd position, except the gratification indicated in the old adage, that "Misery loves company."

I did not "sneer at the gentleman as an obscure individual," nor do I intend to "sneer" at him nor his brethren, but shall do my utmost to treat him as a gentleman—a man of learning and talent, without which I certainly should not have met him. But I did speak in irony of *my own obscurity*, as an offset to his professed

ignorance of my qualifications for a disputant. Those little matters, I hope, I shall not frequently trouble you with.

I was extremely sorry to hear that venerable servant of God, Barton W. Stone, now gone to his rest, alluded to in such an unfeeling manner. I would to heaven, that the gentleman and myself were worthy of the place in the hearts of the most pious, zealous, and godly people in this State, occupied by that holy man. Never did he say anything of our most gracious Redeemer, calculated to give such occasion to the adversary as the language uttered by the gentleman himself, in your hearing this day. But he needs no defense from my hand. How singular the refutation of my Sermon! First to fall upon this holy man, now in his grave; secondly the remark of Mr. Campbell, uttered with some irresponsible men in his eye, such as every denomination is more or less troubled with, that "we have had all sorts of doctrine preached by all kinds of men." How my Sermon on Predestination suffers before such arguments! But if I were disposed to spend time in this way, I could edify this audience with some fine specimens, from distinguished men in the Presbyterian church. I will read you one as a specimen. It reads as follows:

"These things, in the Presbyterian church, their contentions and janglings, are so ridiculous, so wicked, so outrageous, that no doubt there is a jubilee in hell, every year, about the time of the meeting of the General Assembly; and if there were tears in heaven, no doubt they would be shed over the difficulties of the Presbyterian church. Ministers have been dragged from home, up to the General Assembly, and there heard debates, and witnessed a spirit, by which their souls have been grieved, and their hearts hardened, and they have gone home ashamed of their church and ashamed to ask God to pour out his spirit upon such a contentious body."

This extract is from "Finney on Revivals," p. 269, furnished to my hand, by Brother Raines. Christian Teacher, p. 47.

*Mr. Matthews.* —Mr. Finney is not a member of the Presbyterian church.

*Mr. Franklin.* —I presume he was when he wrote this extract. At all events, ! give it as I received it, upon the authority of Brother Raines; but I admit that extracts of this kind prove nothing, and I simply quoted this as a

specimen to show what could be done In this direction, if I saw fit to spend time in this way.

I am truly sorry the worthy gentleman is not willing to form a direct issue with some position I really have taken. I think he is hard pressed for something to disprove, when he has to assert for me something I have never asserted for myself. I have not asserted in the Sermon, nor any place else, that the Apostles and prophets are the only elect mentioned in the Bible. Yet the only thing in the speech you have just heard, on election, is an attempt to refute such an assertion. I know, and knew when I wrote the Sermon, as well as the worthy gentleman knows it, that others, beside Apostles and prophets, are called elect; but in my discourse, I attempt to take certain proof-texts from Calvinists, viz: John xvii, and Eph. i. The elect that I have in my mind consist of those given to Christ, John xvii, and those chosen in Christ, Eph. i. This elect, I undertake to say, is composed of Apostles and prophets. This I call upon the gentleman to meet, as I am set upon it to secure this point beyond the possibility of refutation. In the place of approaching this point, he has gone to other parts of the Bible, to show that the elect there spoken of cannot be the Apostles and prophets. But why did he not come to the passages examined in the Sermon and show that the Apostles and prophets are not the elect there spoken of? For the best reason in the world, as I believe, viz: that no man can do it.

Eph. i, 4-12; Paul speaks of certain persons whom he calls "us" and "we." The persons thus called are elect. Concerning them, there are two important questions to decide. 1. Who those persons are. 2. What they were elected for. When these questions are decided, it will be easy to see that there is no Calvinism in the passage. Calvinists and Universalists agree in one point, viz: That all the elect will be saved. But they do not agree in determining who the elect of this passage are. Calvinists claim that they are *all the saints*, while Universalists insist that they are *all the World*. That they are both mistaken, I shall now show.

There can be no doubt, in the mind of any person who has given the least attention to the first rules of interpre-

tation, that if we could insert the names of the persons intended by the Apostle, by the words "us" and "we," it would make sense throughout the passage. This rule I have tried in the Sermon, and this has not been noticed in the gentleman's speech. It should be observed further, that if the persons in question are not all the saints in all time, past and future, there is no argument for Calvinism in the passage. Did the Apostle intend to teach that all the saints, of all time, were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world? Let me read a few words, inserting *all the saints*, for the words "us" and "we," and see what kind of sense it will make. Verse 11.

"In whom also all the saints have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Is it true, that all the saints had obtained an inheritance when Paul wrote this letter, or have they all received an inheritance yet? Surely not. But let us read on. "That all the saints should be to the praise of his glory who first trusted in Christ." Is it true, that all the saints *first* trusted in Christ? If they did, who trusted in him last or afterward? But even this, ridiculous though it be, is not the worst of the absurdity. Let me read the 13th verse. "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." What does the word also, in this verse, refer to? "In whom ye also trusted," as well as whom? In whom ye *saints at Ephesus* also trusted, as well as *all the saints!!!* Is that it? If so, the saints at Ephesus were no part of all the saints. What ridiculous nonsense such an interpretation makes of the word of God. It represents the Apostle as saying that *all the saints had obtained* an inheritance; that they had all *first* trusted in Christ; and that the saints at Ephesus also, when they heard the word of truth, trusted in Christ, as well as all the saints!!

But we can insert Apostles and prophets for the words "us" and "we," throughout the passage, without involving the least absurdity. See how beautifully it will apply to the third verse, where this pronoun is first introduced. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,



who hath blessed the Apostles and prophets with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." See also how well this expresses the 5th verse. "Having predestinated the Apostles and prophets unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." It is not having predestinated them unto *their own* adoption, but "unto the adoption of *children*" How suitable this to the apostolic work. Predestinated, not merely to their own salvation, but to the adoption of others, through Jesus Christ. See also the 6th verse. "To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made the Apostles and prophets accepted in the beloved." Had God made all the saints accepted in the beloved, when Paul wrote this letter? I think not; but the Apostles and prophets he had made accepted in the beloved. Let us read the 7th verse. "In whom the Apostles and prophets have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." Had all the saints redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, when Paul wrote this? Surely not. Verse 8th, he says: "wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence." Had God already abounded toward all the saints in all wisdom and prudence? Not when this letter was written. At verse 9th he says, "having made known to us the mystery of his will." Had he, at that time, made known to all the saints the mystery of his will, or only to the Apostles and prophets? Certainly only the latter, and what did he make known to them the mystery of his will for? This he answers, verse 30th, as follows: "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him." Did he, in Paul's clay, make known to all the saints the mystery of his will for this purpose? or only to Apostles and prophets? The latter, most certainly.

At verse 11, he says, "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance." Had all the saints obtained an inheritance at this writing, or only the Apostles and prophets? The Apostles and Prophets beyond" dispute. Let us read the 11th, 12th, and 13th verses, inserting the words, Apostles and prophets. "In whom also, the Apostles and prophets have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated

according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, that the Apostles and prophets should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ; in whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth; the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." This, I maintain, gives the exact meaning of the passage. There is some propriety in saying that the Apostles and prophets *first trusted in Christ*, but none in saying this of all the saints. There is also some propriety in his saying, verse 13th, "In whom ye also trusted"—ye saints at Ephesus—as well as us Apostles and prophets; and I defy any man to show any incongruity in this. It makes good sense, the very sense the Apostle spoke, and perfectly harmonizes with the whole scope of the passage.

But I maintain that the Apostle, in so many words, states who the words "us" and "we" mean. In the 9th verse, he says, "having made known unto us the mystery." Who does he mean by this *us*, to whom he had already made known the mystery? This, he tells us in the clearest terms, ch. iii, 3-5. "How that by revelation, he made known unto me the mystery; as I wrote before in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy Apostles and prophets by the Spirit." Now, is it not evident, that when Paul says, "as I wrote before in few words," he refers to the few words, ch. i, 9; when he says, "be made known unto us the mystery." Then, when he tells who this *us* is, to whom he made known the mystery, he says, they were the holy Apostles and prophets, and that, he revealed it to them by his Spirit.

The Apostles and prophets are then the elect spoken of in this passage. What were they elected for? They were clothed with all spiritual blessings in Christ; the mystery was made known to them, and they were chosen in Christ. What for? For "the adoption of children by Jesus Christ"—"that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ"—that through them, others also, might "hear the

word of truth, the gospel of their salvation, and believe"—"to preach among the Gentiles, the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which, from the beginning of the world, hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Such are the objects of this glorious Predestination of God. It is directly opposite to the Predestination of the worthy gentleman. His denies that *all men can see*; but ours is, to "*make all men see.*"—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' FIFTH ADDRESS.

*Thursday, 9 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

*Fellow Citizens*—I intend this morning, first of all, to devote a little time to a review of the proceedings of yesterday. As is usual, the battle-ground has been enveloped in a dense fog or smoke; by whom raised, and for what purpose, I shall not say. I wish to scatter this fog, if possible, and to ascertain, as nearly as I can, the relative position of the combatants.

When I first noticed the gentleman's Sermon, I objected to it, as containing certain points of doctrine, which, in my opinion, were untrue. When the gentleman challenged me to a debate, in the letter accepting that challenge, 'written more than eight months ago, I stated the points to which I took exception. These points, the gentleman came here pledged to defend. In our whole correspondence, he never in the most distant way intimated, either that the doctrines were not in the Sermon, or that I put a wrong construction upon them. Never! Never! But now, after, by his own confession, I have demolished the positions which I attacked, he would be glad to have you believe that I do not touch the doctrines of his discourse. I humbly submit to the good sense of an intelligent community, whether this disclaimer be not *a little too late*; and whether we have not good grounds for suspecting that it has been extorted from the gentleman, either by pressure from without, or by a clear perception of the fact, that his doctrines are indefensible.

Now, I can respect and admire a man, who, when ho

finds himself in the wrong, can nobly acknowledge the fact, and renounce the doctrine. But the man who rinds himself wrong, and begins by shuffling and slippery evasion to seek to hide the fact, while he raises a fog upon some incidental topic, that under its friendly covering, he may escape to a new position, such a man I cannot admire. Let the gentleman openly disown this poor, unfortunate, fatherless bantling—this Sermon that has attained the extraordinary honor of being *stereotyped*: or, let him, since he still seems to cherish for it a sort of sneaking affection, stand forward and defend it. Let him not deliver it over to the tender mercies of the wicked, but still extend over it the shield of his protection!

As to the first point of doctrine in the gentleman's Sermon, when he delivered it here, I did not hear of a man, out of his own denomination, who did not understand him as teaching that when the word "know," in the Scripture, is applied to God, it must be taken in the sense of *approve*. Every unprejudiced man who will read the printed Sermon, will acknowledge that this is the doctrine which it inculcates, without any intimation that the assertion is to be restricted to particular passages. He remarks, "*When* God speaks of knowing certain things, it is in contradistinction from things which he does not approve;" but as soon as I adduce a few texts, where God is said to know "*certain things*," such as good and evil, the heart of man etc., lo! the gentleman discovers that he don't mean that "know," in this connection, always means approve! Well, sir, pray what do you mean? Oh! I mean that know *sometimes* means approve. All! indeed: it needs no witch to tell us that. Pity men, especially in stereotyped discourses, don't always *say* what they *mean*. On this first point then, the gentleman has renounced all that is *peculiar* in his doctrine, and teaches what every intelligent Sabbath school child knows just as well as he.

How is it on the 2d point of doctrine? He labors hard, by forcing an unheard-of meaning upon the word "Foreknowledge," to put the doctrine of God's Foreknowledge, as commonly understood, out of the Bible. He says it is not an Old Testament doctrine; and in the New it means the knowledge which God has before given respecting Christ and his sufferings. But after my argument on the

subject, he then says that his God knows as much as mine, and has known, it as long. But pray, sir, where is your proof of this? It cannot be found in the Old Testament, you say; nor yet in the New. How do you prove it? But further this deponent saith not. We are left to vague conjecture. The "thus saith the Lord" for this item of the gentleman's faith, though called for, has not been forthcoming.

His efforts on the 3d point of doctrine are, if possible, still more brilliant. He says in his Sermon that God's elect are the Apostles and prophets. I adduce every instance in which the word or any of its cognates is found, and show that in not a single instance is it applied to prophet or Apostle; and he replies by expressing his deep, poignant, heart-felt sorrow, that I will not join issue with him on some doctrine which he really believes!! God's elect, says he, are the Apostles and prophets; I demur. That is, he rejoins, I mean, *a part* of God's elect are Apostles and prophets. All! indeed; that is highly probable. But did you really write this Sermon to prove what no one denies? And did you really think that you had destroyed the monster "Calvinism," by proving that the prophets and Apostles compose a *portion* of God's elect! This is as amiable a piece of simplicity as one would expect to find in the most primitive of the rural districts! But I don't mean that exactly either, he says; I mean that the elect spoken of in John xvii, and Eph. i, are the Apostles and prophets. Well, now we understand you. But unfortunately *the word elect does not occur in either of those chapters*. So here we have an elaborate effort to explain a word in two passages of Scripture, where the word is not to be found. This caps the climax, and leaves the most ardent amateur of "ground and lofty tumbling," nothing more to desire!

But I cannot let the gentleman escape in this way. I shall pin him down to the clear and universal proposition of his Sermon; and if he renounces the doctrine there taught, let him do it openly; and not by trying to shuffle into a new position, and conceal the fact that he has retreated from the old.

I argue, therefore, that when the gentleman said that

the elect were the Apostles and prophets, he intended no limitation or restriction to this proposition.

1. Because he *expresses* none. If he had meant that *a part of* God's elect were Apostles and prophets, he would have said so. If he had meant that the elect mentioned in a particular passage, were Apostles and prophets, he would have said so. When a man does not limit his language, the inference is that he intends no limitation of the sentiment.

2. Notice the language of the Sermon. The first sentence reads, "We design calling your attention to the *Bible doctrine of election*, " etc. Observe: "to the *Bible doctrine*; " not to *a part* of the Bible doctrine; not to the doctrine of John xvii, and Eph. i, but to the *Bible doctrine*. Of course every hearer and reader would expect to find the whole of the Bible doctrine set forth. And when told that the Bible doctrine of election is that "the elect are the Apostles and prophets," he would naturally infer that the Bible knew of no other elect than they. The gentleman, in expounding the Bible doctrine, finds but one elect, and that, the Apostles and prophets. His Brother Young, who I am happy to see present, in his Sermon on Bible Election, finds some four or five.

3. *Before introducing* Eph. i, and John xvii, he asks the question, "Who are God's elect?" p. 8; showing that he had no *special* reference to these passages, where the word is not found; but meant the elect treated of in the Bible, or "the Bible doctrine of the elect." This question he answers by saying that he had proved that the elect are the Apostles and prophets.

4. After his Sermon was printed, and he was trying to sell it, he recommends it to the public, because among other excellencies, he says that it "shows *who the elect are*." Proclamation and Reformer, July 1851. Now if any were induced to buy it in order that they might learn the "Bible doctrine of election, or "who the elect are," and it should turn out that the gentleman gave them only *a part* of the Bible doctrine, and told them who *apart* of the elect are, he is guilty of obtaining money under false pretenses, and they have their remedy in a court of law.

Having thus shown what the gentleman's position *was*;

a position which you heard him renounce, under the force of truth; I now follow him to the place where he attempts to rally his shattered forces, and undertake to show that he is wrong in interpreting John xvii, and Eph. i, exclusively of prophets and Apostles. The gentleman has two reasons for referring Eph. i, to Apostles and prophets.

1. The past tense is used. But God who "calls things that are not as though they were," often uses the past tense in speaking of a future event. Rom. iv, 17. 2. It will not make sense to substitute the words "all the saints," throughout the chapter. Very like. But I am acquainted with no Calvinist who understands this passage to allude to all the saints. *Calvinists* take Paul's own word for it, that it refers to himself, and "the saints that are at Ephesus," verse 1. And so vanishes the argument based on the substitution of "all the saints," which figures so largely in the Sermon, and which the gentleman is so fond of, that he repeated it again in his speech last night.

But the passage, Eph. i, 1-4, cannot refer to the Apostles and prophets, solely because there is no reason; and the gentleman gives no authority but himself, for this reference. The prophets are not referred to at all; and no Apostle is referred to except Paul himself.

1. The terms employed are not descriptive of prophets and Apostles in their *official capacity*. I can hardly think the gentleman in earnest in his *original* exposition of the words, "for the adoption of children; " if so, I let it pass, as unanswerable.

2. The language used is eminently descriptive of, and appropriate to, Christians as such.

3. So plain is this whole matter, that even Mr. Burnett, co-editor with the gentleman, repudiates his whole exposition. He says, "When a letter-writer, immediately after the address, uses the pronoun *its*, unless some special reason exists in the context to bind the application to other persons, it grammatically and logically refers, *as it does in this case*, to the writer and the parties addressed."

So say I. Every authority that I know of is against the gentleman's exposition, even his own partner. But what cares he for authority? unless it happens to be in his favor. "*Lei* us look at John xvii. It is freely conceded that

some verses of this chapter refer to the Apostles especially; but none to the prophets. There are others, however, that refer to all true Christians as given to Christ. "That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him; " verse 2. These to whom he would give eternal life, and who were given him by the Father for this purpose, he explains in verses 20-24, to be not only the Apostles, but them also that should believe on Christ, on the testimony of the Apostles. Now these persons cannot be the prophets and Apostles exclusively, for, 1. Some of them never obtained eternal life; as Balaam and Judas; consequently, they had never been given "to Christ," in the sense of this passage. And 2. Eternal life is not confined to Apostles and prophets; but Christ confines eternal life to those "*given*" him, in this peculiar sense, by the Father. For these reasons we reject the theory that these chapters refer exclusively to Apostles and prophets.

I proceed now to the 4th point of doctrine in the gentleman's Sermon; viz: "The purpose for which God's elect were chosen, was to preach the Gospel." I shall make but short work of this doctrine. Paul says that the object of Predestination is that those predestinated "might be conformed to the image of God's Son; " they were chosen "that they might be holy and without blame, before him in love." Peter says, "Elect \* \* unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Mr. Franklin says, elect to preach the Gospel!!

I have not time to notice the gentleman's last speech, at length; nor in my opinion, does it "call for such notice. It was truly dreadful for me to say that Barton W. Stone held certain doctrines; and to *prove it too*, that is worse and worse. Now I wonder who treats Mr. Stone most disrespectfully; he who attributes to him sentiments he was known to entertain; or he who says that such imputation is slander. I regard it as no slander of me, to be told that I believe Predestination; neither is it a slander of Stone, to say he denied a Trinity.

The gentleman refers to "Brother Raines'" authority, for the statement that, C. G. Finney is, or was a Presbyterian. I hold *Brother* Franklin, not Brother Raines, accountable for the statement. Finney is, and was an



Oberlin Perfectionist, If he ever had even a *nominal* connection with our church, it was by an unconstitutional, and consequently null and void arrangement. He is on the gentleman's own side of the house in this controversy. He ridicules the distinctive doctrines of our church; consequently, in slandering our church, he is but laboring in his vocation. But Alexander Campbell uttered no slander, when he said, that under the broad banners of the Reformation, they have all sorts of doctrines preached by all kinds of men.

I have committed also, a mortal offense, in showing that my doctrine of two natures, divine and human, in one Person, is the current belief of orthodox Christendom, and not "rare" and "peculiar," as charged by the gentleman.

Also a still more grievous offense, in quoting authors to show that Christ "*increased in wisdom*;" that he "*knew not* the day, nor the hour," of the judgment; that the Judge of quick and dead, will be the "*Son of MAN*;" even "*THE MAN* whom God has ordained." But Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul, old fashioned as they are, yet with some old fashioned folks, have as much weight as Mr. Franklin, I must, therefore, even console myself in their company, under the full weight of the *gentleman's feigned* horror and indignation.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S FIFTH REPLY.

*Thursday, 10 o'clock, May 27, 1852.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

THERE is really but one question in Debate. That question respects the truth of the doctrine of Predestination as taught in the Confession. This doctrine I deny, and my Sermon is an argument against it, in which I have taken from Calvinism several of its principal proofs. One of these, I set forth in my last speech, and introduced also John, xvii, which I shall now proceed to examine. In this address to the Father, the Lord says, that the Father has given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as the Father had given him. Verse 2d. The first question to determine is, who those were that the Father gave him. Were they all men, as Universalists allege? or all saints, as my worthy friend will maintain? I answer, neither. Let us read verse 6: "I have manifested thy

name unto the men whom thou gavest me, out of the world; thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word." These men were given "out of the world." They were not *all the world then*. The Lord had manifested his name unto them. They were not then, all the saints, for he had not manifested his name unto all the saints. They had "kept the word of God." They could not have been all the saints, for all the saints had not kept the word of God. Millions of the saints were not yet born. To these he had not manifested himself, and they had not yet kept his word. Again, verso 7, he says, that they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me, are of thee. Those given to him *had known*, in the past tense, all things that the Father had given, that it was of him. This could not be all the saints, for they did not know this.

He proceeds, verse 8, "I have given them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me." There are four things said of those the Father gave him here, that could not, as it is said, in the past tense, be said of all the saints. 1. He had given them the Father's words. 2. They had received them. 3. They had known surely that he came from the Father. 4. They had believed that the Father sent him. None of these things could be said of millions of saints who had not come into existence, who had not yet the word of God given to them, had not received it, had not yet known him, and had not yet believed that the Father had sent him.

He further says, v. 9, "I pray for them; I pray not for the world." He here prays for those given to him, but not for the world, thus making a clear distinction between those given him and the world. Those given to him then, cannot be all the world. But he proceeds, verse 11, "I am no more in the world, but these are in the world." They could not be all the saints, for all the saints were not in the world. He did not include the old saints or the saints who have lived since that time, for they were not in the world. Indeed, the class he is speaking of is becoming very much narrowed down. He proceeds in his address concerning those given to him, verse 12, "I kept them in thy name; those that thou gavest me, I have kept, and none of them

is lost, but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." This verse strands the doctrine of ray friend, so that he will never be able to get it together again. The Lord is speaking of the elect here; but he had been with this same elect in the world and had kept them in the Father's name. Surely he had not been with all the saints *in this world*, for but a small portion of them were in the world when the Lord was. He adds, "I have kept them." Whom? Those who had been with him *in the world*—the elect, yes, *the elect*, for if these are not elect, then, there are none mentioned in the Bible. What had he done for the elect? He answers: "I have kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled."

One of the elect was lost then!! Strange doctrine this, to the ears of my worthy friend. His doctrine of election is, that the "number is so definite, that it cannot be increased or diminished," but here the number given to Christ, the elect, was *diminished!*

We have now ascertained that the number of those given to Christ may be diminished, for one of that number, the Lord says, in his solemn address to his Father, *was lost*. If one was lost, others may be, in the same way, for there is no reason why election should save one man and not save another, in the same condition. It thus becomes a matter of vast moment, how this one, given to Christ, was lost. He stood high, for Peter says, Acts, i, 17, "He was numbered with us, and had obtained a part of this ministry." He was of the number given to Christ and had part of the apostolic ministry, and fell from it. How did he fall? This is expressed in the prayer to the Lord, to show whom he had chosen to fill his place, in the following words: "Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of the two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by *transgression fell*, that he might go to his own place." Acts, i, 24, 25. Judas fell then, by *transgression*, and I conclude that others might fall in the same way.

Calvin says, he fell from the apostleship. This is true; but he fell from the same thing that he was elected to. But is that all? Can a man turn traitor to the Lord, betray

him into the Lands of his enemies, and hang himself, with the loss of his office only? If elect persons can do all this, and still be counted good and faithful, while they will be invited to the joys of the Lord, there is but little need of piety! But this is not true, for the falling of this individual shows that the station to which he was elected, chosen or called, was conditional, and through a violation of the conditions, he lost the station. He was one of those given to Christ, who had power to bestow on him eternal life; but the act of turning traitor, forfeited all claim, and led to transgression, by which he fell, and that man who would attempt to show that he was saved, might easily turn Universalist, and contend that all will be saved.

But I leave, for the present, the case of Judas, and proceed with the Lord's address, John, xvii, 20, concerning those the Father gave him. He says of them, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Here we have three distinct classes: 1. Those given to Christ. 2. Those who shall believe through their word. 3. The world. The first class are the elect, the persons given to Christ, John, xvii, 20, the Apostles, through whom the gospel was to be revealed. The second class are all the saints, those who believe through the preaching of the Apostles. The third class are the unconverted world. The Apostles were elect persons, given to Christ, for an important purpose, viz: To reveal the gospel to the world; but one of them, Judas Iscariot, became a traitor, and, through transgression, fell; and even the great Apostle Paul, avowed that he labored to keep his body in subjection, lest he should become a cast away. The doctrine of Predestination, as taught in the confession, is not found in this chapter, and consequently, the quotation in the confession, from this chapter, to support that doctrine, is perverted.

Having closed my argument on those passages. I shall now proceed to make some reply to the worthy gentlemen. I am happy to find him in a more pleasant mood this morning. He became so perplexed on yesterday, with the idea of Christ judging the world *in humanity*, and had such

"peculiar feelings," that I did not know what we might look for. But I think the doctrine of "free grace" is having a fine influence upon him, and that he may yet be delivered from the manacles of Calvinism. He, however, informs you this morning, that he cannot *admire* such a person as myself. I am truly sorry that I cannot have his admiration, but I must try and get along without it. I do, however, admire him, and the laudable efforts he is making to defend what he thinks is truth. I do not look upon him as a dishonest pretender, trying to evade and dodge what he knows to be the truth. I suppose he seriously believes his doctrine, and, therefore, I say I *admire him* while he labors manfully to prove what he believes, though I am satisfied he never can prove it..

I am pleased to see him attempt to post up the argument; but do not precisely agree with him in the account of the labors of yesterday. In the recapitulation, I believe, he has substantially yielded up the first point, unless I will accommodate him so far, as to claim as *my own*, the position he has represented me as taking in this community, but I cannot thus accommodate him. In his haste to expose "humbuggery," he ran prematurely into a most manifest misrepresentation; and I cannot now, merely to save him from his unhappy predicament, assume the position he has attributed to me, on his own responsibility. He can, in but one way, in honor, escape his unenviable representation, viz: by admitting that he *was mistaken*. He must learn not to draw such wide conclusions from such limited premises. When he hears another man speak of those Scriptures, where "God is said to know certain things," and allege that the import is, that he "approves them; " he must not assume for him, that *every place in the Bible, where God is said to know*, and even where Cain is said to "*know his wife*; " the meaning of the word know, is *approve!!!* This, I am certain, will not pass for a fair representation with this audience. In this, though unintentional, he has misrepresented me, and without this, he has given up all, for he admits that the word know, means approve, in *some places*, which is equivalent to my expression, "when God is said to know *certain things*."

On the second point, the gentleman is mistaken; I have not attempted to put Foreknowledge out of the Bible,

but have gone to the very place in the Bible, where it is found, and shown what it is; and, in the place of denying, that what I call the Foreknowledge of God is what I call it, he dares not to deny, that what was before shown by the prophets, is the Foreknowledge of God. But he thinks hard of me not because I put Foreknowledge out of the Bible, but because I will not let him supplant it by something, not once called the Foreknowledge of God in that Book. I find Foreknowledge, in the Bible, well defined; but I am not willing that he shall call something else, the Foreknowledge of God, not once, so called, in all the Bible, and then build a system upon that something else.

My effort on the third point, is "still more brilliant," he thinks; but he has examined every place where the word elect is found in the Bible. In his course here he has been equally "brilliant," for in examining everyplace where the word elect is found in the Bible, he was careful not to examine the very passage about which the remark, "the Apostles and prophets are God's elect," was made. Eph. i, 3-13. But he has now even more "brilliantly" made the discovery that the word elect is not found in either Eph. i, or John, xvii. Perhaps, then, the doctrine of election itself is not found in either of these chapters. If he will define it, by saying, the doctrine of election, as taught in his Confession, is not found in either of those chapters, I will agree to it. But then I should like to know why both chapters are quoted to prove the doctrine, in the Confession, if the doctrine is in neither of them! Singular positions require singular management!

The gentleman inquires whether I was simply trying to prove, what no one denies, viz: that the Apostles and prophets were a portion of the elect. By no means; and I confidently believe I shall yet get him to see that I was trying to prove something more than this, and something he is bound to deny, or give up his creed. That something is, that the elect of the two chapters now mentioned, are the Apostles and prophets, and nobody else. I hope he can understand this, for if I maintain it, as I feel confident I shall, I have taken from him two of the strongest proofs ever urged in his favor. In the place, however, of meeting me at the beginning upon this point, he endeavors to make this audience believe that I have taken the position

that the Apostles and prophets are the only elect mentioned in the Bible. But this I have not done in the Sermon or any place else, so that all the labor he spends in trying to prove such to be my position, in the place of going to disprove any position of mine, only goes to show that he cannot disprove the doctrine of the Sermon itself, but merely his own misrepresentation of it.

He has ventured at length to approach the first chapter of Eph., and informs us that not only himself, but all Calvinists admit that the elect of this chapter does not include all the saints. Well, I am thankful for this admission, for this narrows down the elect of this chapter, much more than I ever expected him to admit. This chapter is referred to some seven times in his Confession, and applied to the definite number of men and angels, which can neither be increased nor diminished, but now it does not mean all the saints, nor any except Paul and the disciples at Ephesus!! If this is not a "brilliant" move to defend Calvinism, I know not where you will find one. He virtually gives up the very proof-text relied upon more in his creed than any other passage; and then, to shut himself up so that he never can escape, he claims that Bro. Burnett and every other authority are against my interpretation, and in favor of his position—that the elect of Eph. i, 3-13, are the writer, and those to whom he writes. Let us look at this interpretation, sustained by so much authority!

I will read verse 12, inserting Paul and the disciples at Ephesus, and see what kind of sense it will make. "That Paul and the disciples at Ephesus should be to the praise of his glory, who *first trusted in Christ.*" Did the Ephesians *first* trust in Christ? I think not. But in verse 13, he says, "in whom ye also trusted." Who does he mean in this verse? The disciples at Ephesus, without doubt. That is, "In whom ye—the disciples at Ephesus—also trusted, as well as Paul and the disciples at Ephesus!" This must be sound for it is sustained by so many authorities!—[*Time expired.*]

**MR. MATTHEWS' SIXTH ADDRESS.***Thursday, 10 o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: —

THE gentleman has fallen into a few mistakes in the speech just delivered; these I must rectify before proceeding with my argument.

He is mistaken in supposing that there is but one question in Debate. The question now before us is *not* whether Predestination as taught in the Confession is true; but whether the doctrines of the gentleman's Sermon are true. To establish the negative of the first of these questions is very far from proving the affirmative of the other. I wish. I could get the gentleman to see this; for ever since the discussion began, he has manifested an eagerness to get away from the point immediately before us, to other points regularly to come up hereafter. Now I tell him distinctly, that when, in regular course, the doctrine of Predestination, as taught in the Confession, comes up, *I shall be there*. But from the previous course of the gentleman, a course which he appears determined to pursue, I venture to predict, that when I get to that portion of the field, he will be somewhere else. Instead of meeting my arguments, as it is the duty of the respondent to do, he prefers to discuss anything and everything, rather than the point in hand. The gentleman is also mistaken in attributing to Calvinists the position that John, xvii, 6-19, refers to all the saints; I told him in my previous speech that part of the chapter referred to the Apostles. His labored refutation of that position is a waste of strength. It is in the second verse that we find the doctrine of election; and we know who they are that are *there* said to be given to Christ; for he "*gives eternal life to as many as are given him*" in the sense of that verse. Does the gentleman think that he gives eternal life only to Apostles and prophets?

The gentleman is also mistaken in attributing to his Bro. Burnett, and to myself, the position that *the whole* of Eph. i, is to be understood of Paul and the disciples at Ephesus. It is only a few verses at the *beginning* of the chapter, that is at all concerned in this discussion; in fact I think I so stated.

When these mistakes are corrected, the gentleman's



speech is answered; and I now proceed, in the next place, to notice the interpretations of Scripture given by the gentleman in his Sermon. The point now before us is that the interpretations of Scripture given in said Sermon do not convey the true mind of the Spirit.

The Author of this Sermon betrays a lurking consciousness that the Bible, in its obvious import, is against his doctrine. He seems to have felt that those who heard, or who should read his production, would notice his utter contrariety to the plain text of many passages of God's word, therefore he feels it incumbent upon him to enter upon the Herculean task of silencing the Living Oracles, at least, if he cannot torture and force them into a seeming assent to his doctrines. But after all his anxious and toilsome labor—a labor and toil calling for our sympathy if expended in a worthier cause—after all his mental throes, and critical contortions, there the obnoxious texts still stand, and there, notwithstanding the gentleman's anxious cares, they ever will stand, in God's own Book, and bearing God's own solemn testimony against all such attempts to emasculate the force of divine truth, and to substitute for the doctrines of God, the puny speculations of a weak, short-sighted man.

The first passage which he attempts to wrest into conformity to his foregone conclusion, is Rom. ix, 13. "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." This passage, with its context, would *seem* to teach—and by every unsophisticated and unprejudiced mind, would be *understood* to teach, that God does not treat all men alike; that he confers favors and blessings upon one, which he denies to others; and that the *cause* of this difference is, not in the character of the person or persons blessed and favored, but is found in his own sovereign pleasure, and in the right which he claims to do what he will with his own. But these doctrines do not suit the author of this Sermon; he is determined not to permit Paul to teach any such doctrine; he comes to the investigation of the passage with the firm determination *not* to find the doctrine of God's distinguishing and sovereign grace in it; and accordingly he does not find it, yet he makes some discoveries notwithstanding. Hear them.

1st. He discovers that the words, "Jacob have I loved,

and Esau have I hated," were not *written* before Jacob and Esau were born. We have here, either a very stupid blunder as to what the asserters of Divine Sovereignty teach, or we have a very cunningly formed false issue sought to' be palmed upon the unsuspecting, I do not know which the gentleman considers the worse compliment; but I am inclined to credit his understanding at the expense of his candor. We do not teach, and I am inclined to think the gentleman *knew* that we do not teach, that these words *were written* before the children were born. But we *do* say—and here is the true issue—we do say that *it was true* before the children were born that Jacob was loved and Esau hated. We say that in the purpose of God, prior to their birth, a distinction was made between Jacob and, Esau, and their respective posterities. We say that before their birth, this purpose was announced. We say that the ground of the distinction could not be the characters of the persons, for they were not yet born, and consequently, had done no good or evil. But we say, that the ground of this distinction is in God himself; he loved Jacob, he hated Esau. This is our *true* position with respect to this passage; it is also the position of God's holy word. "For when Rebecca had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; for the children being not yet born, 'neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth—it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger, as it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Rom. ix, 10-13.

2d. The gentleman discovers that the words "loved" and "hated" are mistranslations; and that "some of our best authorities say that Jacob have" I respected, and Esau have I slighted, is a better translation of the passage." Sermon, p. 16. Now I do not think that I have more of old mother Eve in me than the rest of her sons, but I must confess that I feel no slight curiosity to learn who these "best authorities" are: I have examined Gill and Haldane, Baptists and Calvinists, and they do not so translate this passage. I have examined Clarke and Watson, Arminian Methodists, and *they* do not so translate it. I have examined Scott and Bloomfield, Episcopalians—the former a Calvinist—the latter an Arminian, and *they* do not so ren-

der it. I have looked into Hodge and Barnes, the one an old School, the other a New School Presbyterian, and *they* do not so translate the passage. I have looked into one or two who are non-committal, neither fish, flesh, nor fowl, and *they* do not so render the words. Who can these best authorities be? Perhaps when composing this Sermon, the gentleman was in a state of *Mesmeric clairvoyance*, and had a *prevision* of what the decision of the Sages of the Memphis Convention would be on this troublesome Calvinistic passage. Will he inform us? If it really be so, and they translate the words "agapao" and "miseo" "to have respect to" and "to slight," their translation will fully come up to what the public expect from their hands. 3d. The gentleman discovers that it was Esau's right, as the first-born, to be counted in the lineage of Christ, which right he forfeited, and God, in consequence, "slighted" him, by counting the lineage of the Messiah in Jacob. Now this discovery is a mere dream, and like a sick man's dream at that; it is not only not true, but it has not even the semblance of truth. Isaac is in the lineage of Christ, yet Isaac was not the first-born. So with Jacob—the case in hand. Judah was not the first-born of Jacob, nor Pharez of Judah; Aram was not the firstborn of Ezrom, nor David of Jesse, nor Solomon of David; yet they all are in the lineage of the Messiah. How woefully far out in his reckoning the gentleman is here!

4th. The gentleman's fourth discovery is worthy of special notice. He discovers that the cause of God's hatred of Esau; ' or, as he, after "some of our best authorities" translates it, the cause of God's "slighting Esau," is *Esau's own conduct* in selling his birth-right. Now some of *our* best authorities differ from the gentleman here. One of them states that the purpose to prefer Jacob to Esau was formed and *announced* before the children were born; consequently, being prior to the sale of the birthright, it could not be the *effect* of that transaction. The same authority also states that the intention of the whole transaction was to show that God's purpose according to election stands not of works, but of him that calleth. The gentleman, however, says no; that is all a mistake; that authority must be Calvinistic; for it is evident that Esau

was "slighted" on account of his own works. Now which of these conflicting authorities shall we follow? The one is Saul, formerly of Tarsus, who is also called Paul—an author deeply dyed in Calvinistic doctrine, I admit. The other, is Elder Benjamin Franklin!

When I first heard this Sermon preached, and the gentleman came to this passage, I was forcibly reminded of the good old preacher, who had some notions of his own, on doctrinal points; and happening one day to be reading Paul's writings, he stumbled on something which he did not approve. He stops, and with the most amiable self-complacency, remarks to his congregation, "On this point, I beg leave to differ with Brother Paul!" So with the gentleman; he differs with Brother Paul, and differs widely, indeed.

5. The gentleman sums up his discoveries with the following, "This is merely a prediction to ancient Rebecca, relating to her descendants, and foretelling that the descendants of the elder child should be servants to the descendants of the younger."

On this, I remark, 1. If this were all, the passage has no business where it stands. It occurs in the midst of an argument to show that God, as a Sovereign, may dispense the blessings of his grace to whomsoever he will. And the gentleman will have it, that Paul turned aside from his high argument, to tell of a prophesy made to a woman respecting the relative worldly condition of her posterity! This may be like the gentleman's logic, but it is not like Paul's. 2. The interpretation is not only without plausibility, but absolutely without authority. He gives us no authorities, good, bad, or indifferent, for his gloss. He seems to think, here as elsewhere, that his mere assertion will be to the whole world, "confirmation strong as proofs of Holy Writ."

The connection and meaning are briefly these: The Apostle, at the close of the 8th chapter, ends his discussion of the doctrine of justification by faith. In this 9th chapter he enters upon the question of the rejection of the Jews from being the peculiar people of God, and the calling of the Gentiles to the privileges of the Gospel. As this subject would naturally be exceedingly offensive to the Jews, who had long looked upon themselves as the special favor-

ites of heaven; and upon the Gentiles as outcasts; he prefaces the discussion with expressions of the most ardent affection for the Jews, his kinsmen according to the flesh; and shows his sense of their former high position, by enumerating what God had done for them, He then introduces the subject of the rejection of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles to enjoy the blessings of God's grace. He proves that God had a perfect right to act as he does, because in the original covenant with Abraham, he did not bind himself to favor *all* the posterity of Abraham; but from among the children of Abraham, he selected Isaac, saying, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." And even in the case of Isaac, not all his descendants were to be the peculiar people of God; for of his two sons, born at the same time, of the same mother, he selected one; and that, the younger; not on account of their character, for the selection was made before their birth; to be taken into special nearness to himself; and whose descendants were to enjoy peculiar tokens of the Divine favor.

The argument is this: If God may select among the sons of Abraham, and again among the sons of Isaac, and bestow distinguishing spiritual privileges on one and not on another; and that, not on account of the character of the persons selected or rejected, but by a mere sovereign act of his own will, and in accordance with a purpose formed and announced prior to the birth of those who are affected by it; then God may take a seed to serve him, from the Gentiles also, and no one has a right to pay that, in the exercise of his sovereignty, there is unrighteousness with God.

Even granting that in this whole matter, the posterity of Jacob and Esau were looked to, still the choice made was the choice of *Jacob*, and the rejection was the rejection of *Esau*; and their posterity are concerned in this transaction, *solely* because they are respectively connected with Jacob and Esau.

But whether nations or individuals are concerned, these truths are plainly taught in the passage: 1. God does confer special spiritual blessings on some men, which he withholds from others. 2. The ground of this preference is not in the individuals themselves, in their conduct, or their character. And 3. The reason is in God himself, who is a

Sovereign, and who dispenses his favors, spiritual and temporal, as seems good in his sight.

These truths, this passage plainly teaches; these truths are taught again and again in God's Holy word; these truths the church of God, in her purest state, has always testified for; these truths have been the comfort and solace of many an afflicted pilgrim, in the house of his bondage; of many a sainted martyr, in the hour of his fiery trial; these truths shall remain unscathed, amid all the opposition and hatred which they will encounter from the pride of human reason. Heaven and earth shall pass away; they shall not pass away. These truths, some delight to sneer at, as *Calvinism*.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S SIXTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

BEFORE I proceed to the last speech of *my* worthy friend, I must reply to his remarks on the design of the elect; Eph. i, and John xvii. I think he has missed the real design, and differs also, from the design set forth in his creed. His creed says, that they are "predestinated unto everlasting life," while the balance are "foreordained to everlasting death." Calvin says, that "God reprobates, and from no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestinates for his children." Inst., Vol. 2, p. 163. But this, though it sets forth Calvinism, by no means sets forth the design of Eph. i, The gentleman has quoted verse 4, to show the object of their Predestination: "That we should be holy and without blame before him in love." But if he makes all the Disciples at Ephesus the elect here spoken of, and makes it the object of their election, that they "should be holy and without blame before him in love," he will find that the object was not gained, for very few, if any, of those were "without blame." But the truth is, this holiness and exemption from blame, was not the design of their election or being chosen, but a requirement in their character, and for the want of which Judas fell. In the place, however, of predestinating them unto *everlasting life*, as the Confession has it, the 5th verse says, "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ."

As I have before said, they were not predestinated unto their *own adoption*, but unto the *adoption of children*. This was the important work for which they were chosen, and not the mere selfish and partial purpose of *their own happiness*. To be suitable persons for this great calling, they should be holy and without blame before him in love; and for this purpose, he says, "He hath abounded toward them in all wisdom and prudence," and made known to them the mystery of his will. See verses 8 and 9. What was this for? merely to prepare them for their own happiness, or some further and higher end? Certainly the latter. So the very next verse expresses it: "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ." This perfectly accords with the statement of the Apostle of the object of their election, as stated, Eph. iii, 5; where he informed us who the elect were. In verse 6 he tells us what the mystery was, mentioned ch. i, 9, and ch. iii, 5; viz: "That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel; *whereof*," says he, "*I was made a minister*." For this purpose, he was made a minister, to reveal the secret that Christ had committed to him. He proceeds, verse 8, to give the object of his election, his being made a minister, or of "this grace," as he calls it, being given to him, in the following words: "That I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world had been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." This is all according to the eternal purpose of God; in strict agreement with the benevolence of God, seen in every part of his gracious dealings with the children of men.

This too, harmonizes delightfully with a comment of Dr. Rice, in his debate with Mr. Pingree, on the words, "who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth;" 1 Tim. ii, 4. He says, "He makes some pretensions, I presume, to an acquaintance with the Greek language. If so, he ought to know, that the Greek word, (*thelei*) translated, *will have*, does not express *& purpose* to save all men, but the *benevolent desire*

that all might come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved." *Rice and Pingree's Debate*, p. 183.

This is as good a sentiment as I have seen in any boob, and I have no doubt the exact meaning of the passage. He follows this, with the following very just remark, "But Universalists ask, can any of God's benevolent desires fail to be accomplished? We will let the Bible be its own interpreter. As the benevolent Jesus was descending from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem, "He beheld the city and wept over it, saying, if thou hadst known, even thou, at least, in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace." Luke xix, 41, 42. On another occasion, he took up a lamentation over Jerusalem, and said, "Oh Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which were sent unto thee, *how often would I have gathered thy children together*,. even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but *ye would not*." Here we have the benevolent design of God set forth, to save certain persons, but through their *own perversity*, they were not saved; and we have it asserted by Dr. Rice, that this benevolent design of God extends to all men. Election is not then, simply to extend the benevolent design "of saving to *some men*; to a *special few*, for their own good; nor does such a view comprehend a tithe of the benevolence and philanthropy of the great God. It falls infinitely below it.

But the chosen persons of the chapters under consideration were not chosen for their *own benefit*, but as an elect channel, through which God, according to his eternal purpose, intended to extend his benevolence to the race. The reason, then, why all are not saved, is not that the benevolence of God is not extended to all, for Dr. Rice says, "The grace of God *offers salvation to all*; but they must receive it, must believe, or be condemned." This is done through the Apostles and prophets, who were chosen or elected for this special purpose. Mr. Wesley, in commenting upon the words, "The dispensation of the grace of God given me in your behalf," Eph. iii, 2, says, "That is, the commission to dispense the gracious Gospel; to you Gentiles in particular; " and on the words, "According to the gift of the grace of God," Eph. iii, 7; he remarks, "That is, the apostleship which he hath graciously given



me; and which he hath qualified me for, by the effectual working of his power."

I am now ready to proceed to the gentleman's speech. ' He says, I am mistaken, "in attributing to Calvinists the position that John xvii, 6-19, refers to all the saints. I told him in my previous speech, that part of the chapter referred to the Apostles." I hope the audience will remember this, and that my worthy friend will inform them, why John xvii, 9, is quoted in his Confession, and applied to the elect!! Are the Apostles the definite number that can be neither increased nor diminished? He says, the Apostles are the persons referred to, from verse 6 to 19; but his creed quotes verse 9, and applies it to the elect. How is this? Are the Apostles the elect?. or does the creed pervert this quotation? He is against his creed, and I offer this as another evidence that he is not orthodox. He is coming over to "free grace!" But there is still a little of the old leaven lurking in his system. He says, "it is the second verse that refers to election." This verse, I believe, is not quoted, as a proof-text, under the article. But if it refers to election, we must look at it. I should be pleased for him to show how he learned that those *given to Christ*, verse 2; are not the same men "given out of the world," verse 6; "given me," verse 9; "given me," verse 11; and the same ones spoken of as belonging to him, up to the 24th verse. I maintain that they are the identical persons from verse 1 to 24, and it is not in his power to show to the contrary. I know of no passage that says, "he gives eternal life to as many as are given him." Such is not the reading of verse 2. It simply asserts that, "power was given him over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." He has power to bestow eternal life, but will never bestow it upon any like Judas, who fall by transgression. We therefore, may conclude there is no Calvinism in this chapter. I call upon him to give a reason for saying there are two classes given to Christ, as stated in that chapter. The Lord commenced his address to heaven; verse 1, and verse 2, he mentions persons given him by his father. He proceeds with the same address through the chapter and mentions those given to him, verse 6; mentions them again verse 9; again verse 10; again verse 11; again verse 12;

and continues to speak of them to verse 24. He has not, and cannot give a reason, for making those described in the very same words, as *given him*, both in the 6th, and 9th verses, out two different classes. In this he is completely stranded, and for him there is no remedy, but a renouncement of his error. He is opposed to his creed as well as to what is obvious to all present; the meaning of the passage. Which way can he turn?

My worthy friend also shows symptoms of departing from his position on Eph. i. He confines to Paul and the Ephesians only a few verses at the beginning. I should be pleased to hear him say how far the beginning extends. He had no opportunity to misunderstand me, for the Sermon definitely specifies to the 12th verse as applicable to the Apostles and prophets. He seemed to assume an air of pride in taking his stand by the side of Brother Burnet, in the position that the words "us" and "we," from the 3d to the 12th verse, meant Paul and the Disciples at Ephesus. But since finding that his creed refers to verses, in this passage, six or eight times, to sustain Predestination, as taught in that book, he begins to doubt the orthodoxy of his assumed associate, and the solidity of the foundation upon which they both stand!! No wonder he begins to back out, for, although I regard Brother Burnet's judgment as very correct in general, his position here has not one good reason in its favor. It is ridiculous to make Paul say, that himself and the Disciples at Ephesus trusted in *Christ first*, and that the Ephesians also trusted him as well as Paul and the Ephesians! I am not in any mistake here, but my opponent is in a most horrid difficulty, out of which there is no escape.

All the gentleman said about my aversion to the obvious meaning of Scripture, is entirely gratuitous. He has signally failed on John xvii, and Eph. i; and now falls upon Esau with a seeming determination to make something out of that old hacknied and oft-refuted argument. But here he is bound to fail also. He seems to claim Paul as on his side of the question, but he will find some sad comments from him on the Esau case. Esau had a birthright. He never was, then, a reprobate, in the Calvinistic sense. Their reprobates never had any birth-right. He must have been one of the elect, for none but elect persons

could have a birth-right. He *had one and lost it*. How did he lose it? I like the obvious meaning of Paul's reasoning on this point so well that I must quote it. Hear him: "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord; looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God." A singular Calvinist, this Paul, to speak of men "*failing of the grace of God!!*" But as my friend claims fellowship with him, we must hear him further. He proceeds: "Lest any root of bitterness springing up, trouble you, and thereby many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birth-right. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited a blessing he was rejected; for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." Now it is no matter what this birth-right was, it was lost, and lost through transgression, and what is more, it could not be regained. This case, in the place of being used, as the worthy gentleman has used it, is used by Paul, to admonish Christians against the dangers of apostasy.

The gentleman seemed incensed at me for having intimated that any one should have thought that the words, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," were written before these men were born. If he is not aware that thousands have thought so, this audience is, and many who will read the Debate, he will find, think the same. But it changes the appearance of things very much, when they learn that this remark of the prophet was not uttered till hundreds of years after their birth, and after the descendants of these men had been called by their respective names more than a thousand years. When the prophet uttered this language, the two nations, the descendants of the two brothers, were called *Jacob* and *Esau*, and it was of the nations the Lord spake, and not of the men bearing those names, when he said, "Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated." Nothing of importance, in our argument, depends upon the translation to which I referred, and consequently, I have not prepared to make any defense of it. Nor do I see anything to call forth so much odium from the gentleman upon the "Bible union; " nor am I satisfied that the public expectations from that quarter, are of such

a character as he insinuates. He will yet find that organization more formidable than he expects.

The passage, Genesis xxv, 23, says nothing about Jacob and Esau, in their own persons, but what is said, relates to two nations that should spring from their mother, and it is simply stated, the elder should serve the younger. But my friend is bound to admit that God foresaw that Esau would "despise his birth-right," or deny that he foresees everything. And if he admits that he foresaw that he would despise his birth-right; that he would sell it, and, as Paul explains it, by this means, would fail of the blessing, he gives up a strong point. He then, acted freely and voluntarily, and by a voluntary act of wickedness, lost his position. Was Esau reprobated to everlasting death? I think the gentleman will hardly say so. Was Jacob elected to everlasting life? If so, ESAU was ordained to everlasting death. But he will not say so. Then why does his creed refer to Jacob and Esau, as a proof under Predestination to everlasting life? He is bound to apply this case to everlasting life and everlasting death, or oppose the application made in his creed. The same is true of John xvii, and Eph. i.

He objects to the remark in the Sermon, that according to the custom of nations, it was Esau's right to be enrolled in the genealogy of Christ. But his objection amounts to nothing, for there are exceptions to all general rules, and the fact that God had broken in upon this general custom, in a few instances, proves nothing to the contrary of what I have said. I claim then, that my interpretation in the Sermon stands correct, and that Calvinism is deprived of any support from that source.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' SEVENTH ADDRESS.

*Thursday, 11 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

THE gentleman is already beginning to fulfill my prediction, that as I progressed in my argument, he would probably take a position as far in the rear, as, at the outset he had in advance of *my* position. We have now come to his interpretations of Scripture, but he is back again to the

doctrines of the Sermon, already disposed of. Some how or other he don't seem to relish my company. He prefers being anywhere else than on the part, of the ground I occupy. He finds it much more comfortable to light where he has no opponent; than to meet his adversary face to face, and exchange shots at point blank distance. However, I am grateful to him for having vindicated my claims as a *true prophet*. I claim that the gentleman has proved me to be one of *his elect*.

The gentleman, however, is still vigorously engaged in the light; he is gaining stupendous advantages. He has annihilated Calvin, converted Dr. Rice, blown the Confession of Faith sky high obtained a pat on the back from Wesley on a point where there is no difference of opinion, contradicted the Savior, rejected the testimony of Paul, administered a dose of *his "free grace"* to me, ridiculed and repudiated his brother and associate, Mr. Burnet, and stirred up a grand muss, generally.

I shall briefly re-state my position on the points to which the gentleman has recurred, and then leave them. Said a distinguished judge to a prosy lawyer: "Mr. ----; it is to be presumed that the court knows something." I shall presume that my audience know enough to render it unnecessary for me to be continually saying over again the same things. The text of the gentleman's Sermon is Eph, i, 4—6. To *these three verses* he applies the theory of his Sermon, and tries to make it appear that the persons alluded to are the Apostles and prophets. Mr. Burnet repudiates the interpretation of the passage. He says: "*it is impossible to apply the verses from one to seven, to Apostles and prophets*" The gentleman, in his last speech, applies this remark to *subsequent* verses, and says, that Mr. Burnet's position "*has not one good reason* in its favor." "It is ridiculous," etc! "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!!!" Now I say that Mr. Burnet is right; and in order to make him wrong, the gentleman is compelled to misrepresent his position; just as he does Calvin, the Confession of Faith, and his present opponent, Mr. Burnet said nothing, and I said nothing respecting the 12th and 13th verses. Yet to *these* verses the gentleman persists in applying remarks made respecting those which stand at the head of his Sermon!

Those who *read* the Debate when published will be able to see the disingenuousness of the gentleman, in all this; for I shall insist upon the Sermon forming part of the volume.

He thinks it very strange, that if these verses in the 1st of Ephesians, refer only to Paul and those to whom he wrote, that the Confession should apply them to the elect. The Ephesian Christians were part of the elect; the Christians of Thessalonica another part; those at Corinth another part; the Disciples for whom Christ prayed, as well as those who would believe on him through their word, John xvii, 9-20, another part. It was no misapplication of Scripture, therefore, in the framers of the Confession, to apply what is said of them, *as elect persons*, to all elect persons. What is true of all the parts, is true of the whole.

The gentleman says, that holiness and exemption from blame *was not* the design of the election or choice. Eph. i, 4, *Paul* says, "He hath chosen us in him, that we should be holy and without blame!"

The gentleman says, "they were *not* predestinated unto their *own adoption*." Mr. Burnet says, that they were chosen "that they may be holy, and without blame before him in love, and ADOPTED AS CHILDREN." And *Paul* says, they were predestinated, *eis uiiothesian*, UNTO A STATE OR SONSHIP.

The gentleman says, he knows of no passage which says, Christ gives eternal life to as many as are given him. Jesus Christ says that he has power over all flesh, "that he should give eternal life to as many as the Father has given him!" He says, also, of all "given him," in *this* sense, that he should "lose nothing, but raise it up at the last day;" also that they, seeing the Son, and believing in him, will have everlasting life. If the gentleman can see no difference in those said to be "given to Christ," in John xvii, 2, who all shall obtain eternal life, and those "given him" to be his companions in life, and his witnesses after his death, I counsel him to be couched mentally, that he may see; or that he procure a different set of glasses from those which he uses, which are very opaque; or better than all, that he get some of the "eye salve" of which Die good Book speaks.

The gentleman treads softly over the portion of my speech which showed up his perversion of the case of Jacob

and Esau. He makes a faint effort to sustain himself by taking a flying leap from the 9th of Romans, to the 12th of Hebrews, but the ruse is too plain.

He says, thousands think the words of Malachi were written before Jacob and Esau were born. I suspect if I called for these *thousands*, and even offered to discount seventy-five per cent, as in the case of the thousand Trinitarians last evening, I would find, as in that case, that they would come up missing.

He says, nothing of importance depends upon the translation he gave. I beg his pardon. I think I have read somewhere that it is rather an important matter, *to add to, or take away from*, the words of this Book. Can I not prevail upon the gentleman to tell me who his "best authorities" are?

He still holds out the idea that the distinction made between Jacob and Esau, was on account of their conduct respectively. Paul says, that the whole transaction shows that election is *not* of works. But the gentleman is so in the habit of disagreeing with Paul, that to find him in direct antagonism with himself, is, with him, a very small matter. But I find the gentleman in opposition to an authority which he evidently regards as much higher than Paul. He says, in his speech, that it was of the two *nations* that Malachi wrote, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated;" but this authority says that Esau was hated, or "slighted," because he freely and voluntarily sold his birth-right. Of course it was Esau, the *individual*, who was "slighted;" for it was Esau, *the individual*, who sold the birth-right. The authority the gentleman differs from so widely is elder Benj. Franklin, author of a stereotyped Sermon on Predestination and the Foreknowledge of God!

I proceed now to consider the next passage of Scripture in the gentleman's Sermon, which he has introduced, in order to explain away its force, as it bears upon his doctrine. "Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another to dishonor?" Rom. ix, 21. Instead of attempting an interpretation of this passage, he tells us that Paul quotes it from Jeremiah; and then flies off to the passage in that prophet where he was directed to go down to the house of the potter; and he entertains us with a dissertation on the art

of making pots! This *ruse* may serve the gentleman on other occasions, but shall not serve him here. Paul does *not* quote from Jeremiah. The passage of that prophet may have *suggested* the simile; but the language is not a quotation; it is Paul's own. The gentleman must face Paul and not Jeremiah. Our business at present is not in the "house of the potter, but in the 9th chapter of Romans. I do not wonder that he is anxious to get out of that chapter; every sentence in it is a thrust at the very vitals of his system. But he must get used to it; for I intend to make him visit it more than once before the close of this Debate. "

In his dissertation upon pottery, which he gives us instead of an interpretation of this text, he tells us that if a vessel is made to dishonor, "the fault is in the clay; " not, in the intention of the potter; that "it depends entirely upon the clay." Now this may be very good pottery, but it is very poor interpretation. It is just, in effect, saying: Paul, you know nothing about it; you have utterly mistaken the matter. Brother Paul, I beg leave to differ with you, and, with your leave, I will tell you what you *ought* to have said. How could you be so absurd as to imagine for one moment, that any sensible potter would act as you suppose? Talk of making one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor, "out of *clay of the same lump!*" I tell you Paul, the thing is nonsensical!! It is *not* out of the *same* lump that the vessels unto dishonor are made, but out of an *inferior article!* Oh! Paul, Paul, why didn't you attend the Memphis Convention?

Now I think that the gentleman has completely got the advantage of Paul in this argument, and perhaps I had better net venture to say a word or he'll demolish me too! But as Paul has stood by me faithfully in this whole debate, and as I expect still to need his assistance, if he ever recover from the terrible mauling which the gentleman has given him, I will not desert him at this pinch.

I beg leave then just to intimate to the gentleman, with all deference, that, possibly, the connection may shed some light upon the subject, and show us the sense in which Paul uses these words. This verse is a part of Paul's answer to an objection to his doctrine, which we find stated in the 19th verse.



The objection is that his doctrine destroys human responsibility. "Why doth he yet find fault? for who hath resisted his will?" The same objection we hear uttered with the same flippancy every day. Paul makes two remarks in reply to this objection. 1st. He shows the presumption of a poor, weak, short-sighted creature presuming to sit in judgment upon the acts of the Creator, and arrogantly pronouncing sentence upon those acts, the reasons of which it is impossible that he can comprehend. "Who art thou, Oman, that repliest against God?" 2d. He asserts the right of God, as a Sovereign, to bestow or withhold mercy as he pleases; just as a potter has power over the clay to make from the same lump, one vessel to honor and another to dishonor. So out of the corrupt mass of fallen creatures, *in the same moral condition*, God may select, some as the objects of his distinguishing favor, and leave others to perish in their corruption, and no one has a right to challenge his conduct, or to say to him "what doest thou?"

The whole force of the illustration depends upon the fact that the clay is of the *"same lump."* For this illustrates the *sovereignty* of Divine Grace, in distinguishing among those who were all in the same lost and perishing condition.

[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S SEVENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: —

THE speech you just heard, very forcibly calls up one of the sayings of the Lord to the illustrious Paul, with whom the gentleman claims some harmony of spirit. "It is hard to kick against the goads." Never, in any controversy known to me, have I witnessed a more complete failure in attempting to refute any position, than the failure of my worthy friend, in attempting to demolish my insignificant Sermon. His attempt to assume the place of the judge, who presumed the court knew something, is out of the question. The fact that this audience is intelligent, should have a different effect from what he has suggested. In the place of his assuming the position of the judge, he reminds me of the man, who, on coming into court for trial, was seen to tremble. His attorney plead with him not to

fear; that he would see that justice was done him. The poor fellow answered, "That is exactly what I am afraid of." The same is what should be the case with my opponent. The *intelligence* of this audience, is precisely what he should fear, and what I should fear, were I in his place.

I called upon him for a reason for assuming that those given to Christ, as mentioned John, xvii, 9, were a different class from those mentioned, verses 6-9, and up to the 24th. Has he given a reason for this assumption? He has not, and cannot, nor can any man. There is not the slightest intimation of the Lord's changing his address to speak of any other persons. Yet my friend assumes, without the least reason to support him, that verse 2 refers to the elect, and admits that from the 6th to the 19th, the persons given to him, were the Apostles!! To show him that he is not sound in the faith, I refer him to the fact that his Confession quotes the 9th verse and applies it to the elect. "Behold how beautiful for brethren to dwell" in unity with their creed. I suppose that when he was ordained he promised to maintain the doctrine of his creed. But here is a manifest departure from it. The creed applies John, xvii, 9, to the "definite number of men and angels predestinated unto everlasting life," but he says it means the Apostles! In this case he is right, and has come over and agreed with the very Sermon that he called *humbuggery* when he first heard it. He admits the correctness of the application the Sermon makes of the whole chapter, except verse 2, and I leave it with the intelligence of this audience to say, what evidence he has given, for assuming that those spoken of, verse 2, are different from those spoken of throughout the chapter. I claim that he is almost converted on this chapter. All he lacks, is to admit, which I think his good judgment will soon tell him, if it does not now, that the persons spoken of, verse 2, are the same spoken of, up to verse 24.

I am succeeding with the worthy gentleman beyond all my expectations. He now thinks that Eph. i, 4-6, speaks of different persons from the same chapter, verses 12 and 13. Yet he claims to be with Bro. Burnet. I can inform him that he need not claim fellowship with Bro. Burnet in this subterfuge. He took his position relative to the per-

sons called "us" and "we," from verse 3 to verse 12, and he will not attempt to make these words apply to one class up to verse 6, and another class from that to verse 12, without giving the slightest reason for it. But he attempts to make some capital out of the difference between Bro. Burnet and myself, in the interpretation of this passage, not perceiving that his interpretation repudiates Calvinism as much as mine. But we call his attention to the following: Dr. Rice says, "It is the *benevolent desire* of (rod to save all men." My friend obstinately refuses to admit that "it is the benevolent desire of God to save all men." Dr. Rice says, "the Grace of God offers salvation to all," but Mr. Matthews refuses to admit that the Grace of God offers salvation to all men. "Behold! how beautiful for brethren to dwell together in unity."

The worthy gentleman has scarcely referred to any argument of mine to show the design of election. He quoted the same things urged by him in his former speech, but made no effort to refute the arguments I have offered. I hope he will come out and be explicit, and show some good reason for saying that the words "us" and "we," Eph. i, 3-6, mean different persons from the same words, from verse 6 to verse 12. This he never can do. I wish him also to show us how a reference to a few elect persons can sustain his doctrine of a definite number that can be neither added to nor diminished! And if from verse 6 to verse 12 the passage means somebody else, and not the elect, how he makes persons believe his creed that so frequently applies it to the definite number of men and angels!!! We need a little more light on these matters, if he can afford it.

I should like to hear him define himself a little better on Jacob and Esau. He should inform us at once, whether he understands Esau to be a reprobate and Jacob one of the definite number. If they are, then the creed and the gentleman use the case right. If such is not the case—if the birth-right Esau lost was not eternal life, but merely earthly advantages, and if these were lost by his despising his birth-right—selling it, as the Scripture says, the whole case is perverted every time it is applied to Calvinistic predestination to everlasting life, for there is no such predestination in the whole case. I claim that Esau lost his birthright; that that birth-right was his proper place in the

genealogy, as the elder son. He lost it by transgression, which could not have been the case, if that birth-right was eternal life to which he was unchangeably predestinated. Calvinistic birth-right cannot be lost. He had a birth-right and lost it. How does this prove anything toward the doctrine of the definite number of men and angels?

The gentleman dislikes descending to so humble a place as the potter's house. But he must not only with myself, but with the prophet, go down to the potter's house, and learn a lesson of heavenly wisdom from this potter. He objects to calling Paul's words a quotation from Jer. xviii. I believe the passage is a quotation, but whether it is a quotation or not, it is the same thing, only the prophet speaks of it at large, and gives the reason why God makes one vessel unto honor' and another unto dishonor. That reason the gentleman knew to be against him. It is there explained, that if a nation turn from righteousness it shall be made a vessel to dishonor, or if a nation turn from wickedness, it shall be made a vessel to honor. This *I* shall show at full length, hereafter, but for the present, I am determined to show that it does not give currency to the doctrine of my friend, Paul says, "If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work." 2 Tim. ii, 21. From this, it is clear, that it depends on the quality of the clay, whether it will be a vessel unto honor or not. If a man *shall purge himself from evil*, he shall be a vessel unto honor. Paul does not then fraternize with the gentleman in the doctrine, that God makes men vessels of honor and dishonor regardless of their characters.

Having now replied to the last speed, so far as any reply is demanded, I shall proceed with my independent argument. I have already proceeded so far as to develop my first argument, the original design, purpose, or decree of God, viz: That all men should have the privilege of seeking the Lord and finding him; that all men should have the privilege of seeking, of believing, serving, and enjoying God forever. As Dr. Rice has expressed it, the will of God is that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved, or this is the benevolent desire of God. This I have shown from the Scriptures, from the Confes-

sion, and Dr. Rice, to be the original intention of God or his eternal purpose. I have given this as my first argument.

2. My second argument is founded upon the promise to Abraham, Gen. xii, 3. "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." This promise relates to Christ and the Gospel, and is so applied by Paul, Gal. iii, 8. "The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached' before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Now it cannot be true that God would predestinate the elect to life "without any foresight of faith," as asserted in the Confession, and foresee that he would "justify the heathen *through faith*," as Paul says. The predestination of the Confession is in direct opposition to Bible foreknowledge, for one is "*without any foresight of faith*," and the other, is *through faith*. "If God foresaw that he would justify the heathen *through faith*, he could not have predestinated them unto life *without any foresight of faith*. This is impossible, and I defy any man to avoid the difficulty.

This promise contains a blessing for all nations. This I defy the worthy gentleman to find without renouncing Predestination as taught in his creed. He has no blessing for all nations. He knows no blessing for all families of the earth. He really has no Gospel to every creature. Gospel is *good news—good news to every creature*; but he has no good news to every creature, unless it be considered, as it certainly will not, by this audience, good news to inform them that God reprobated a large portion of them "from no other cause than to exclude them from the inheritance predestinated to his children"—that Christ only died for a part of them—that his blood was only shed for a part of the race, and that the grace of God is circumscribed to a few of his special favorites. But who, in his senses, can think such a system, good news of great joy to all people? Such it never was and never can be. While the Lord promises a blessing to all nations, and declares that he will render to every man *according to his works*, Calvinism, as taught by Calvin himself, Inst., p. 141, asserts that, "What is so necessary to be known, never can be known, unless God, *without any regard to works*, chooses those whom he has decreed." This is substantially the same as the decla-

ration of the Confession, that Predestination is "without any foresight of faith."

Calvinism contradicts the original design of God, as set forth both in the Bible and the Confession, or the eternal purpose of God, which is the same thing. In carrying this eternal purpose out, Paul labored to "make *all men see*," while Calvinism labors to prove that God has blinded the non-elect so that they *never can see*. It contradicts that design further, in representing the Holy God, as shutting up his bowels of compassion from the non-elect, and never sending one spiritual blessing to them; while the original design of God was, that all men might have the privilege of seeking him and finding him. It also contradicts the promise made to Abraham, that in him all nations should be blessed, and denies substantially that God ever did or ever will "bless all families of the earth." Not only so, but while Paul asserts that "the Scripture foresaw that God would justify the heathen through faith;" Calvinism asserts, that God predestinates to everlasting life without any foresight of faith.

3. My third argument is founded upon the testimony of the prophets. The prophets affirm the same unbounded benevolence set forth both in the "eternal purpose" and in "the promise." Peter says, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins;" Acts, x, 43. Let us hear a few words from one of the prophets: "It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh \* \* \* that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call." Joel, ii, 28-32. This passage is referred to by Paul, Romans, x, and, after commenting upon it, he says, "Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." Rom. x, 18. This shows that the prediction of Joel was made in view of the Gospel being preached to the ends of the world. What for? To offer faith to the world. Faith is offered, that the world might have life. This is manifesting the same benevolence, as seen in both the purpose and promise.

Let us hear another prophet: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else." Isa. xlv, 22. Now I ask the worthy gentleman, if he regards this as a candid invitation? Does he believe the ends of the earth can look unto God and be saved? or does he believe the language of Calvin, that God had reprobated some portion of them, from no other cause than to exclude them from the inheritance predestinated to his children? Does he believe that God had unchangeably ordained a portion of mankind to everlasting death, and yet, that that holy being stands inviting those thus ordained to death, and *unchangeably ordained to death*, to "*look unto him and be saved?*" He cannot believe it. It is an impeachment upon his holy attributes, such as he surely will not make before this people. Let us hoar this prophet once more: "The Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God." Isa. liii, 10. How can the non-elect, whom God hath blinded, and whose hearts he has hardened, "see the salvation of God?"—

[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' EIGHTH ADDRESS.

*Thursday, 3 o'clock, P.M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

No doubt the audience feel their obligations to the gentleman for the information, that, in the effort to refute his Sermon, I have made a complete failure; for this is one of the things which, unless they had been informed of by so disinterested a witness, they could *not* be presumed to know.

He says, I have assigned no reason why the persons "given" to Christ, John xvii, 2, are different from those mentioned in verses 6-16. I am more and more convinced that the gentleman's spectacles are defective.

"His ores are dim, he cannot see; he cannot see at all."

My reason, given once and again, is this: Those "given" to Christ in the sense of the 2d verse, *shall all obtain eternal life*: this was the object for which they were given; "*that he should give eternal life to AS MANY as thou hast given him;* "

while those mentioned in verses 6-16, were given him, that they might be instructed in the nature of this kingdom, and become witnesses of his resurrection.

As an offset to my exposure of his vagaries on Eph. i, 4-6, by his own brother and associate, Mr. Burnet, he pretends to have discovered an inconsistency, between my position and that of Dr. Rice, *on a topic respecting which I have not uttered a single syllable since this discussion began!!*

Ho is vociferously calling for "more light," on Eph. i. That he *needs* light very much, I am very free to admit; but the misfortune is, that while crying out for light, he keeps his eyes fast closed; though with the aid of Mr. Burnet, I am trying hard to induce him to open them". In pity to him, however, I will let him hear Mr. Burnet once more: "*It is impossible to apply the verses from one to seven to Apostles and prophets. They belong to Christians as (Christians. The difficulty of understanding the "we" of the 11th verse, vanishes, if the last clause of verse 12 is inserted after the word "also," in verse 11; thus: "In whom also, we who first trusted in Christ, have obtained an inheritance," etc; evidently including the Jewish converts. In the 13th verse, the Gentile converts are introduced. This parallelism between the Jew and Gentile Christians, runs through the whole didactic portion of the Epistle; but especially in chap, ii; and more especially, verses 11-22, where the application of the 'we' and the 'ye, ' is as plain as the letters on the page."* Proc. and Reformer, Vol. 2, p. 786. I think the gentleman has now a superabundance of light. All that is requisite now is, that he take off his opaque spectacles, and open wide his eyes!

The gentleman makes no effort to extricate himself from the predicament in which he is found on the case of Jacob and Esau, but calls upon me to define my position in the premises. My position is, that his interpretation "*does not convey the true mind of the Spirit,*" This is the only point *now* before us. This point I have sustained by showing: 1. That the gentleman misrepresents the position of his antagonists. 2. That the gentleman has given a *false translation* of the words *agapao* and *miseo*, saying that, "some of our best authorities," so render them, *which authorities I cannot prevail upon him to produce*. 3. That his idea of what Esau lost and Jacob gained, by the election



mentioned, is a mere, dream, without semblance of truth. 4. That his assertion that the choice of Jacob and the rejection of Esau, was the result of their own conduct, is directly in the teeth of Paul, who states that the distinction was made "before the children were born," and when "they had done neither good nor evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, NOT OF WORKS, but of him that calleth." And 5. That the application of the passage, by the gentleman, as a mere prediction to Rebecca concerning the nations of Israel and Edom, is a perversion of Paul's design in its introduction; without authority; and at war with the whole connection and context. I also showed, in my last speech, that the interpretation of the gentleman, brought him in collision with one of his best authorities, viz: Elder Benj. Franklin. The One saying, that "Esau have I hated," referred to the *nation*, the other, that it referred to the *individual*; and was the result of his selling his birth-right!

Having thus sustained my proposition, that this interpretation did not convey the true mind of the spirit, I showed what the passage really did teach. 1. God does confer Special spiritual blessings on some men, which he withholds from others. 2. The ground of this preference is not in the individuals themselves, in their conductor character. 3. The reason is in God himself, who is a Sovereign, and dispenses his blessings, temporal and spiritual, as seems good in his sight. To all this the gentleman has found it convenient to make very meager and unsatisfactory replies. I have no doubt, that it is from his own experience he has learned that "it is hard to kick against the goads."

The gentleman is determined to escape from the 9th chapter of Romans. It is as difficult to get him to face Paul's argument in that chapter, as to meet me on the points of my affirmative proposition, as I bring them regularly forward. He would rather be anywhere else than where the real battle is to be fought. He still persists in asserting that Rom. ix, 21, is a quotation from Jeremiah. Here is Home's Introduction, the work of a very learned and eminent *Arminian* critic. In it he gives a list of every single quotation made by the writers of the New Testament, from the Old. *This* passage is not found in the list.

The book is at the service of the gentleman, that he may see for himself, that he is mistaken.

Finding, however, that his flight from Rom. ix, 21, to the potter's house, in Jeremiah, will not serve his purpose; he tries to escape in another direction; and was last seen, in 2 Tim. ii, 21. But all avenue of escape in that direction, is closed; for Paul there is on a *very different subject*, from that discussed in the 9th of Rom. He is there speaking of Christians solely, and showing that a man's usefulness *in the church* depended upon his diligence in study; his shunning profane and vain babblings; and his fleeing youthful lusts. I must drag the reluctant steps of the gentleman back again, from his attempts at flight, to that "*clay of the same lump*" of which Paul treats, in the passage before us.

The only question to be decided is, which is right, Paul, or my distinguished opponent? The one says that vessels to dishonor are made from "*clay of the same lump*;" the other, that they are made of a decidedly *inferior* article!

The gentleman is pursuing, what he calls, an "independent argument." I presume he so styles it, because there is no *dependence* of the conclusion on the premises. Every argument which the gentleman has adduced, might be true, and still, it would *not* be true that the interpretations of Scripture given in his Sermon, convey the true mind of the spirit. *This* is the point now before us.

Four times, in his last speech, he asserted that the Confession of Faith taught that "Predestination was without foresight of faith;" and four times he asserted what is not true. The Confession teaches no such doctrine, any more than the Bible teaches that there is no God. This perversion and garbling of the Confession, is the more inexcusable, as I have already set him right on the point more than once. But he that would quote an inspired prophet, in the way the gentleman did Joel, in his last speech; picking out what suited him, and omitting what did not; thus bringing together ideas that have no connection in the prophet's mind, cannot be trusted in citing from any author. He is fond of giving us scraps from Calvin, and other authors. I intend to show, when it will be in order so to do, that he misrepresents Calvin, and knows no more

of Calvinism than if he had just emerged from the bowels of the earth.

I now proceed with the gentleman's interpretations of Scripture. He quotes the words, "he will have *mercy* upon whom he will have mercy, and whom he will, he hardens;" Rom. ix, 18, and declares that it is quoted by Paul, from Ex. xxxiii, 19. Now, it is not so at all. The 15th verse is a quotation from Exodus; but the 18th is Paul's own conclusion, in his own words.

There is a remarkable degree of confusion attending all that the gentleman says about this terrible 9th chapter of Romans. I would be glad if the gentleman would tell me which of these verses it is that he intended to quote, and I will confine my remarks to that.

*Mr. Franklin.* —Proceed, if you can find anything to say.

*Mr. Matthews.* —I will then consider *both*. The 15th verse is the quotation.

The gentleman says, that the expression, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," is similar to the expression of Pilate, "what I have written I have written;" and he interprets the one by the other; but this is a mistake. The gentleman has been misled by the ambiguity of the verb "*will*," which sometimes is used as an auxiliary, conveying simply the idea of futurity; and sometimes as a principal verb, denoting a wish, desire, or purpose. He thinks it an auxiliary verb in both cases, where it occurs in this verse; but the truth is, in the latter instance, it is a principal verb. The words of Pilate, in the original, are in the *same mood and tense: ho gegrapha, gegrapha*, The words of Paul, as quoted from Moses, are in *a different mood, and a different tense: elecso hon an eleo*. The first "*will*" in the translation, is the sign of the future tense; the second "*will*" is indicative of the good pleasure or purpose of the Almighty.

Paul quotes *verbatim* from the Septuagint. Now, Home gives, in parallel columns, the Hebrew and the Greek of the Septuagint, and the original of this text; and he translates the Septuagint, which, observe, is the very language of Paul, thus: I will have mercy on whom *I please* to have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom *I please* to have compassion. This, no doubt, expresses the

meaning; and I give Home as authority the more readily as he is an Arminian, and is testifying against himself.

The 18th verse would not have a particle of difficulty, if we omit the words supplied by our translators. "Therefore hath he mercy *on whom he will*, and *whom he will* he hardeneth." The whole passage, therefore, teaches that in bestowing mercy, or in withholding it, God acts with absolute sovereignty; finding the causes of his discrimination in his own will and good pleasure alone. "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."

These are all the quotations made in the Sermon, bearing directly upon the subject which it professes to discuss; there are, however, a few other passages, relating to other topics, to which I will devote a moment's attention. The author quotes Heb. vi, 4-6, to prove that Christians can totally and finally fall away and be lost. But the reference is an unfortunate one for the gentleman. Before he can use it to establish this point, he must: 1. Show that the persons there spoken of, were really regenerated persons. This I deny. I maintain that every characteristic there mentioned, might be possessed, and was possessed in the Apostles' days, by those whose hearts were never really changed by the grace of God,

2. He must show that if a man backslide and fall from grace, he can never be restored. For of *these* persons it is said, that "if they shall fall away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance." Is the gentleman prepared to take the ground, that when a man, once a Christian, apostatizes, there is for him no hope of salvation? This he *must* do before he can consistently apply this passage as proof that true Christians may fall away,

He quotes, also, Heb. x, 26. To this passage, the same remarks apply. It proves *too much* for the gentleman, and therefore, proves nothing. It proves that when a man falls from grace, he has no more offers of mercy; there is for him "no more sacrifice for sin." Does the gentleman believe this?

The truth is, neither passage refers to really converted persons, but to those Jews, who, having been enlightened in the truths of the Gospel, and having become convinced that Jesus was the true Messiah, were in danger of stifling their convictions, and turning their back upon the Savior.

To such, Paul solemnly declares, that if they thus sin willfully, after they have received the knowledge of the truth, there remains no more sacrifice for sins. They have turned their back upon the only Savior. They have renounced all part in that all-sufficient sacrifice, which alone, is efficacious to take away the sins of the world.—

[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S EIGHTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I SEE that I shall be under the necessity of taking my worthy friend to the potter's house, notwithstanding' his aversion to pottery, and give him a thorough training in that art. I am unable to see why he wishes me to be confined to Rom. ix, in the consideration of this subject. Does he think the Bible contradicts itself? I hope he does not, I am certain I do not. Now when I quote a passage, I do not wish to cut him off from the light thrown upon it by parallel passages. But, in this case, he seems bound to exclude all the light thrown upon this figure, in the different parts of the Bible where it is found. This cannot be admitted; we must resort to other passages where the potter and the clay are mentioned. In Rom. ix, it is simply asserted that the potter has power over the clay of the same lump, to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor. This does not give the reason why he makes a vessel to honor or dishonor. Is there any place that informs us why he makes a vessel to honor or dishonor? I maintain that there is, and one place of that kind is Jer. xviii, 1-10. To that passage then, we must go.

The prophet says, "I went down to the potter's house, and behold, he wrought a work on the wheels. And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hands of the potter; so he made it again, another vessel, as seemed good for the potter to make it." Now I allege, that if the vessel is marred in the hands of the potter, it is not because he decreed it, or *willed* it, *but contrary to his will*, and I challenge the gentleman to show the contrary. The fault is not in the intention of the potter, but in the clay. But when it mars in his hand, contrary to his intention, he has power to make it over again as seemed good for the potter

to make it. If this is what he calls "sovereign power," I have no objection to it, for I believe he has this power, and that the Scripture under consideration, shows us precisely how he will exercise it. Let us hear the prophet further: "Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying, O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel. At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom } to pluck up and pull down, and to destroy it; *if that nation*, against whom I have pronounced, *turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do unto them.*" Here then, is God's own reason for exercising his sovereign power, in making a vessel unto honor—"if they *turn from their evil.*" Whom will God make vessels of dishonor? The following, informs us: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; *if it do evil in my sight*, that it *obey not my voice*, then, I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them." Here, in the clearest and most explicit terms, we have the reason stated for making a vessel unto dishonor; "*if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice.*"

But I am reminded that both vessels to honor and dishonor are made of the clay of the *same lump*, or *mass*, as the word "lump" means. We must then inquire what the lump is? The house of Israel is certainly the lump or mass in the hand of the potter. There is, then, nothing strange in their being good and bad clay in this lump—the house of Israel. But, perhaps, my worthy friend would be glad to get off from this potter's house to the New Testament, to ascertain what this "lump" means. Rom, ix, 21. "Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor." What does he mean by the word "lump," or *mass*? We shall have to follow him to where he uses the word in other places, to see how he has used it, and what he means by it. We find the word again, Rom. ii, 16, "If the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches." What is this "lump" from which branches may be broken off? Is it the olive tree, or what is it? Let us have another passage. 1 Cor. v, 6. "Your glorying is not good, Know ye not

that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? What is the "lump" he is speaking of? The next verse shows: "Purge out the old leaven, that *ye may be a new lump*, as ye are leavened." This shows that the lump is, in the following words: "That ye may be a new lump." The church is the lump or mass; hence the Apostle, Gal. v, 9, says, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." The lump of clay, then, is the Israel of God—the Church.

Now is there anything strange in the idea that there are different kinds of clay in this "same lump?" Not at all, but just what is recognized both in the Scriptures and reason. God, then, addresses himself to this lump—the Church, saying, "If a man, therefore, will purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work." I maintain, then, that I have interpreted the passages concerning it correctly, in the Sermon, and that there is not a scrap of Calvinism in them, nor had Paul any such monstrous doctrine before his mind.

My worthy friend has not had the nerve to say, that these vessels to honor, were persons predestinated to everlasting life, nor that the vessels to dishonor were ordained to everlasting death, nor has he had the nerve to say that Esau was reprobated to everlasting death, or Jacob predestinated to everlasting life; yet his creed gives both this miserable application. He is gradually coming over from Predestination, and, I trust, will soon entirely renounce it. John, xvii, from 6th to 19th, is given up as referring to the Apostles, though the 9th verse is, in the Confession, applied to the definite number of men and angels, ordained to everlasting life. Eph. i, from the 6th to the 12th is given up, though the 11th verse, is, in the Confession, applied to those predestinated unto everlasting life. Jacob and Esau, though applied to the same subject, Predestination to everlasting life and reprobation to everlasting death, in the Confession, he gives no such application, The potter and the clay, he slurs over in the same way. Will his brethren approbate such a defense of their creed? I doubt it very much. I think when they see one of their most reputable ministers thus shrinking and failing to meet the question and defend their doctrine as taught in their own creed, they will consider themselves entirely at liberty to

renounce it. They 'will not be bound to believe what their preachers will not publicly defend.

It is a miserable apology for the gentleman to say he is not saying anything about the doctrine of the Confession, but is speaking of the doctrine of my Sermon. Is he at liberty to interpret the Scriptures quoted in the Confession differently from the interpretation given in that book, or make a different application from the one made in that book, because he is on another subject? Because he is opposing my Sermon, on the very passages quoted in his creed; he is not on the subject treated of in the creed; has not said *one word about it*, and appears to feel at liberty to apply those passages in a different way entirely from the creed. He is, however, hard to understand on Eph. i, for he now seems to favor Brother Burnet's position, that the "we" of the 12th verse, must mean Paul and the Disciples at Ephesus. But for the present, I leave this point, as his last effort surely needs no refutation.

We come now to the expression, "He will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens." My worthy friend seems so fully set upon it that he must oppose my Sermon, that he enters into a learned, a grave criticism to show that I am grossly in error, in saying this expression is like that of Pilate, "What *I* have written, I have written." This criticism I shall not disturb. I can see abundance of matter for a speech without a conflict about words to no profit. But this no one can deny; the words, "I will have mercy upon whom I will have mercy," do not inform us whom God will have mercy upon; but merely assert his fixed purpose to have mercy upon some, and harden others. All I ask of the worthy gentleman, is to let me appeal to the infallible word of God, where we are most clearly informed upon whom God will have mercy. For this purpose, let us hear Moses, to whom God uttered the words in dispute, and he will show upon whom God will have mercy, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third



and fourth generation of them that hate me; and *showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.* "' Ex. xx, 4-6. Here is the same passage referred to in the Sermon, and the same application given. Has it been shown to be incorrect? It has not, and cannot be.

Let us hear another prophet: "I beseech thee, O Lord God of Heaven, the great and terrible God that keepeth *covenant and mercy for them that love him, and keep his commandments.*" Ne. i, 5. Can the gentleman show that God gives mercy to men regardless of their characters with this before him? Let us hear our gracious Lord, "Blessed are the *merciful, for they shall obtain mercy,*" Mat. v, 7. This is worth more than all the Calvinism in the world, for it acknowledges the truth of the quotation of Paul from Moses, that God will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and proceeds to tell us, in the most explicit terms, whom he will have mercy upon. Let us hear an Apostle inform us upon whom God will not show mercy. "For he shall have judgment *without mercy, that hath showed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgment.*" Ja. ii, 13. Am I perverting Scripture, in quoting these passages, to show upon whom the mercy of God will be shown? I think not, and believe that Paul never taught anything to the contrary, nor can any man show that God disposes of his mercy regardless of the characters of men, in the face of these Scriptures.

It appears, I have committed a high offense against Calvinism, and consequently against the worthy gentleman, in the use of the quotation from Heb. vi, 4-8. "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come; if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God; but that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." As the gentleman has connected this with Heb. x, 26-32;

and that very justly too, we shall quote verse 29 of that passage in connection with the foregoing: "Of how much ' sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace."

These passages, I have quoted in the Sermon, to show the possibility of falling from grace. The gentleman has, I confess, in this ease, surprised me. I had not the most distant idea that any man of his learning, at this advanced period, would attempt to defend such a position as he has undertaken. His position is, that the persons spoken of, whom it is impossible to renew again to repentance, are persons that *never were converted*, and that all that is said of them may be said of men out of the kingdom of God! Let us see what kind of a description we can get from this passage, of these sinners. It is said of them, that "they were once enlightened; tasted of the heavenly gift; partook of the Holy Ghost; tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come; received the knowledge of the truth, and were sanctified by the blood of the covenant!!!" These, with my worthy friend, are sinners, nay more, reprobates. I never before heard any man assert that reprobates, had once repented, been enlightened, come to the knowledge of the truth, tasted of the good word of God, partook of the Holy Ghost, felt the powers of the world to come, and were sanctified by the blood of the covenant!

But this is not all. If these unconverted, totally corrupt sinners, reprobates, shall *fall away*, it will be impossible to renew them again to repentance. What does the Apostle say? "If they shall *fall away*." "Fall away" from what? From their reprobacy and depravity? or what? This must be it, I suppose! And pray, what will be the consequence, if they fall from this depravity? It will be *impossible* to renew them again to it!! Alas for them! Yes, and alas for the system, involving men of sense, men of learning and good men, in such wretched absurdities. I would leave such a system before the setting of the sun. —[*Time expired.*]

**MR. MATTHEWS' NINTH ADDRESS.**

*Thursday, 4 o'clock, P.M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

My kind and sympathetic friend is deeply concerned on my account, lest my brethren should not approve my mode of conducting this discussion. I am happy to alleviate all his distress respecting this matter. For, notwithstanding the vast number of overwhelming arguments which the learned and talented gentleman has brought in fearful array against me, strange to tell, my ministerial brethren present, as well as my brethren of the eldership, have with one voice, pronounced themselves more than satisfied with my efforts on this occasion. It is, "however, to me, a subject of profound regret, that my efforts have not succeeded in satisfying the *gentleman's* brethren. But I must even go on in my own way, though I doubt not many of them are capable of suggesting a course to me, much more likely to secure *their* approbation. I must decline their kindly proffered advice. They may take the gentleman, and drill him, and school him to their hearts' content. I have an odd habit of doing things in my own way. I therefore, most respectfully, but most peremptorily, decline their interference.

I do not doubt the gentleman's skill in pottery; in fact from his acquaintance with the art, I incline to the opinion that there was an excellent potter spoiled when he became a proclaimer. But I must still doubt whether an apprenticeship in the house of the potter, is the best qualification for an interpreter of Scripture. I certainly have no objection to the gentleman's referring to parallel passages, to shed light upon a text. But I do object, most seriously, to his calling that a quotation which is not such; to his calling those parallel passages, which have not the slightest relation to tile same subject; to his flying anywhere and everywhere but to the subject before us; and, above all, to the idea that seems to have taken full possession of his brain, that *his mere assertion* on any point, is sufficient authority, though not another man, from the flood to the present time, take the same position.

There are some beauties in the gentleman's disquisition on pottery, which it were wrong to have go into oblivion.

He declares, and challenges me to prove the contrary; that when a vessel is formed to dishonor, it is contrary to the purpose, intention and will of the potter. That is, to apply the figure, the Almighty undertakes to make some nation or individual answer a particular end; but, *contrary to his intention, against his will, and in despite of his power; he fails* in his purpose. He then devotes that nation or people to destruction. The gentleman teaches, does he? that God is disappointed in his plans; thwarted in his intentions, and defeated as to his power!!

The lump of clay, the gentleman informs *us*, is "THE CHURCH!!" But Paul makes a wide distinction between "the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction," and the "vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, even us, whom he hath called not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles," verses 22-24. *After the vessels of mercy were formed, they were constituted the church, and became "the people of the living God."* But according to the gentleman, the mass of clay, *before* it is formed into vessels, represents the church! And it is out of the *church* that vessels to dishonor are formed!!

He says there might be different kinds of clay, in the same lump. The whole argument of Paul is based upon the fact that there was no difference in the clay. Take that idea away, and the passage is pointless. The fact is, the gentleman has pottered, and pottered, and pottered away, until he has succeeded in pottering all force and meaning out of the passage!

The gentleman prudently declines to controvert my arguments on the words, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy." Yet he persists in saying, that these words do not inform us whom God will have mercy upon! I beg the gentleman's pardon. The very argument which he finds it best not to disturb, proves that the persons on whom God will have mercy, are those whom *he pleases* to have mercy upon; the objects of his Sovereign choice. The gentleman is wiser than our Savior; for he fancies he has discovered a reason in the persons themselves, why God has mercy upon them. Jesus says, "Even so, Father, *for so it seemed good in thy sight.*"

Such Scriptures as, "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy," prove nothing against the sove-

reignty of Divine grace, but only show the inseparable connection between electing grace, holy character, and final reward.

The gentleman expresses great surprise that I should deny that the passages in Hebrews refer to really regenerated persons. I would be surprised at his surprise, if anything that he could say or do would surprise me. But that time has long since passed. With respect to him, I have certainly attained the "*Nil admirari*," which Horace imagines to be the summit of enjoyment. I do most certainly deny that there is anything in the description here given, which unconverted men, in the Apostles' days, might not, and did not possess. Nor am I at all '*peculiar*' in this denial, as I will show, if I am put to the proof. The strongest expression used is, that these persons "were made partakers of the Holy Ghost; " but the allusion is to the miraculous gifts which were conferred, in the apostolic days, and often upon unconverted persons. For many, at the last day, will profess to have prophesied, cast out devils, and done many wonderful works in the name of Christ, whom he never knew as his own blood-bought people.

The gentleman says, they "were sanctified by the blood of the covenant; " but Paul does not say so. He speaks of "the blood of the covenant, wherewith He, (i. e. Christ,) was sanctified," or set apart. Of course this proves nothing as to the condition of the persons spoken of.

But what can they fall away from, if they are not converted? I answer from their high privileges; just as the unbelieving cities to whom the Savior preached, though exalted to heaven, were to be brought down to hell. If those who were "once enlightened" as to the truth of Christianity; who had "tasted of the heavenly gift," been baptized, partaken of the Lord's Supper, or enjoyed some of the common operations of God's Spirit; "and were made partakers of the (miraculous gifts of the) Holy Ghost; " who "had tasted the good word of God," felt that the word was good, and had some pleasure in its contents; "and the powers of the world to come," or the New Dispensation; if any such person should deliberately apostatize, deny Christ, reject Christianity; they have sinned the sin unto death. They can never be renewed

again, and brought to repentance. But that these persons were not Christians, is evident. For

1. They are not described in the terms usually employed to describe Christians. Nothing is said of Faith, Hope, Love; of being born of God; chosen, called, saints, etc; these are the common designations of Christians, in the Scripture, but they are not found here.

2. There is nothing in the description which has not been found in unconverted men.

3. The Apostle does most clearly distinguish these persons from real Christians. If the gentleman had not, *unfortunately*, stopped reading just when he did, he would have found Paul saying to his brethren: "But beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak." He did not say these things of Christians; he was "persuaded better things, and *things that accompany salvation*" of them. How clear the distinction.

So in the 10th chapter. After speaking of some sinning willfully, after receiving the knowledge of the truth, etc; he adds, "But WE are not of them that draw back unto perdition, but of them that believing to the saving of the soul." Here also the distinction between those who apostatize, and real Christians, is strongly marked.

But I must remind the gentleman that he has not yet answered my questions respecting these passages. He believes they refer to real Christians, and that, such may totally fall away. Does he believe that a fallen Christian can never be restored? I want the gentleman to hear this question. He talks of "slurring." Let us have no slurring here. There is great anxiety to know of the gentleman whether every Christian that falls away, is hopelessly doomed to judgment and fiery indignation. *This* question he must meet, whether he ever tell us who his "*best authorities*" are or not.

The gentleman, in his Sermon, quotes Rev. xxii, 19: "If any man shall take away from the words of the prophesy of this book, God shall take away his part out of the book of life." The margin reads, "from the *tree* of life." And I will explain this passage for him, in accordance with our doctrine, if he will tell me how it is that

"to him that hath shall be given; and *from him that hath not, shall be taken away, even that which he hath.*"

He also quotes Gal. v, 3-4: "Ye are fallen from grace;" and declares that here is an end of the controversy. The gentleman makes large calculations on the credulity of his hearers. He seems to think that the *sound* of the *words*, whether he get the *sense* or not, will be sufficient for his purpose. The words which he quotes have no bearing upon the question whether a Christian may totally and finally fall away. Paul was contemplating a different subject. There are two modes of justification, a human mode, and a Divine mode: the former by works, the latter by faith. The natural heart prefers a mode of self-justification. Hence the Gospel had to maintain a constant struggle against tendencies toward self, or law justification. Man prefers a salvation by works; God offers salvation by grace through faith. But if any one depended on his circumcision, or obedience to the law, he had renounced salvation by grace, and had embraced an opposite doctrine.

Here the Sermon ends, and here ends my review. It is no pleasure to me, to be compelled to expose the mistakes, perversions and misrepresentations of the gentleman. But when God's own truth, and the interests of immortal souls, are at stake, I have no alternative. I do most firmly believe that the doctrines of this Sermon are unphilosophical, illogical, and unscriptural; that the translations and interpretations of Scripture are contrary to sound philology, and utterly alien to the intention of the Spirit by whom the Scriptures were inspired. All error is dangerous; the errors of the Sermon peculiarly so; they strike at the vitals of the Gospel. Therefore I have felt it my duty to expose them. And now, may God defend the night.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S NINTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I THINK less of Calvinism than I have ever done before. Its miserable evasions of the clearest Scriptures in the Bible, and its outrages on the holy attributes of God, strike me with more force than ever before. I had marked a passage in Mr. Wesley's Doctrinal Tracts, setting forth the

odious character of this doctrine, but which, on account of its severity, I doubted the propriety of reading. But with, the interpretations now made before us, by my worthy friend, the advocate of Calvinism, I need feel no embarrassment in rending the extract. I read from Doctrinal Tracts, p. 169.

"This doctrine represents our blessed Lord Jesus Christ, the righteous, *the only begotten Son of the father, full of grace and truth*, as a hypocrite, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity. For it cannot be denied, that he everywhere speaks as *if he was willing* that all men should be saved. Therefore, to say *he was not willing* that all men should be saved, is to represent him as a mere hypocrite and dissembler. It cannot be denied that the gracious words which come from his mouth are full of invitations to all sinners. To say, then, he did not intend to save all sinners, is to represent him as a gross deceiver of the people. You cannot deny that he says, 'Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden!' If then, you say he calls those that cannot come, those whom he knows to be unable to come, those whom he can make able to come, but will not, how is it possible to describe greater insincerity? You represent him as mocking his helpless creatures, by offering what he never intends to give. You describe him as saying one thing, and meaning another; as pretending the love which he had not. Him *in whose mouth was no guile*, you make him full of deceit, void of common sincerity; then, especially, when drawing near the city, 'he wept over it, and said, O Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, and ye would not. ' Now if you say, they would, but *he would not*, you represent him (which who could bear?) as weeping' crocodile's tears, weeping' over the prey which himself had devoted to destruction."

"Such blasphemy as this, one might think, might make the ears of a Christian to tingle. But there is yet more behind; for just as it honors the Son, so doth this doctrine honor the Father. It destroys all his attributes at once. It overturns both his justice, mercy and truth. Yea, it represents the most holy God as worse than the devil, as both more false, more cruel, and more unjust. More false,



because the devil, liar as he is, hath never said, 'He willeth all men to be saved. ' More unjust, because the devil cannot, if he would, be guilty of such injustice as you ascribe "to God, when you say that God condemned millions of souls to everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels, for continuing' in sin, which, for want of that grace he will not give them, they cannot avoid; and more cruel, because that unhappy spirit *seeketh rest and findeth none*, so that his own restless misery is a hind of temptation to tempt others. But God *resteth in his high and holy place*; so that to suppose him, of his own mere motion, of his pure will and pleasure, happy as he is, to doom his creatures, whether they will or no, to endless misery, is to impute such cruelty to him as we cannot impute even to the great enemy of God and man. It, represents the most high God (he that hath ears let him hear!) as more cruel, false, and unjust than the devil."

The gentleman has faulted me for stigmatizing his doctrine in calling it *Calvinism*, but it strikes me that you will consider what I have said about it mild, compared with the language quoted from the distinguished Wesley. But I do not hold that we are under any particular obligations to speak mildly of a doctrine that circumscribes the grace of God, denying that it is a free gift of God to the world. It is now time that we should have this doctrine a little more fully defined. The following is Calvinistic definition of the Church:

"The visible Church, which is also a Catholic or Universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world, that, profess the true religion, together with their children: and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, and of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." Con., ch. xxv, sec. 2.

It will be observed, that the professors of the true religion and *their children*, compose the Church of God, and out of this ordinarily there is no *possibility of salvation!* Who is outside of this Church? All who do not profess the true religion and *their children*. What of these children? "*There is no ordinary possibility of salvation*" for them. This has much the appearance of infant damnation. Who can explain it otherwise? This shows where

this doctrine places infants not in the Church. Where does it place the pagan world?

"They who having never heard the Gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, cannot be saved, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, or the laws of that religion which they profess; neither is their salvation in any other, but in Christ alone, who is the Savior only of his body the Church." Con., p. 208.

This is very clear and explicit, touching the condition of the Pagan world, children and all. But if any scrap of doubt remains about Calvinistic works teaching the doctrine of infant damnation, hear the following from Calvin himself:

"I inquire again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations, with their infant children, in eternal death, but because such was the will of God." Inst., p. 170, Vol. 2.

But I must leave this matter for the present, and give a few moments' attention to the speech you have just heard. My worthy friend thinks an apprenticeship in pottery is not a suitable place to learn divine truth. It does have that appearance, I confess, when I consider the little progress he has made, after the insight I gave him in that art. But there is one point that I think may yet be brought to his perception. I did not say that the vessel is made to dishonor contrary to the will of the potter. But when he is using the proper means to make a good vessel, and it mars in his hands, the *marring is contrary to his will*. He then, because it would not make a vessel to honor, makes it over again, into a vessel to dishonor, as seems good to the potter to make it. When God, in his goodness, deals with a person or nation in the proper manner, to make a vessel to honor, and, through its own defect, it mars in his hand, he has power, as in the case of Pharaoh, to make it a vessel to dishonor, and thus make his power known in all the earth.

My worthy friend seemed astonished, if anything I could do could astonish him, that I should speak of its being the will of God that a nation should be a vessel to honor, and yet that it should not be such. Is he about to

set up the Universalian argument, that the will of God is always done. I would that I could get him to see Dr. Rice's exposition of the words: "Who will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. ii, 4. He says this "expresses the *benevolent desire of God that all men should be saved.*" It is the *will of God* that all men should be saved. It is his will that all should be vessels to honor, and he operates upon all in such a manner as would make them such, were it not for their *opposing wills*. God says, "he is not willing that any should perish," or be vessels to dishonor, "but that all should come to repentance," or be vessels to honor; but those who "deny the Lord who bought them," must fall under the fierce thunders of his wrath, not for not doing what they never had any power to do, but for not doing what was clearly in their power to do, as well as what was the will of God they should do.

My worthy friend says, "according to the gentleman, the mass of clay is the Church." This is correct, only he should have given Paul the honor. According to Paul and Jeremiah both, it is the Church or the house of Israel. In this great house of Israel or mass, there are different kinds of clay, so that he makes of some vessels to honor and others vessels to dishonor. Hence Paul said to those in the Church, the mass, "If a man therefore shall purge himself, he shall be a vessel unto honor," and in this he implies the opposite, that if he purge not himself he shall be a vessel unto dishonor.

We are now favored with a reason why the Lord "will have mercy on whom he will have mercy," and I think we should acknowledge our obligations to the worthy gentleman for producing this reason, for it is found in the last words I should have looked to for a reason on that point. He sagely finds this reason in the words of Jesus, Matt. xi, 25, and Luke, x, 21, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." What seemed good in the sight of the Father? According to the application of the gentleman, "to have mercy on whom he will have mercy!!!" Is that what the Lord is speaking of? If it is, it is a wonder to me! I had always thought the Lord was speaking of keeping "these things" from the wise and prudent, sages and philosophers, and revealing them to babes—the

illiterate fishermen of Galilee, and that he did this because "so it seemed good in his sight." But we are now shown that the Lord did not mean what he was talking about, but he meant that "it seemed good in his sight" "to have mercy on whom he will have mercy!!!"

The gentleman still maintains his position on Heb. vi, and x, insisting that those spoken of as falling away, were never converted. But he reminds you that my position proves too much, for it proves that backsliders can never return. But this is but a poor come-off for his unenviable position. I have said nothing about this falling away, as to what extent it must go, before one gets to where he cannot return, nor would it relieve him if I could not tell. The fact lies before us, that persons in some cases, and so far as this argument is concerned, it matters not whether many or few, *may fall away, and fall away* to where they cannot be renewed again to repentance. The only question between us is, were they ever converted? Upon this question hangs the fate of the gentleman's whole theory. If he fail here, no argument from any other quarter can relieve him, If I fail, I am mistaken in the meaning of this passage. He claims that all here said of these persons may be said of persons not converted. This I deny. Let him produce an instance where those not converted, *"have tasted of the heavenly gift,"* have been made *"partakers of the Holy Spirit,"* have *"tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come,"* and been once renewed to repentance. For these had been renewed to repentance, or the Apostle could not have spoken of *"renewing them again to repentance."* But in the tenth chapter Paul puts himself in with those of whom he speaks, and says, *"If we sin willfully after we have come to the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries."* Paul here includes himself among those of whom he speaks. Had *we* not been converted? I maintain that the Apostle does speak of persons sanctified with the blood of the covenant, and these persons putting under their feet that blood, and doing despite against the Spirit of grace, and he does consider such worthy of a sorer punishment than death without mercy. The worthy gentleman fancies that the Apostle speaks

of another class, ch. vi, v. 9, "But beloved we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany Revelation, though we thus speak." Though he thus speaks of whom? Is he not referring to the previous verses and the things he had there said of them? Is not this his meaning, "We are persuaded better things of *you*, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak" *of you*? I trust men of profound understanding will read this debate, who can see, as this audience now sees, that the Apostle speaks of no other persons in the 9th verse, from those spoken of back to the 4th.

I was amused with his refutation of my argument drawn from taking a man's part *out of the book of life*. He says the margin reads it, "from the tree of life." Are any admitted to the tree of life but saints? Can any be taken from it but those admitted to it? But he is worse than the Bible Union if he intends to change the words, "out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and out of the things written therein," for the words "away from the tree of life." ' He is laying sacrilegious hands upon "our immortal translation." But he needs another translation; nay, more, *another Bible*; for none but saints ever had their names in the book of life, or in the holy city, and none whose names were never in, *can have them taken out*, "He that overcometh shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot his name *out of the book of life*." Rev. iii, 5. Did any but saints ever have their names in the book of life? and can any have their names blotted out whose names had never been in the book of life?

[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' TENTH ADDRESS.

*Friday, May 28th, 9 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: —

*Fellow-Citizens:* —Having, in the preceding two days, disposed of the *doctrines* of this Sermon, and fully canvassed its misinterpretations of Scripture, I enter upon the consideration of the third and last topic embraced in my affirmation, viz: an assertion of the gentleman in this Sermon, that the doctrine of the Confession of Faith in chapter 3d, sections 3d, 4th and 5th, is not the Predestination

of the Bible, or anything like it. This assertion I am now to prove is not true in fact. I feel it due to myself to say to the Moderators, and to you, fellow-citizens, that this portion of my proposition was tacked on against my wishes, contrary to my earnest protestations. I had several objections to it; 1st, It introduces confusion. I preferred that my affirmative should relate entirely to the doctrines, of this Sermon, and that the gentleman's affirmative should relate entirely to the doctrines of the Confession of Faith; but *by* tacking on this matter, the doctrine of the Confession is made to figure in both propositions, and I am compelled to act both on the offensive and defensive at the same time.

2d. It compels us to travel twice over precisely the same ground. I am now under the 1st proposition to show that the doctrine of a certain part of the Confession is *scriptural*—the gentleman has bound himself to show, under the 2d. proposition, that the doctrine of the same identical chapter and sections is *unscriptural*. This I think illogical and unnecessary.

3d, I am compelled to prove a negative—I must prove that an assertion of the gentleman is *not* true, before any attempt on his part to establish its truth. But I was forced, to embrace this matter in my proposition, or have no debate; and though never very solicitous of the honor of appearing as the gentleman's antagonist, yet the matter had gone so far that I was resolved there should be no shrinking there. Therefore I agreed, reluctantly, to embrace it.

Having thus explained the cause of that irregularity and confusion in our propositions which will strike every one, and washed my hands of all responsibility therefor, I proceed with the argument.

The extract from the Confession reads as follows (Vide Con. Faith, ch. iii, sees. 3, 4, 5). The gentleman asserts that "this doctrine is not the doctrine of the Bible, nor anything like it," and he has compelled me to say that this assertion is not true. The gentleman's veracity then would seem to be our present topic; no very important matter to most of us, however interesting to the gentleman. And if it should turn out that the gentleman shall suffer in mind, body, or character, as we proceed, he will have him-

self to thank for it. He it was who insisted upon this topic forming a part of our present proposition. In disproving this assertion of the gentleman, *my* plan will be to take up the doctrine of the Confession, item by item: explain its true meaning, and show that it is amply supported by Scriptural authority.

"BY THE DECREE OF GOD."—What do the framers of the Confession mean by the "*Decree of God*?" This we are at no loss to determine, for they themselves have defined their meaning in the use of the term *Decree*. "The decrees of God are his eternal purpose according to the counsel of his own will, whereby for his own glory he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass," The DECREE of God, then, is the PURPOSE of God—the *plan or predetermination*, existing in the Divine Mind from eternity, in accordance with which plan, purpose, or predetermination he foreordained all things that he himself would do, or permit to be done. ' The question is: Was there, in the Divine Mind, any such purpose, plan, or predetermination, when he resolved to create this world and place man upon it? The Confession says there did exist in the Divine Mind a purpose, and a plan with respect to the creatures which he was about to call into existence. The gentleman says that this is not the doctrine of the Bible nor anything like it. Where lies the *truth*? Not with the gentleman—but in the Confession. For: 1st. It results from the character of God as described in the Scriptures that he had a purpose, or plan in creating the world. The Scriptures tell us that (*rod is wise*—nay that "God only is wise." Rom. xvi, 27. He alone has the attribute in perfection. In comparison with him the angels are chargeable with folly, and the wisdom of man is foolishness. Now what is implied in the very idea of *wisdom*? Is it more or less than selecting a suitable end, or object to be attained, and the employment of the means best adapted to produce the end selected? He is a wise man who always in all his conduct acts with a plan or purpose in view: and who adapts the means to the accomplishment of the end. The farmer who acts without a plan, acts foolishly. He has a purpose in plowing the earth: he has a purpose in selecting his seed: he has a purpose in committing his seed to the earth; in the manner in which he does it: in, the place where and in the time

when. With a wise forecast he resolves what crop he will raise, and from what field he will raise it: what agents he will employ, and how he will employ them. And just in proportion to his wisdom will be the extent of his plan, and the success of his execution. The Mechanic acts with a plan, or model in his mind, and adapts his labors to the execution of his designing. The Sculptor takes a rude block of marble as it comes rough from the quarry, and commences to clip it off by slow degrees. Week after week, he labors on, seemingly to no purpose: the mass is still rude and shapeless. But still he works steadily on, until at length, from that rude rock, springs a form of matchless beauty. You saw nothing but a formless rock at first, but the Sculptor's eye saw the statue in the block of marble, and he determined to realize his *beau ideal*. He toils on slowly, but every blow which he strikes is in accordance with his previously settled plan, and furthers the attainment of his purpose. Had it not been for the previously formed plan, the statue would ever have remained concealed in the stone. The Physician, the Teacher, the General, the Statesman, who would act without a plan and purpose, would act without wisdom. Every man, who is not a fool; has some end to be attained by his conduct, and employs the means which he supposes will attain that end. And shall we, *dare we*, suppose that the all-wise God, acts with less wisdom than his creature man? Shall we, *dare we*, think that in the immense work of creating the universe, he had no purpose to be attained? Shall we adopt the language of infidelity and say that this world, with its various grades of existences, and orders of intelligent beings, is but

"A mighty maze, and all without a plan?"

We cannot, we dare not, harbor the blasphemous thought! The fact that God is *wise*, is proof conclusive of the fact, that, in the work of creation, he did not act without a fixed purpose, and predetermination: *and this is his "DECREE."* 2d. But we are not left to inference alone, on this important subject. The Bible does explicitly declare that God, in creation, did act in accordance with a wise plan and predetermination. "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all." Ps. civ, 24.



"The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth, by understanding hath he established the heavens." Pr. iii, 19. If anything can be done *in wisdom*, when there was no plan, purpose or predetermination respecting the doing of it, then I admit these passages are nothing' to the purpose—but if wisdom implies necessarily a plan, and a purpose, then these passages clearly teach the existence of a divine purpose or decree.

3. Various terms are employed in the Scripture with reference to God, all implying the existence of a purpose or decree. Such is the true *prognosis* twice applied to God: once in Acts ii, 23, and once in 1st Pet. i, 2. This terra literally signifies foreknowledge. But the connection in which it occurs shows that it is rather to be taken in the sense of predetermination. A word having precisely the same derivation is used when it is said "Christ was *foreordained* before the foundation of the world." 1st Pt. i, 20. I may add also that critics of the most opposite opinions concur in giving the word this sense. I will again quote Bloomfield (an eminent Arminian critic) on this point. "The best commentators are agreed that *prognosea* signifies *decree*: a signification common both to Hellenistic and classical Greek." For the gentleman's satisfaction, I add, that Alexander Campbell translates the word by "*predetermination*." After this it would be superfluous to say that Calvin understands the word, when used with respect to God, as synonymous with *purpose*. The point is to prove that God has decrees, or purposes, with respect to this world and its inhabitants. And the argument is, that the Scriptures use a term, with reference to God, which both Calvinists, Arminians and nondescripts understand to mean purpose, decree, predetermination.

The Scriptures also use the term *prothesis* with reference to God. Rom. viii, 28. "The called according to his PURPOSE." God then has purpose or decree.

The words "determinate counsel" are also applied in the Scriptures to God. Acts ii, 23. The word "counsel," (*boule*) when applied to God, means *design* or *purpose*. God, then, has a "determinate design or purpose, "

If, then, when the gentleman asserts that the doctrine of the extract from the Confession was not the doctrine of the Bible or anything like it, he includes that part of the

extract which predicates decree, purpose or predetermination of God. I have shown that, in this respect, the assertion is not true. The doctrine that God has purposes is not only like the doctrine of the Bible—it is the very language of the Bible itself.

It would be an easy task to show both from the attributes of God, and from the declarations of Scripture, that God's purpose will stand—that what his soul desireth that he doeth—that he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will—and that, therefore, whatever God does or suffers to be done in time, is all included in the plan and purpose formed in eternity. But as this does not come immediately within the portion of the Confession which we are considering we pass to the next point of doctrine in the extract.

"By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life."

I shall omit, for the present, the clause respecting the manifestation of the divine glory—it can be more properly considered afterward.

The next point of doctrine in the extract is that "some men are predestinated unto everlasting life."

As respects the meaning of the term "*predestination*," I remark that it differs from the term *decree*, already explained, only in respect to the objects to which it is applied. Thus the *decree* of God means the purpose of God with respect to all the works of his hand—Predestination means the purpose of God with respect to angels and men. When, therefore,, the Confession says that "Some men are predestinated unto everlasting life," it simply means that it is the purpose of God to deliver some men from the effects of sin, and to bestow upon them the boon of eternal life. The gentleman says that this 'is not the doctrine of the Bible. I take issue and maintain that it is. And now you shall hear the proof, and judge for yourselves.

FIRST, *I argue, then, that "Some men are predestinated to everlasting life," from the character of God as revealed in the Scriptures.*

I. The Scriptures reveal God to us as an *omniscient* Being. "His understanding is infinite." Consequently the actions of all his creatures, and their everlasting destiny were known to him from eternity. They were known

not as what *might* happen, but they were known as *actually to comedo pass*, and, therefore, they are *certain* to come to pass, just at the time, and just in the manner, in which it was known to God that they would occur. God knew all things from eternity that ever would take place in time. But if God have certain knowledge that an event will take place, that event is certain to take place. To suppose the contrary is absurd. It involves the contradiction that God may know a thing to be *certain* which is at the same time *uncertain*. Now an event cannot be certain without some ground or *reason* for that certainty. But before the existence of the universe, there *could* be no ground for the certainty of the events which God knew would certainly occur, *except the purpose of God himself*.

Let me illustrate and apply the argument. It will be granted that some men will actually attain eternal life. Now, God being omniscient, knew from eternity that these men would attain to everlasting life. But if God, from eternity, knew that some men would be saved, they certainly will be saved. No one will say that God knew that some men would be saved, when it was uncertain whether they would be saved. Since, then, it was certain from eternity that some men would be saved, there must have been something which rendered it certain. In itself considered, it might be, or might not be. There was no necessity in the nature of things that any should be saved. Yet from eternity it was certain some would be saved. What rendered it certain? Not, as we have seen, the nature of the case—and not, I will add, anything in any creature: for, before any being was in existence but God, from all eternity, it was certain some would obtain eternal life. Again I ask, what rendered it certain? What is the *cause* of this certainty. Not any creature for no creature existed: and no cause can produce an effect, before the cause itself exists. There is no door of escape from the conclusion which all see is inevitable. The cause of this certainty must be sought alone in the Creator, the only being in existence. *It, was certain from eternity that some men would be saved, because it was fixed in the eternal purpose of Jehovah to save some men—and this eternal purpose to save some men is predestination.*

Again, from the *omniscience* of God it follows, that God

before he entered upon the work of creation knew precisely the kind of world which he was about to call into existence. He knew each individual, and the actions of each individual, and the effect which those actions would have upon the whole world. Not *only* so: he knew what results would follow from forming a world upon a *different* plan from the one selected. A skillful architect, in selecting a plan of a building has before his mind various different plans, with varied modifications. So we must believe that the Supreme Architect comprehended in his infinite mind, not only the universe that is, but an infinite variety of other forms of a universe which his power could have formed, instead of the one that exists. But why does the present universe exist as it is—Why did not God select some other plan? Do you say he knew no other plan? Then you limit his omniscience: nay, you make him inferior in knowledge to his own creatures: for *we* can conceive of a universe different in many respects from the present. Do you say he could create no other universe than that which exists?—then you limit his almighty power. It is clear, then, that God did not create the universe according to a different plan, not because he was deficient in knowledge or power, but *because he did not choose to do it*. Out of all the forms possible, he selected the one that exists, and determined to create it. He chose it because, *on the whole*, it is best adapted to promote the designs which he proposed to himself. Now this act of choice is the reason why the present universe exists. And as it is the reason of the existence of the *whole*, so it is the reason of the existence of *all the parts* involved in that whole. But according to the present plan of the universe, some men are saved. God, then, chose in eternity a universe in which some men were to be saved from the consequences of their sin. He determined to create such a universe. *This determination to create a universe in which some are to be saved, is really a determination that some men shall be saved*. And this is *predestination*. The *omniscience* of God, then, necessarily involves the purpose to bring some men to eternal life. It *is* not strange, therefore, that they who hate the doctrine of God's eternal purpose, should be restless in contemplating his omniscience. The two are so joined together that to get rid of the one, they are forced to tamper with the other.

2. It results from the *wisdom, power and immutability* of God that men were predestined to eternal life. I shall take it for granted that some men are saved. The gentleman admits this. Now I maintain that if God be a wise Being, we must conclude that what actually takes place, *he designed should take place*. In other words, since God is wise, powerful, and unchangeable, it necessarily follows that whatever he *does* in time, he *intended* to do from eternity; and whatever he *permits* to be done in time, he *intended to permit* from eternity. If God be wise he did not make this world without an end in view. But a wise being will never aim at an end without selecting the means necessary to attain that end. The man who commenced building a tower without considering the means, is held up by the Savior as an example of improvident folly. We must beware of attributing such folly to the "only wise God."

God, then, had a purpose in creation: and that purpose included both means and end. Will that purpose be accomplished. Either the purpose which God has formed respecting the universe *will* be accomplished: or, he will *change* that purpose: or, endeavoring to carry it out, he will *fail* in the effort. But he cannot *fail* in carrying out any purpose which he desires to accomplish, for he is omnipotent. "He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou?" Neither will God *change* the purpose which he has formed. "With him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." He is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever: " "He is of one mind, and who can turn him: and what his soul desireth even that he doeth: " "He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will: " "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure," saith the Lord. God's purpose in creation shall therefore be accomplished. What follows? Why it follows that whatever he does, or permits, in time, he *purposed* to do, or permit, from eternity. But he gives some men eternal life. Then it was the purpose of God from eternity to give to these men eternal life. *Now this eternal purpose to bestow everlasting life, is PREDESTINATION*. I solemnly warn the gentleman to beware. And the character of his speech last evening, makes me wish to

give double emphasis to the warning. He intimated very distinctly that God might intend to convert an individual, and use the means to bring about that result, and yet fail; contrary to his will and intention. Again I say, beware The doctrine he is laboring to overthrow, is so intertwined with the perfections of God, that they stand or fall together. If God has no purposes, then is he not wise? If God change his purposes, then is he not omniscient, and immutable. *If God fail to execute his purposes, then is he not the ALMIGHTY.* Where will the gentleman strike? Or will he not rather shudder at the consequences of his teaching, and cease his puny efforts to overturn the throne of the Most High.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S TENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

WE have now arrived at a point where it is highly important that our positions be well defined. I have insisted from the commencement, that we have but one great point of controversy, and that a vital point in Christian teaching. That point is set forth in the Confession, under the head; "GOD'S ETERNAL DECREES." The doctrine there set forth, I do not believe, but that doctrine my opponent is pledged to defend. Thus far the argument has been conducted by his assailing an argument of mine, offered in a Sermon, delivered in this place. At the close of that Sermon, there is a brief argument to sustain the doctrine that persons once truly converted to God, may fall from grace. The proofs on that point, in the Sermon, I think, remain in all their force. But as I have plenty of time, and as I am determined to make this point doubly secure, I shall call up a few points already introduced, and add some others to them.

The gentleman objects to the proof from Gal. v, 4: "Whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace." But what is the objection? He allows that they had simply gone back under the law of Moses. That is precisely what they had done, and by that law, it was impossible for any to be justified in the sight of God. They had left the system of grace, where, men could be justified, and gone back under the law where they could not be justified. This Paul calls "falling from grace," and says of those in that condition, "Christ shall profit

you nothing." They could not have "fallen from grace," if they had not been "in grace," and they cannot be saved if they have fallen to such a condition that Christ shall *profit them nothing*.

But I invite your attention to another expression of Paul, as the gentleman claims fellowship with him. "But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." Rom. xiv, 15. Here is a brother spoken of, "*for whom Christ died,*" and Paul commands the brotherhood not to *destroy him*. Did Paul command thus, knowing that they could not destroy him? or is not the principle recognized as clear as it can be, that a brother for whom Christ died, *may be destroyed*?

The Apostle Peter not only makes statements favorable to my position, but makes quite an extended argument in favor of it. He says:

"For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better For them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened, unto them according to the true proverb, the dog is turned unto his own vomit, again, and, the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." 2 Pet. ii, 20-22.

Here we have persons "*escaped from the pollutions of the world,*" but *turned lack*; persons who "*have known the way of righteousness,*" but "*turned from the holy commandment which had been delivered to them;*" they had "*been washed*" or purified, but had gone back to their sins or wallowing in the mire. Could the dog return to his vomit again, if he had not been delivered from it? Could the hog return to the mire, if it had not been taken from it? Could persons turn away from the holy commandment, who had never received it? Could they turn from the way of righteousness, if they had not been in it? Could they have "*escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord,*" and not have been Christians? Here, then, are persons once converted, but gone down into the mire again; "*fallen from grace.*" Let us hear Peter once more:

"But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, then denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." 2 Pet. ii, 1.

I ask no man to take *my* explanation of this passage, but I ask him to grant that he believes it. Is it true? Then, here are persons whom the Lord "*bought*." What *becomes* of them? They "bring upon themselves swift destruction." This passage is a standing refutation of Calvinism, for it asserts that the number of the elect, is so definite that it cannot be *increased or diminished*. Those the Lord bought are the elect. It is here expressly stated that some of those the Lord bought "*bring upon themselves swift destruction*." If some of the elect could bring upon themselves swift destruction, others could, and therefore; the possibility of falling is certain. Hear this same Apostle, in the chapter preceding this, after enjoining virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity, upon the Disciples, says, "for if ye do these things, *ye shall never fall*;" hence, too, that admonition of Paul, "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed *lest he fall*." Such are the admonitions of the holy Apostles, in the place of inflating the Disciples with the notion that they *could not fall*. This is of the same spirit Jude 12, where he speaks of "trees twice dead and plucked up by the roots." These had been *living and growing*, but were *dead* when the Apostle spoke of them.

I suppose the gentleman is becoming impatient to hear some reply to his fine speech, this morning, and I must not keep him in suspense any longer. There is no disagreement between us on the question abstractly, whether God had a *plan* or a *purpose*. I took the position at an early period in this debate, that God had a *purpose*. But the gentleman's purpose and mine are as wide apart as the poles. His purpose is the same as the decree or foreordination, set forth in his creed, as follows:

"God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel, of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatever comes to pass."

This is my worthy friend's decree. All his other decrees are included in this. There can be no decree not



included in "whatever comes to pass." This includes everything that ever has or ever can come to pass. The decree of the third section, is contained in this. It reads as follows:

"By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished."

This doctrine, I have said, and I now say again, is not the Predestination of the Bible nor anything like it. But before I proceed with my argument, I must quote the second section, as it makes a clear distinction between the *decree* and the Foreknowledge of God! It reads as follows:

"Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass, upon all supposed conditions; yet hath he not decreed anything because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass, upon, such conditions."

Now if Foreordination and Foreknowledge are not the same, I should like to know what becomes of Foreknowledge, if God foreordained whatever comes to pass. Is it possible that God should have foreordained without foreknowing it? It is not strange that God should have foreknown all things, if he unchangeably ordained them. This, it appears to me, destroys the beauty, if not the very idea of prescience. The prescience of God is great and wonderful beyond all human comprehension, with the idea before the mind, that he looks down through the long cycles of time, and foresees every voluntary act of all the myriads of free agents in the universe. But if God unchangeably ordained all things, it is not strange that he should foresee them. His Foreknowledge is a mere farce; it is nothing more than God foreknowing that what he has *unchangeably decreed shall come to pass*. This destroys the beauty of the prophecies. It is not strange that God should enable a prophet to predict what he has *unchangeably decreed*. The prophets of the Scriptures have done something more wonderful than this; they have predicted what free agents would do, acting voluntarily or without being under any unchangeable decree.

I am aware that it is denied that the Predestination of the Confession makes God the author of sin, but this cannot, in justice, be denied, if he unchangeably ordained whatever comes to pass, for sin is among the things that "come to pass," and if God ordained unchangeably whatever comes to pass, he has unchangeably ordained sin. Let us hear Calvin. He says:

"Hence appears the perverseness of their disposition to murmur, because they intentionally suppress the cause of condemnation, while they are constrained to acknowledge in themselves, hoping to excuse themselves by charging it upon God. But though I ever so often admit God to be the author of it, which is perfectly correct, yet this does not abolish the guilt impressed upon their consciences." Inst. p. 166.

Calvin here says, to confess that God is the author of the *cause* of condemnation, "is perfectly correct." What is the cause? Sin, undoubtedly. Let us hear him again:

"I confess, indeed, that all the descendants of Adam fell by the Divine will into that miserable condition in which they are now involved; and this is what I asserted from the beginning, that we must always return at last to the Sovereign determination of God's will, the cause of which is hidden in himself." Inst. p. 166.

We must have a little more light from Calvin. In the above he says, that "Adam fell by the Divine will." Let us hear him once more:

"If God simply foresaw the fates of men, and did not also dispose and fix them by his determination, there would be room to agitate the question, whether his providence or foresight rendered them at all necessary. But since he foresaw future events only in consequence of his decree, that they should happen, it is useless to contend about Foreknowledge, while it is evident that all things come to pass rather by ordination and decree." Inst. p. 171.

Here, you perceive, it is argued that God foreknows "only in consequence of his decree." But we must hear him once more. He says:

"I inquire again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations with their infant children, in eternal death, but because such was the will of God." Inst. p. 170.

This passage not only teaches that many nations, with their *infant* children, are involved in *eternal death*, but that this was, "because such was the will of God." In these passages, we have it clearly taught, that God is the author of sin, that not only Adam, but many nations, with

their infant children, are involved in eternal death. Nay more, that what God foreknows, he foresees, because he decreed it, or unchangeably ordained that it should come to pass. We must, while on this point, turn to the Confession once more.

"The almighty power, unsearchable wisdom and infinite goodness of God, so far manifest themselves in his providence, that it extendeth itself to the first fall, and all other kinds of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding, and otherwise ordering and governing of them, in a manifest dispensation to his own holy ends."—CONFESSION, Chap. v, Sec. 4.

The gentleman will perceive, from this quotation, that even the Providence of God, extends not only to the first fall, but to *all other sins of angels and men*, and that NOT BY A BARE PERMISSION, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and *powerful bounding*, and otherwise *ordering and governing* of them, in a manifest dispensation to his own holy ends. Now, I am aware that a disclaimer follows this denying that God is or can be the author of sin, which is perfectly true, but which could not be, if the quotation just read were true.

Now, I deny that it was the decree of God that Adam should fall, and I deny that it was by the will of God that he did fall, while I freely admit that God foresaw that he would fall. I deny that God decreed that he should fall, for if this were the case, he was compelled to break the decree of God or the commandment, For God commanded him, saying, "Thou shalt not eat." If he eat, he broke the command, "Thou shalt not eat." But if he eat not, he broke the decree, for God had decreed that he should fall.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' ELEVENTH ADDRESS.

*Friday, 10 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

THE gentleman informs us that there is but one point before us. It is true. My proposition covers a great many points—a goodly number of them we have already disposed of, and still some remain behind. But it is true that there is but one point before us *now*; and I intend that there shall be but one point before us *at a time*, until

I shall have disposed of my affirmative. But since there is but one point before us now, as the gentleman admits, what shall we say of the relevancy of the speech just delivered? He has discussed the doctrine of Final Perseverance, Foreknowledge and Foreordination. Combated various points of the Confession, quoted and culled Calvin, *but never once came up to the simple and only point now at issue, viz:—Has God predestinated some men to everlasting life?*

I think the gentleman's speech lacked but one thing to make it a *perfect* specimen of the usual mode of *refuting Calvinistic arguments*. He ought by all means to have brought *Servetus* upon the carpet; *then the refutation would have been complete*. But I presume we will hear of him *by and by*.

The gentleman says he has plenty of time. I think it very unfortunate then, that he did not employ some of it; in discussing the question before us. Now I have *no time* to spend upon irrelevant points. This the gentleman) knows. Accordingly, he finds it *convenient* to discuss doctrines not now in controversy. It would be easy to show that God's *everlasting covenant* with his people, will never be broken: that his promises of eternal life to *every one that believes* will be performed: that Jesus *told the truth*, when he declared, that he "gave his sheep eternal life, and they should NEVER PERISH, neither should any pluck them out of his hand:" that Paul was not mistaken when he declared, that "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, *shall be able to separate us from the love of God*, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." All the cases of apostasy which seem to conflict with these glorious and consoling truths, John explains most satisfactorily—"They went out from us, *but they were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would no doubt, have continued, with us:* but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.' The substance of his doctrine upon this matter of falling from grace is, that "*Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin*, for his seed remaineth in him, *and he cannot sin because he is rom of God.*" But I have no time to argue this point. I must discuss the question before us.

The objections of the gentleman I must reserve until I get through With my argument. And I now pledge myself to show, that not one of them has any force against the position which I have assumed. And in particular that charge of teaching infant damnation, which the gentleman has introduced, knowing that we repudiate it and denounce it as an unfounded calumny, *I pledge myself to make recoil on his own head.* It is he, not I, who holds doctrines involving this odious dogma. On this point I should have Said nothing, had not the gentleman, retreated from the field of fair argument, to the more *congenial and more, successful* occupation of vilification, calumny and abuse. On this point we shall "meet again at Philippi."

The point now before us is—" God hath predestinated some men to everlasting life." This point I attempted to establish in my last speech, by an argument from the character of God as revealed in the Scriptures. You have heard the gentleman's reply, and now it is for you to say whether that argument does not remain in all its force.

My SECOND general argument in proof of this position, is drawn from *the connection of this doctrine with other doctrines of the Bible.*

There is a beautiful harmony and consistency in the doctrines of the Bible. Admit *one*, and you are logically compelled to admit *others*, clearly implied in, and deducible from, the first. Deny one and the same logical necessity forces you to the denial of many more. Hence no error is unimportant. Hence error is never confined to a single point. But I proceed to show that the doctrine of some men's being predestinated to everlasting life is true, because implied in many other doctrines of the Bible.

1st. The doctrine of *Providence* implies Predestination. That doctrine is, that God exercises supreme government and control over all his creatures and all their actions. Nothing happens by chance. Nothing takes place by blind, fatal necessity. The Providence of God is over all. It extends to things great and small; to the world of matter and the world of mind; to events occurring in accordance with fixed laws, and to those seemingly the most contingent and accidental. This is a plain doctrine of the Bible, Passages, numerous and conclusive, might be quoted to establish it; but this, I hope, is unnecessary, I think even

my opponent will not have the hardihood to deny the universal agency of the Providence of God. And yet if this doctrine be true, the doctrine of the Predestination of some men to everlasting life must also be true. If not a sparrow falls to the ground without (rod's control; if not a hair of our heads is lost without his notice; if he fixes the bounds of our earthly habitation; if he numbers GUV days and permits not death to strike before the appointed moment, *shall we, dare we say that the same Providence does not extend to our everlasting abode? If in every temporal good, we recognize the hand of the "Giver of every good and perfect gift," shall we dare deny, that to him we owe the boon of eternal life? Is eternal life not expressly called the "Gift of God?"*

Since then the Providence of God extends to all events, and since the eternal destiny of his children is embraced in that Providence, there remain but two questions to be settled and our demonstration is complete—*Does God in the operations of his Providence act in accordance with a purpose or plan? We say, yes. "He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." The gentleman admits that it would be casting a foul stigma on the character of God to doubt it. Very well. Now one other question: Is this purpose according to which he works all things, eternal? We say yes, again: otherwise God is a changeable being. God's Providence then is but the execution of an eternal purpose. But in his Providential dealings with his creatures, God gives to some men eternal life. This he does in accordance with an eternal purpose, and this eternal purpose is Predestination?*

2d. The Bible doctrine of *man's natural condition* necessarily involves Predestination.

By nature we are *guilty*. "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Rom. v, 19. "By nature we are children of wrath." Eph. ii, 3.

By nature we are *depraved*. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," (or corrupt). John iii, 6. "For I know that in me, (that is in my flesh), dwelleth no good thing." Rom. vii, 18. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one," Job xiv, 4. "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. li, 5.

By nature, and in consequence of their guilt and depravity, men are *helpless*. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good, who have been accustomed to do evil." Jer. xiii, 23. "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." John vi, 44. "So then, they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Rom. viii, 8. The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be:" viii, 7. "The Natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, Neither can he know them," etc. 1 Cor. ii, 14. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly." Rom. v, 6. "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. ii, 1. Such is the teaching of the Bible respecting man's natural condition. He is *guilty—depraved—helpless*. Helpless, because being supremely attached to sin, he has a total distaste for, and disinclination to, the service of God. In this condition the Gospel finds mankind. It has offers of full forgiveness, and perfect restoration: but its light shines in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not. The natural eye is blind to gospel light. The invitation falls upon ears as deaf as the adder's. Nevertheless the Gospel is the "power of God, and the wisdom of God to the salvation" of some. While it is true that "no man can come except the Father draw him," and some *do* come to Christ, *therefore the Father must have drawn them*. Such is our helpless condition by nature, that, without the exertion of some power other than their own, none could be saved. But some are saved. *It must therefore, be by Divine power*. Did God exert this power *designedly*, or not? We must say, *designedly*. *When was this design formed?* The designs of an eternal and unchangeable God, must be *eternal*. *Now this eternal design to exert his power in delivering some from their wretched natural condition, is Predestination*.

3d. The truth of Predestination also appears from the doctrine of *Regeneration*, or the *New Birth*. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." John iii, 3. Is Regeneration a work of man, or is it the work of God? They are "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, *but of God;*" i, 13.

Hence the regenerated are described as "born of the Spirit;" "born of God;" "begotten of God;" and are called "his workmanship." Now had God a purpose to regenerate those whom he does regenerate; or does he act at random? If he *had* a purpose, then that purpose was *eternal*, else he changed when he formed it. *Now this, eternal purpose to regenerate a part of the human family is Predestination.*

4. The Bible doctrine of *Efficacious Grace*, also proves Predestination. "By grace are ye saved," says Paul. Are all men saved? No. Why, then, are some saved and not others? "By *grace* are ye saved," says the Apostle. But we are told all men receive grace. Why, then, are not all saved? Some, we are told, resist the grace given. *But why do not all resist? Why do some yield, and others not?* This yielding is the very turning point of salvation. Is it *grace* that produces the disposition to yield; or, does this disposition arise from a man's own nature? If it *be of grace* that some yield to the Gospel, while others will not, then it follows that God imparts to some an amount of grace sufficient to overcome his natural opposition to the Gospel, and does not grant such an amount to others. But if it be of man's own nature that he yields, salvation is not *entirely* of grace, but is due, *in part*, to the man himself. But the idea of man being, even in part, his own Savior, is so shocking to Christian sensibility, and so contrary to Scripture, that I think the gentleman will hardly venture to take that position. The truth is, *all real Christians*, however much they may hate the word Predestination, do, in fact, admit, that *it is grace which induces a sinner to yield his heart to Christ.* Hence they *pray* to God to *make the truth effectual* in subduing the hard heart of sinners. Hence when any turn to God, they all return thanks to Him. Our Methodist friends dislike Predestination very much. They think, with Wesley, as quoted by the gentleman, that it is a dreadful doctrine—yet they, *in fact*, believe it. And if there were tears in heaven, the great and good Wesley would weep at the harsh things he said against the doctrine and its defenders. In the articles of religion contained in the Book of Discipline it is said, that we have no power to do good works, acceptable to God, *without the grace of God preventing* (or anticipating) *us, that we may have a good will,*



*and working with us when we have that good will.* Even in the hymns sung in the gentleman's own congregation, we find such sentiments as these:

"Buried in sorrow, and in sin,  
At hell's dark door we lay;  
But we arise, BY GRACE DIVINE,  
To see a heavenly day.

"Amazing GRACE, how sweet the sound,  
That *saved* a wretch like me;  
I once was lost, but now am found;  
Was blind, but now I see.

"Through many dangers, toils, and snares,  
I have already come;  
'Tis GRACE *has brought me safe thus far,*  
*And grace, will lead me home."*

Yes, blessed be the name of the Lord, grace will lead the believer *home*. Does the gentleman hear? "Grace will lead *me home*;" will not permit me, if I am a child of God, either totally, or finally *to fall away and perish*, but will LEAD ME HOME." Again:

"*Grace first contrived the way  
To save rebellious man;  
And all the steps, that grace display,  
Which drew the wondrous plan.*

"Grace all the work shall crown,  
Through everlasting days  
It lays in heaven the topmost stone,  
And well deserves the praise."

Yes, the grace of God will crown the work begun in the heart, with glory in heaven! "*Grace will lead me home!*" If this be not Calvinism, then I know not the meaning of the term. I hope these noble hymns will neither be expunged from the volume, nor passed by in silence by the gentleman and his brethren, because I, a Calvinist, have given their sentiments my approbation. Long may they be felt and sung by all who bear the Christian name. Let but these sentiments obtain full possession of the *heart*, and I hope they will act as salt against the corruptions of the *head*. The truth is men may preach against Calvinism, and argue against it, but when they approach God, in direct acts of worship, they recant all they have said, and become Calvinists themselves. Their *prayers* and *hymns* contain the very sentiments which they reprobate in their

sermons. They dare not tell God what they tell their fellow men. Lord Chatham speaks of a church which had a Popish Liturgy, Calvinistic articles, and an Arminian clergy. But it was reserved for these days to exhibit men whose hymns and prayers are Calvinistic, whose sermons are a compound of Arianism, Trinitarianism, Pelagianism, Socinianism, and Arminianism; and the whole completely deluged, and held in solution, by *the watery Gospel of Bethany!*

But let us apply the argument from efficacious grace. By grace men are saved. This saving grace was given, not by chance, but of design. This design, being God's, must be eternal. *But an eternal design to overcome, by grace, the natural opposition of the human heart to God is Predestination.*—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S ELEVENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

WE are now fully into the merits of Calvinism; into the unchangeable decrees of God. Here is the field for argument. If God has unchangeably ordained or *decreed*, which is the same thing, whatsoever comes to pass, he has decreed that we should hold this debate, that the worthy gentleman should undertake to prove this unchangeable decree from Scripture, and that I should oppose him! Nay, more; if he has unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass, he has unchangeably ordained that free grace should be preached, for it has "*come to pass*" that it is preached. He, then, who preaches free grace, preaches only what God has unchangeably ordained, and what he could not avoid, and consequently is doing the will of God as much as the worthy gentleman. If this doctrine be true, it is just as unchangeably ordained that I should oppose him, as that he should defend this truth; and I am doing the will of God just as much in this opposition as he is in his defense!!!

But even this, comes not to the worst. If God has unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass, every *heresy* that has ever come to pass, was foreordained of God, and comes to pass, not merely as God foresaw it would come to pass, but as *he decreed, unchangeably, it should come to pass!*

Even this, reaches not the climax of the absurdity; for if God unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass, every theft, robbery and murder, with every other crime that has ever come to pass, has not simply come to pass as 'the omniscient saw it would come to pass, but as *he unchangeably ordained it should come to pass!!* And he not only unchangeably ordained that *it should come to pass*, but unchangeably ordained the instruments through whom it *should come to pass*, and *unchangeably ordained them to that very end*. In view of this, what becomes of the agency of man? I do not say "free agency," for there can be no agency, unless it is free or has power to act. A mere machine is not an agent, for it has no power to act, but is merely driven by the force that acts upon it. Is this man's condition? Has man no will? Has he no volition? Has he not the power of choice? Or *does he*, and *can he move in no direction*, only as he is moved upon by some power, irresistibly and of necessity driving him to the end for 'which he was unchangeably decreed before the world?

If this is the case, he was not "created in the image of God," for no one here thinks it was this mortal body that was created in the image of God, but the *inner man*, that is capable of dwelling in a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, after he has left this fleshly tabernacle, was created in the image of God. This is the man whom God addresses in the Bible, not as a machine, but an intelligent being, with a *will*, a *volition*, capability of *choosing* or *determining* the course of his actions. From this principle or attribute, arises all blame and all praise. If man cannot determine his own action, or choose his own course, *decide between good and evil*, he is not an accountable being, can neither be blamed or praised, punished or rewarded, *justly*. Why do we not punish an insane man who kills a man? Not because the action, in itself, is not just the same as if committed by a sane person, but because that he who performed the deed, is deprived of the highest and most noble attribute with which he was endowed, in being created in the image of God; *his will, the power of choosing* between good and evil, or of *controlling his own actions*. To avoid responsibility, and throw the blame of all crime back upon the blessed and glorious Creator, the effort has been made, to place the whole world

on the same footing with the insane; that is, mere machines, acting as they are acted upon, without the least power to act in any other way — *driven by an eternal necessity*.

My worthy friend does not deny the free agency of man! Indeed; but how free is he? Only free to do that which God ordained unchangeably he should do! That is, those ordained to everlasting death, are *free to sin and go to hell*, but not free to receive the Gospel and be saved, for Christ never died for them, never gave them the power of believing, never granted them repentance unto life, never offered them eternal life. How free, then, are they? Free to *be lost*, but *not free to be saved*; free to follow the devil, but not to follow Jesus; free to *do evil*, but not to *do good*! They never had it in their power to be saved. They may pray, with all the powers of their souls; plead with God for mercy, to save them from the eternal burnings; they may pour out their tears and breathe out to heaven, their unutterable groanings, but they never can be saved; for, although the Scripture says, "It shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved"—that "God is not willing that any should perish," and that "He takes no pleasure in the death of the sinner"—that "he that cometh to him he will in no wise cast out"—yet these he will never *hear or save*, for he has foreordained them to everlasting death!!! Their freedom then, consists in an eternal necessity *to sin, and consequently be lost*, growing out of the sovereign, determination of God, "all to the praise of his glorious grace," See Con., chap. 3, sec. 5. This is "free agency," I suppose! This is the beauty of "*the plan*" of Calvinism, but not of the *plan of God*.

But if he believes man to be *free*, I wish him to inform this audience in what respect. Were the reprobates ever free to be saved? Is it in their power to be saved? Can they come to God? I call upon the gentleman to answer, when he shall again rise, for I am bound to show to this assembly, what kind of "free agency" he believes in. If the non-elect are free agents, can they turn to God? Is it in their power to serve God? Can they, by any possibility, escape hell? If they can, they can escape the unchangeable ordination of God. But I leave the worthy

gentleman to answer the question: *is it in their power to be saved?*

I have admitted that God had a *plan*, an eternal purpose, and I have gone back to the original intention or eternal purpose of God, and have shown from the infallible Scriptures of truth what that plan or purpose was—that it was to *give all men that dwell on all the face of the earth the privilege of seeking God and finding him*. This, by the blessing of God, I shall develop at large before we close. I have shown that the first step the Almighty Father has taken in executing and carrying out his purpose or plan, was the promise to Abraham that he would *bless all nations*. He had a purpose to bless all nations, and he promised Abraham, the father of the faithful, that he would do it. My first argument was founded upon the original intention of *God*. My second argument was founded upon the Promise to Abraham. My third argument was founded upon the Developments of the holy Prophets concerning this purpose and promise.

4. My fourth argument is founded upon the Testimony of John the Baptist. John the Apostle says of him, John i, 6-9: "There was a man sent from God, whose name

was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of: the Light, that all men through him might believe. He 'was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. That was the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Again, said John the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world." Now can it be true, that Jesus is the *Light of the world—that he lighteth every man that cometh into the world—that he is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world—that "oil men through him might believe,"* and at the same time can it be true that he has *ordained some men to wrath?*

5. My fifth argument is founded upon the Love of God. My first proof is found John iii, 16-17. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." In this passage, it is asserted that God *loved the world*, and that *the world through him might be*

*saved.* This my opponent does not believe. I have no doubt, he thinks he believes the Gospel in some sense, but *I* maintain that he is opposing the very object God had in sending Christ into the world, viz: "*that the world through him might he saved.*" God certainly did not unchangeably ordain a portion of the world to everlasting death, "all to the praise of his glorious grace," and then send his Son into the world that the world through him might be saved!!

Again, the Apostle says, "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died: for us." Rom. v, 8. David says, "The Lord is good to; all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." Ps. cxlv, 9. This expression cannot be true and Calvinism true, for it denies that God is in any sense good to all. He has never been good to those unchangeably ordained to wrath before the foundation of the world. The original intention of God agrees with his promise; his promise agrees with the testimony of the prophets; their testimony corresponds with the testimony of John the Baptist; and his testimony perfectly harmonizes with the Love of God. These gracious expressions of God's benevolent plan will stand when Calvinism will have gone to oblivion.

It is the easiest thing in the world for the worthy gentleman to refute all my arguments. This he does at a single dash, by declaring them *not to the point*. His own opinion, upon which depends my veracity, is equally easy of proof. He only has to string together a few words of Scripture, that say not one word about it, and it is proved beyond controversy. I must give an example. "Not a sparrow falls to the ground without his observation"— "Even the hairs of your head are all numbered"—"the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit"—"No man can come to me except the Father draw him"— "he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," etc., etc. But which one of these passages proves that "these angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished, or how do they prove that doctrine when taken altogether? When he commenced his present argument, he allowed that the doctrine of his creed was *almost in the very words of Scripture* /

But these passages appear to me to be "far fetched." He "presumed," a day or two ago, that "the court *knew something*." He, however, does not now appear to proceed upon that presumption, but has adopted the expedient of the cuttle-fish, when he muddies the water, to hide him from the view of his pursuer.

Who in this audience sees any relevancy of his quotations to the point? There is not a solitary word in one of these passages about *unchangeably designing any definite number of men and angels*. Where is the proof, then? His proof must contain the terms of his proposition or others of the same import. But his proof-texts contain neither. His proof must be in the passages quoted, and his conclusion in his proposition. Is his argument this? "Not a sparrow falls to the ground without his observation," therefore, "These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished!!" If that is it, we have a long stride from the premises to the conclusion. , But he has hit upon another argument; salvation is by grace. This he proves clear as demonstration, both from Scripture and our Hymn Book, and even manifested some devotional feeling. But who ever doubted this? Surely no one here. It was grace that first contrived the way. It was grace that first purposed the whole scheme. It was grace that first promised our father Abraham, to bless all nations. It was grace that gave all the intimations of it by the prophets. It was grace that spoke through John the Baptist and declared that "through him (Christ) all men might believe." It was grace that said "" that the *world through him might be saved*." This is the true grace of God, but I cannot get the gentleman to believe the doctrine it sets forth. This is "the grace of God that brings salvation to all men," or, as Dr. Rice says, that expresses the "benevolent *desire of God to save all*." But my worthy friend is the last man, that should say anything about this grace. Paul says, "Where sin abounded, grace did *muck more abound*" but he has it where sin abounded grace did *muck less abound*. This grace that God gave freely to all the world, he is set upon it, to circumscribe to a *part of the world*.

He has clearly shown that all men, in an unregenerate state are sinful, and that they must be born again, and even more, that the new birth is of God. But has he read of a new birth or any other religious performance, that does not have respect to the will of the creature? Are men *born again* without consulting their volition? Are men born of God without their own consent? And is it not in the power of others to be born again? The gentleman must come out on these matters; he cannot hide, in the muddy waters. Jesus says, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." If a man is not born again, whose fault is it? Not the man's, if he never had it in his power to be born again, for a man can not be blamed for what he could not avoid. But the God of Calvinism shuts him out of the kingdom of God, for not doing what he never had it in his power to do. Mail", according to Calvinism, has it not in his power to repent, to believe or do anything acceptable in the sight of God, without his especial aid, and yet from a large portion, he withholds that special aid, without which he cannot repent, and *damns him, for not repenting!*—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' TWELFTH ADDRESS.

*Friday, 11 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I INFER from the commencement of the gentleman's speech, that, in his opinion, God never intended this discussion to take place, but somehow or other, we got the better of the Almighty, and concluded to have it whether or no. The gentleman after this must really bear with me if I occasionally quote a text which proves that the Providence of God extends to all events.

I wish to make a single observation for the benefit of those who are not familiar with our Confession. The doctrine which the gentleman is battling with, is *not* the doctrine which I am defending. I am proving that God "Predestinated some men to everlasting life." He is bringing objections to the doctrine that "God foreordains whatsoever comes to pass." Now I have no objection, at any suitable time and place, to prove that our doctrine on this point is the doctrine of the Bible. *But this doctrine is*



*not embraced in those sections of the Confession which we are pledged to discuss.* I leave it for the audience to decide *why* it is that the gentleman *never* will meet me on the particular point in controversy; and to whom Mr. Campbell's pet illustration of the cuttle-fish best applies.

So much of the gentleman's last speech as relates to the origin of evil, and man's moral agency, I reserve to be considered with the other objections ordinarily made to our doctrine. In the meantime I must hurry on my argument, as my time is limited.

My arguments do not please the gentleman! Well that is truly my misfortune! I have done the very best I could, yet still the gentleman is not satisfied. His clear and logical mind revels in such sublime heights, and such profound depths, that we common men cannot *fix* up an argument to please him! *So he proudly disdains even to notice our weak efforts;* but stalks majestically onward in his own peculiarly luminous and elevated path! Well, I would love very much to have the gentleman's company: but still, if he feels above traveling at so moderate a pace,

and with so obscure a companion, I shall not grieve too much at the privation. But of one thing the gentleman may be very sure, he can neither coax nor scold, allure nor drive me away from the course of argument with which he is so much dissatisfied. The point before us is that "Some men are predestinated to everlasting life."

My FIRST general argument in proof of this point, was from the character of God as revealed in the Scriptures.

1. God is *omniscient*. He foreknew from eternity, that some men would attain eternal life. It was then certain from eternity that some would be saved, and who would be saved. There can be no ground for this certainty out of the Divine purpose. Since it was fixed from eternity that some would be saved, God must have fixed it, for no other being existed.

Again. God being omniscient, he knew what kind of a world he was about to create, and he knew that he could have made it differently if he had chosen. But he chose to make a world in which he saw that some men would "attain eternal life, and this choice before any of them existed, looks to a common mind, very like predestinating them to that end.

2. The same doctrine follows from the wisdom, power and immutability of God. If wise, he formed a plan. If powerful and unchangeable, he will execute that plan. But some men attain eternal life. This then was the eternal purpose of the Almighty.

My SECOND general argument was, the connection of this doctrine with the doctrines of the Bible.

3. The doctrine of a universal and particular providence, extending to all creatures and all events, to time and eternity. This eternal providence, being the execution of an eternal purpose, implies Predestination.

2. The doctrine of man's natural condition. So wretched is that condition that none can save himself. All are saved by Divine influence delivering them from their natural condition. This influence being bestowed in accordance with a design, and that design being eternal, Predestination, must be true.

3. The doctrine of the New Birth. It is God's work It is the result of a purpose. This purpose is eternal; An eternal purpose to regenerate a sinner's heart is Predestination.

4. The doctrine of efficacious grace. By grace we are saved. Grace not merely "prepared the way," but directed "all the *steps*" of the process. By grace the heart yields to Christ. This grace is given designedly: But an eternal design to overcome the opposition of the heart to the Gospel, is Predestination.

Such is an imperfect synopsis of the argument so far. I proceed to my fifth argument. The Scripture doctrines of *Repentance and Faith*, imply Predestination. Without Faith and Repentance no man can be saved. "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted," is the Gospel as preached by Peter. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," is the message of Paul. But will a man; if left to himself, repent and believe? Do these fruits grow upon the natural stock, or are they the products of Divine grace? We are told that "Christ is exalted a Prince and a Savior to GIVE *repentance* to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Acts v, 31. The Apostles rejoiced that "God also to the Gentiles *granted* repentance unto life;" xi, 18. Paul exhorts the man of God, in meekness to instruct them that oppose themselves, "*If God peradventure*

*will give them repentance.*" 2 Tim. ii, 25. Repentance then, according to these Scriptures, is the gift of God. There is a repentance which is man's own work. But it is such as Judas had—a sorrow of the world which worketh death. This however is radically different from that "Godly sorrow that worketh repentance to salvation." The latter is the product of Divine grace. How is it with Faith? "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, *it is the gift of God.*" Eph. ii, 8. "For unto you *it is given*, in the behalf of Christ \* \* *to believe upon him.*" Phil. i, 29. "Jesus the *author and finisher of our faith.*" Heb. xii, 2. "Which had believed through grace." Acts xviii, 27. In addition to these positive declarations that faith is the gift of God, we learn the same truth from the fact that it is an object of prayer. "Lord, I believe, help thou my unbelief." Mark ix, 24. "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." Luke xxii, 32. "Increase our faith." xvii, 5. "Peace be with the brethren, and love *with faith* from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." Eph. vi, 23. Why pray to God for faith or for an increase of faith, if it be a simple act of man's own intellect? But hear Paul again. "Who believe according to the working of his mighty power." Eph. i, 19.

Repentance and Faith then are both gifts of God. Does he bestow these gifts in pursuance of a *purpose*? If he does, that purpose must be eternal. *And this eternal purpose to bestow faith and repentance is Predestination,*

Other doctrines involve the same consequences, but I think it needless to pursue this line of argument farther. It is clear that *God* saves those who are saved, and not they themselves. But if God save a sinner; he does it not by *accident*, but in the execution of a purpose. All God's purposes are eternal. *Hence we have an eternal purpose on the part of God to save those who are saved.* Is not this Predestination?

I have thus proved that it is a scripture doctrine, that "Some men are predestinated to everlasting life," from the character of God as set forth in the Bible, and from the necessary connection of this doctrine with others clearly revealed. I have preferred to show, in this way, that the doctrine which I defend; has a broader foundation on

which to rest, than the arbitrary interpretation of a few texts: that, in fact, *it is based on the essential attributes of God, and underlies all the leading doctrines of Christianity*. If there were then, no explicit declarations in the Scriptures respecting God's predestinating love, still proof enough has been adduced to show that the doctrine must be true. But when we find that the conclusion, previously reached by two separate lines of argument, is also supported by explicit declarations in the word of God, we rest satisfied that our deductions are true, being thus supported by a "three-fold cord" which is not easily broken.

THIRD.—I argue then, in the third place, that God has predestinated some men to everlasting life, because the Scriptures do explicitly declare that fact.

"All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and he that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." John vi, 37. On this passage I remark—

1st. The whole connection shows that the object of the "giving" here spoken of, was that those given to Christ might attain eternal life.

2d. There are some who, in a *special sense*, are given to Christ by the Father. It is true the Apostles are said to have been given to him, and that one of them was lost. But this passage has no reference to men appointed to any office, but to those who, in consequence of believing upon him should attain everlasting life.

3d. All who are thus given by the Father to Christ, "come to him, or believe upon him." These phrases are constantly used interchangeably: see verses 39-40.

4th. Those who do thus come to him, he will not reject. They will then all be saved. For he adds, "He came down from heaven, not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him; and this is the will of him that sent him, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth upon him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

Here then is the doctrine of the passage. God has in the covenant of redemption, given some men to the Savior: and it is the will of God that not one thus "given, should be lost, but that all should attain eternal life. The Savior came into the world to carry out this will of God. There-

fore, all that the Father has thus given him, shall come to him, believe upon him and attain everlasting life. Here then we have an explicit, declaration, that God designed to secure the salvation of some men, by the mission of his Son: that to accomplish that design, Christ came into the world: and that that design shall be fully accomplished. This, to my mind, looks very much like Predestination.

I call your attention to another passage, in which the Predestination of some men to everlasting life is explicitly declared.

Luke, in giving an account of Paul's labors at Antioch, says, "As many as were *ordained to eternal life* believed." Acts xiii, 48. This one text is decisive of the whole controversy—it is the doctrine of our Confession in almost the same words.

The gentleman, however, may tell you that some of their "*best authorities* " translate the word differently. Of course they do. How else could they keep up a show of believing the Bible, when denying a doctrine expressed almost in the very language of the Bible? New translations are the constant refuge of individuals and sects, oppressed and overwhelmed by the too clear import of the commonly received version. But what is the new version of this verse?—"As many as *were disposed* for eternal life, believed." So says the *old* "New Version " of A. Campbell. What the *new* "New Version" may say, I am not clairvoyant enough to pre-*vis*e.

On this translation I make one or two remarks.

1st. Even admitting it to be correct, still the passage virtually teaches Calvinism. For why were *some* "disposed to eternal life " and not others? Who is the author of all good dispositions in the heart of man? Is it not "God that works in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure?" Such is the constant tenor of Scripture. Such is the belief of all evangelical Christians. The passage already cited from the Methodist articles, shows that they hold, that "the preventing grace of God is necessary that we may have a good will." If then, some were disposed for eternal life, and in consequence believed, it proves that God, by his "preventing grace " wrought such

a disposition in the hearts of some, and not of others. Now this is tolerable Calvinism. But

2d. The translation is grossly erroneous. Verbs are divided, by the Greek grammarians, into two classes: the one expressive of *action*, the other of *being*, or a *state of being*. Now, in order to support the translation given by Campbell, and contended for by Arminian critics generally, the original verb here should be of the latter class. It should express, not action, but simply the state, condition or disposition of the subject. But it is *not* of this class. It is a verb of *action*.

Again. Verbs expressing action have, in Greek, three voices—the Active, the Passive and the Middle. The active voice expresses action *performed* by the subject or nominative: the Passive, action *performed upon*, or received by the subject or nominative: the Middle denotes an action performed by the subject *to* or for himself. Now the voice here employed is the *passive* voice. The action was not performed by the persons themselves. That would require the Active voice or the Middle; and the use of the Passive shows that the action was performed by another, and that they were but the passive recipients of it.

But the sure method of ascertaining the meaning of a word in the Scriptures, is to compare a number of passages where the same word occurs. The word here employed is used but eight times in the New Testament. Matt. xxviii, 16; Luke vii, 8; Acts xv, 2; xxii, 10; xxviii, 28; Rom. xiii, 1; 1 Cor. xv, 16; together with the passage in dispute. *Never once is it used in the sense of an internal disposition.* What its meaning really is you may judge from a specimen or two. "The eleven disciples went into a mountain, where Jesus had *appointed them.*" Matt. xxviii, 16. "*They determined* that Paul and Barnabas should go up to Jerusalem;" etc. Acts xv, 2. "The powers that be *are ordained* of God." Rom. xiii, 1. "Appointed"—"determined"—"ordained"—these and not "disposed," are the meaning of the word. It is worthy of remark too, that Mr. Campbell, who translated the word "disposed" in *this* passage, does *not so render it in a single other instance where it occurs.* This looks suspicious. It suggests the

thought that the meaning is wrested here, in order to avoid an obnoxious doctrine.

It is sometimes quibblingly said that it is not "as many as were *pre-ordained*," but simply ordained. They were ordained before they believed, and they believed before they had a title to eternal life; consequently they were ordained to life before they entered upon the enjoyment of it; and this, I humbly submit, is Preordination.

It is also objected that they are not said to have been ordained by God. But who has the disposal of eternal life but God? The gift of God is eternal life. The ordaining then must have been by God.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S TWELFTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

THE worthy gentleman allows that if there were tears in heaven, Mr. Wesley would weep on account of the harsh things he has said of Predestination and its advocates. I am not aware that Mr. Wesley said anything hard of the *believers* of Calvinism, or gave any encouragement to any one else to do so. But while he treated those who hold the doctrine with the utmost courtesy and kindness, he did handle the doctrine itself without gloves. To show this more fully, I will read you another extract from him. He says, speaking of those who hold the doctrine: "And the more you are grieved with them that do thus blaspheme, see that you *confine your love to them the more*, and that your hearts' desire and continual prayer to God be, ' Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'" Doct. Tracts, p. 169. This is the manner in which he advised those agreeing with him, to act toward Calvinists. But Calvinists are the last men who should say anything about harsh treatment. I see it stated of Calvin, Life of Calvin, p. 230, concerning Predestination, that "He frequently preached it with warmth, regarded it almost as the basis and foundation of religion, and treated those who rejected it, without ceremony, as scoundrels, rogues, and worthless fellows."

Balsec took the position, "That when St. Paul says, (Eph. i, 5,) that God has elected us through Jesus Christ, this does not regard election to salvation, but the election

of Disciples, and of St. Paul himself to the office of an Apostle." Touching this point, Calvin observes, in a letter to the ministers of Basle: "When I objected to him that in that case the Apostles alone would be capable of gratuitous election, they alone reconciled with God, they alone presented with the remission of their sins, he was so fair from being touched that he heard these thunders with a dog's grin." Dyer's Life of Calvin, p. 130. The gentleman is aware of what can be produced in this direction, hence he has been looking for the Servetus case. I hope we shall hear no more of Mr. Wesley's tears in heaven. But to do him ample justice, I must read you another extract from his Doctrinal Tracts, p. 171.

"This is the blasphemy clearly contained *in the horrible decree of Predestination*. And here I fix my foot. On this I join issue with every asserter of it. You represent God as worse than the devil, more false, more cruel, more unjust. But you say, you will prove it by Scripture. Hold! What will you prove by Scripture? That God is worse than the devil? Whatever that Scripture proves, it never can prove this. Whatever its true meaning may be, this cannot be its true meaning. Do you ask, 'What is its true meaning then?' If I say 'I know not/ you have gained nothing. For there are many Scriptures, the true sense whereof neither you nor I shall know till death is swallowed up in victory. But this I know, better' it were to say it had no sense at all, than to say it had such a sense as this. It cannot mean, whatever it may mean beside, that the God of truth is a liar. Let it mean what it will, it cannot mean that the Judge of all the world is unjust. No Scripture can mean that God is not love, or that his mercy is not over all his works; that is, whatever it may prove beside, no Scripture can prove Predestination.

"This is the blasphemy for which (however I love the persons who assert it), I abhor the doctrine of Predestination; a doctrine, upon the supposition of which, if one could possibly suppose it for a moment (call it election, reprobation, or what you please, for all conies to the same thing), one might say to our adversary, the devil, 'Thou fool, why dost thou roar about any longer? Thy lying in wait for souls, is needless and useless as our preaching. Hearest thou not that God hath taken thy work out of thy hands? And that he doth it much more effectually? Thou with all thy principalities and powers, canst only so assault that we may resist thee. But he can irresistibly destroy both soul and body in hell! Thou canst only entice. But his unchangeable decree to leave thousands of souls in death, compels them to continue in sin till they drop into everlasting burning. Thou temptest; he forceth us to be damned, for we cannot resist his will. Thou fool, why goest thou about any longer, seeking whom thou mayest devour? Hearest thou not that God is the devouring lion, the destroyer of souls, the murderer of men? *Moloch* caused only children to pass through the fire, and that fire was soon quenched; or the corruptible body being soon con-



sumed, its torments were at an end. But God, thou art told, by his eternal decree, fixed before they had done good or evil, causes not only *children of a span long*, but the parents also, to pass through the fire, of hell! the *ire which shall never be quenched*; and the body which is cast thereinto, being now incorruptible and immortal, will be ever Consuming, and never consumed; but the *smoke of their torment*, because it is God's good pleasure, *ascendeth up for ever and ever.*"

Let the gentleman show that this great man ever said anything for which he should shed *tears in heaven*, of Calvinists, and I pledge myself to more than match it from his speeches and our correspondence. I shall now proceed with a regular and independent series of argument. But the gentleman does not see why I call it an "independent argument." I so called it at first, because it was independent of my replies to his speeches, but I may call these arguments independent from another reason, viz: Because they stand independent of any reply from him, in two respects. 1. Because he has not attempted any. 2. Because it is impossible for him to make any that can in the least invalidate my arguments. He has but two chances in this case, and I care not which he takes. 1. To pass this series of arguments, upon which I shall rely to upturn his whole theory, in silence; thus granting virtually, that he cannot make any reply, that he thinks will be of any service. 2. To try to meet ray arguments, and fail. I say not this boastingly, but, if possible, to call his attention to these arguments. I shall proceed with the argument.

6. My sixth argument is founded upon the death of Christ. Who did Christ die for? Did he die for all, or only for a part of mankind? This must be decided by an appeal to the infallible Scriptures. Let us hear Paul: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. xv, 21-22. Now no man can deny that the same "all" that die by Adam shall be made alive by Christ. But before I extend any comment, I quote Paul. He says, "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they who live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose again." 2 Cor. v, 14-15. As I am determined to show that there is not

one particle of fellowship between my worthy friend and the Apostle Paul, I quote him again: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by' the grace of God should taste death for every man." Heb. ii, 9.

What was the design in making Jesus a little lower than the angels? Paul answers: "That he by the grace of God should taste of *death for every man*." Here we have not simply the fact that he did taste death for *every man*, but the *Intention or purpose of God*, in his being made' a little lower than the angels, was that he should taste death for *every man*. He then, who denies that he did taste death for every man, in so doing, denies the *design or purpose* of God. But in the passage to the Corinthians, he says, "if one died for all, then were all dead." The Apostle here assumes it as a fact, that he *died for all*, and uses it as an argument to prove that all were dead. My opponent admits Paul's conclusion, that *all were dead*, but denies his promises, that Christ *died for all*. Now, I ask, can it be true, that God unchangeably ordained, before the world, a portion of our race to everlasting death, and yet that Jesus, by the "grace of God *tasted death for every man*;" that "he died for all," as Paul, in just so many words, declares! No man living, even though he claims to have the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with power to remit and retain sins, as in the case of the worthy gentleman, ever did, or ever can reconcile these passages with the article of the Confession under consideration. The same "all" that die in Adam, will be made alive in Christ. Christ died for the same all that were dead; he tasted death for every man. If there be any that Christ did not die for, they will not be raised from the dead, for we have no account of any resurrection only by Christ, But Calvinists have argued as strange things as to contend that the non-elect will not be raised by Christ. Let me read you a few words from one:

"Upon the whole, the salvation of our children, as it has no countenance from the Bible, so it has no foundation in the reason of things. The Scripture brings down the children of wicked parents to the grave, and leaves them there, and so do I; the Scripture has not provided any resurrection for them, neither can I do it." Watts' *Ruin and Recovery*, Quest. 16. I read from *Christian Teacher*, p. 131.

Such are some of the absurdities men are led into in denying that Christ died for all. But for the present, I leave this, my sixth argument, and pass to other matters. The worthy gentleman thinks I am not pleased with his arguments. In this he need give himself no particular trouble. I think he is doing as well as the barrenness of the soil will admit. I do not see how he could do better. It is impossible to bring something out of nothing, though he had the strength of Samson. While then, I admit his effort worthy of a better cause, I think it an easy matter to refute his arguments. This I will now show by a brief reference to his last speech.

1. His first argument is from the character of God. God is omniscient. He foreknew that some men would attain eternal life. What does that prove? Is God the cause of everything he foreknows? If he is, he is the author of sin, for he foreknew that men would sin. But this is no more than Calvinists admit. Let us hear one or two of them. Calvin says, "I say, that by the ordination and will of God Adam fell. God would have man to fall. Man was blinded by the will and commandment of God. We refer the cause of hardening us to God. The highest or remote cause of hardening is the will of God." Beza says, "God hath predestinated whomsoever he saw meet, not only unto damnation, but also unto the cause of it." Zanchius says, "It is certain that God is the first cause of obduration. Reprobates are held so fast under God's almighty decree, that they CANNOT but sin and perish." Martyr says, "God doth *incline* and *force* the minds of wicked men into great sins." Zuinglius says, "God moveth the robber to kill. He killeth, God moving him thereto." I find these passages selected to my hand in the Chris. Teach., p."131. Now is this forcing men to sin and "holding them so fast under God's almighty decree, *that they cannot but sin,*" what the gentleman means by Foreknowledge? Does he mean that man's destiny was immutably fixed by a decree of God before man as created? or does he mean that God saw that man would sin, when acting as a voluntary agent, and that he would be punished for committing sin that he could have avoided? Now I have tried to get him to relieve himself from suspense in the minds of this people, by answering the ques-

tion: Can the non-elect avoid sin and consequently avoid punishment? But he has no answer. His tongue is tied on this point. I wish him to show what kind of free agency he believes in. If he believes simply that God foresaw that men would act wickedly, contrary to the will of God, when he had given them power to do his will, and be lost for it, we have not the least disposition to doubt it. But if he believes that he decreed that men should sin, and that they cannot avoid it, but that God will punish them in hell for committing the sins he decreed they should commit, we deny it, and declare it an impeachment upon the character of the holy God.

2. His second argument is based upon the connection of this doctrine with other doctrines of the Bible, But this is no argument at all, for he *assumes* without the least argument this connection, and proceeds to quote passages plentifully on other points that could be just as well quoted to prove anything else. I will, however, give him a few words on some of these passages at a convenient point.

3. His third argument is based upon the doctrine of the New Birth. This I have attended to, as far as I think requisite at present.

4. I have also replied to this fourth argument; on Efficacious Grace.

5. The Scripture doctrines of Repentance and Faith, imply Predestination! Not in my Bible. My Bible teaches, that the Gospel was preached to all the world, that "*they, might believe,*" and that "God commandeth all men everywhere to repent, while Calvinistic Predestination denies that all men can *believe* or *repent*. Yet God will damn men for not believing and not repenting. Will he damn them for not doing what they could not do? This is Calvinism. Believe it you who can; I cannot.

Faith and Repentance are gifts of God in a certain sense. He endowed man with an understanding; with the capability of believing. He gave him the Gospel to believe, and "many infallible proofs," to show him that it is a divine revelation. Having thus given him the *power* to believe, and that *which he requires him to believe*; the Gospel of his Son; he threatens to punish him if he does not believe. He has shown man that he was sinful, in the Gospel of his Son, and called upon all men everywhere to

repent, which shows, beyond dispute, that he had granted them the power to repent, because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' THIRTEENTH ADDRESS.

*Friday, 3 o'clock, P. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—

BEFORE noticing the extraordinary speech just delivered, I shall conclude my argument on the point now before us. The point is these words of the Confession, "Some men are predestinated to everlasting life." This doctrine I have attempted to establish;

FIRST—From the character of God as revealed in the Scriptures.

SECONDLY — From its connection with other essential doctrines of the Bible.

THIRDLY—From explicit declarations of Scripture.

Under this third head I have already quoted John vi, 37, and Acts xiii, 48, and shown how they clearly establish the doctrine in controversy. I might rest my proof here, as no reply has been attempted to my remarks on these passages. But out of deep commiseration for the sufferings of the gentleman, who has not been able to get a single argument out of all the matter which I have been laying before this people for two days past, I must try find add a few texts more. Perhaps some of them may contain an amount of argument which his transcendent and soaring genius will not disdain to notice.

"For whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to he conformed to the image of his Son." Rom. viii, 29,

All who bear the image of God's Son, will obtain eternal life.

But from this passage, it appears that God predestinates some men to be conformed to the image of his Son.

Therefore he in fact predestinates them to eternal life.

Yet this is the doctrine which the gentleman says is not the doctrine of the Bible, nor anything like it!!

"That he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy before prepared unto glory, even as whom he hath culled, not of the Jews *only* but also of the Gentiles." Rom. ix, 23-24.

That vessels here mean men is evident. The term is employed with reference to the illustration of the potter, just preceding, Paul's doctrine is that "God has prepared" some men "unto glory;" nay, "has *afore-prepared*" them "unto glory." That the term "glory" means everlasting happiness is evident from the connection in which it stands, as well as from the current usage of the word in the New Testament.

The doctrine of the passage then is, that as a potter, in fashioning the clay, has entire control over it, and fashions some of it into vessels for honorable purposes, so God out of the corrupt mass of human nature, *selects*, and *prepares beforehand*, some men for the enjoyment of that "exceeding and eternal weight of glory," to be bestowed upon the saints. Now to my mind, at least, this *preparation* looks very much like a *pre-destination*. And I am confirmed in my opinion when *I find the identical word here translated "afore-prepared," rendered "before ordained"* in Eph. ii, 10. Giving it the same rendering here, the passage will read, "*vessels of mercy which he has BEFORE ORDAINED unto glory.*"

I invite the attention of the gentleman to another text— "Salute Rufus, chosen in the Lord." Rom. xvi, 33. This, it is true, looks like a very harmless, inoffensive text, but the gentleman will find it a troublesome customer. Rufus was not a prophet, nor did he belong to the band of Apostles. The choice, or selection of him, therefore, was not to an *official station*. Rufus was not a whole church, or a whole nation; the choice or election of him was not an election of *communities to external privileges*. This is, therefore, a clear instance of *personal, individual* election. To what he was elected is not indeed explicitly mentioned, but it is clearly implied in the expression "in the Lord." He was "in Christ," "a new creature," an heir of heaven.

"For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 These. v, 9. So it seems God does appoint some men to obtain salvation! *When* does he thus appoint them? *After* they have salvation already, or *before* they attain it? Before, most assuredly. This appointment, then, is really a *pre-appointment*. Will the gentleman be good enough to show us benighted Calvinists the precise difference between *pre-appointing*

some men to salvation, and *predestinating* some men to everlasting life?

Here I rest my proof of the clause under consideration. That it is not only "like" the doctrine of the Bible, but is the very teaching of the Scripture itself, I have shown, 1st, from the character of God; 2d, from the connection of this with other essential doctrines; and 3d, from the express declarations of the Scriptures themselves. I leave it for an intelligent and candid public to say— after pondering my affirmative argument, and observing the nature and spirit of the replies attempted—whether it is not the doctrine of Holy Writ that "God predestinated some men to everlasting life."

Before I enter upon the proof of the next clause' of the Confession to be investigated upon this occasion, I shall attend to the gentleman's last speech.

He thinks that it is not harsh language to use *against* Calvinists to call them "blasphemers"—to compare them to 'the murderers of the Savior—to represent them as making God worse than the devil; a liar, cruel and unjust. But for Calvin to call an opponent dog, is terrible! The gentleman is like all his class—whenever the *faults* of an opponent are to be viewed; a glass of vast magnifying power is employed. If his virtues are seen at all, it is through the telescope *inverted*. But when the faults of their own set are exhibited, they use no glass, and they shut their eyes. I do not justify Calvin in every expression he may have used, or in every act he may have done—but he should be judged by the standard of his own age and times, and not by the *ex post facto* of modern days. I will tell the gentleman, however, that the book from which he quotes, Dyer's Life of Calvin, is a foul libel upon the memory of that learned and pious Reformer; it is not regarded as authority, and I will not admit it as authority in this discussion.

The gentleman is fond of reading from Wesley; why does he not read *this* passage? "*I believe Calvin was a great instrument of God, and that he was a wise and PIOUS man.*" And again: "*John Calvin was a pious, learned, and sensible man.*" Philpot, the martyr, calls him that Godly man." Bishop Jewel speaks of him as "*so worthy an ornament of the church of God.*" These were all Episcopalians; and other similar testimonies could be adduced. Woe to the cause

that can be sustained in no other way than by blackening the characters of God's own most eminent saints! The gentleman should have spared the memory of Wesley, and forborne to drag to light his Address to the Devil. His enemies could wish nothing better than to expose such effusions—his admirers and friends should blot them out with their tears,

A word on the gentleman's "independent argument." I have forborne to answer it hitherto, for two reasons: 1st, I am anxious to get through with my own affirmative arguments on the proposition now before us; this I could not do in the time allowed me if I turned aside to discuss everything that the gentleman, in the wide range he allows himself, might introduce; and, 2d, I think his argument untimely and misplaced. It is the duty of the respondent to *reply* to the arguments of the affirmative; but it is not expected of him to neglect those arguments, and pursue "an independent" course of his own. I did, and do greatly desire to have my arguments fairly met, and refuted, if they can be. If they are unsound let it be shown. But all that the gentleman can effect by the course he pursues is to make the Bible have the appearance of teaching his doctrine and mine too. Beside, all the arguments he is adducing can be brought in under the second proposition as well, and better, than any can here. When I become respondent, and have no argument of my own to pursue, I now pledge him my word that he shall not complain, for want of attention to his arguments. I must say, however, of the arguments of the gentleman, that they have no *special* bearing on the doctrine of *Predestination*. They look much more like an argument to prove the universalist view of the atonement. Indeed, the main burden of his song has been, that God loved all men, promised to bless all men, and sent John to testify to all men, and his Son to die for all men. His arguments, I say, if they have any force, go to prove the *universality of the atonement*; but have no special bearing upon the doctrine before us.

But, says the gentleman, if I prove that Christ shed his blood for all men, won't that refute Calvinism? I answer no, no. I can *bring, from the works of Calvinists*, stronger arguments to prove the universal extent of the atonement, than any the gentleman has offered. Did the gentleman



ever by chance look into the theology of Dr. Dwight, one of the fathers of New England Calvinism? There he would find the doctrine of Predestination strongly set forth, in conjunction with the doctrine of a universal atonement. The same is true of the works of Dr. Richards, late of Auburn Theological Seminary, and of Albert Barnes, the distinguished commentator. These nil, and many others, most firmly held the doctrine of Predestination, in connection with the doctrine of a general satisfaction for the sins of all men. The gentleman then is wasting his strength. He might just as well attempt to refute Calvinism by arguing that baptism can only be administered by submersion.

But the gentleman may not be satisfied with this. He may wish to know *ray* sentiments on this point. Well, it is not exactly in order, but for once I will gratify him.

I believe that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ is sufficient, in value, to atone for the sins of the whole human race.

I believe that Christ is a Savior precisely suited to the wants of every sinner, wherever found.

I believe that forgiveness through the cross of Christ is to be preached to every creature.

But I do *not* believe that it was the purpose of the Father to *effectually apply* the merits of Christ to the salvation of *all*. And I do not believe this, simply because I do not believe the doctrine of universal salvation. As to the *value, suitableness, and offer* of the atonement, I believe it co-extensive with the race. As to its design, Christ loved the church and gave himself for it.

I will now answer the argument of the gentleman founded on the death of Christ. He says he died for all mankind. *He does not believe it himself*. I repeat it. THE GENTLEMAN HIMSELF DOES NOT BELIEVE THAT CHRIST DIED FOR ALL MANKIND. I hold in my hand the "Monthly Christian Age" for March, 1852. My distinguished opponent is one of the editors. In it I find an article headed "*Infant Salvation*," and signed "B. F." Do any of you know what those letters stand for? Well, in this article on so promising a theme, I find the following sentiments from Dr. Carson:

"THE GOSPEL HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH INFANTS.\* \* \* THE SALVATION OF THE GOSPEL IS AS MUCH CON-

FINED TO BELIEVERS, AS THE BAPTISM OF THE GOSPEL IS. NONE CAN EVER BE SAVED WHO DO NOT BELIEVE IT—CONSEQUENTLY, BY THE GOSPEL, NO INFANT CAN BE SAVED."

These sentiments "B. F." fully indorses, and adds a few more of the same sort, and especially saying that Jesus did not come to seek and save infants, but those; who are lost!!

So it seems that, after all, the gentleman has said and sung, since this discussion began, about the whole human race being blessed in Abraham, and died for by Christ, etc., etc., it turns out, that with respect to fully *one-third the race*, he don't believe it himself. Why I never heard of a Calvinist, except the one the gentleman told us of, who made the elect the one-twentieth of the human race, but who vanished when his name was called for, along with "some of our best authorities." I never heard of a Calvinist that presumed to limit the work of Christ as much as the gentleman himself.

And just here I will settle with the gentleman about the salvation of infants. He cannot find a respectable preacher or author in our church, who believes any other doctrine than that all infants shall be saved. Our Confession reaches no other doctrine. It is only by the most violent wresting that any other can be forced upon its language. But what have we here? "*The Gospel has nothing to do with infants*," "The salvation of the Gospel is *confined to believers*." Now those who are not saved by the Gospel are not saved at all. "There is no other name given under Heaven among men, whereby we must be saved." But infants have nothing to do with the Gospel salvation. It is confined to believers. Jesus did not come to save them, says Dr. Carson and B. F.; *then they cannot be served!!*

But just look at this. Says the gentleman in his speech: "*If there be any that Christ did not die for, they will not be raised from the dead.*" Well, in this article, he says that infants are not those that Christ came to save. He came to save the lost, but they are not lost. *Infants then, according to his own belief, will not be raised from the dead.* They never will stand before the throne, in robes washed white in the blood of the Lamb, or join the sweet anthem of praise to redeeming love! *They will never be redeemed!*

The pretended extract from Watts, teaches just the gentleman's own doctrine. "The Scripture has not provided any resurrection for them."

The contemptible scraps which the gentleman has been dealing in, at second or third hand, are *not correct representations of Calvinistic doctrine*. The very men from whom they are said to be quoted, teach directly opposite doctrines, as I shall show if I have time. But the gentleman must be indulged. These are the weapons with which all anti-Calvinistic armories are filled. He is using the ordinary weapons of our opponents. But I hope his present predicament will enforce upon his mind the profound wisdom of the old adage: "They who live in glass houses should not throw stones."—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRTEENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I HAD spent so much of my time upon other matters, before I commenced my review of the worthy gentleman's last speech, that I failed to get through it. After quoting many passages that say nothing about ordination or fore-ordination, he has succeeded in finding *one passage* containing the words, "ordained to eternal life." But he did not appear to enjoy the passage, as much as the quotation from our Hymn Book. Poetry, however, may inspire devotional feeling, while mere prose will not do it. He appears to be haunted with the Bible Union, and New Translations. He seems to have an utter abhorrence of the Memphis Convention, the Bible Union and New Translations. And why did these matters assail his mind at the precise moment he quoted the passage alluded to? I have not troubled him with New Translations. He has himself appealed to the original several times, but just at this moment he has an aversion to New Translations. What can be the cause of it? He has good reasons, and I shall presume upon the intelligence of this audience so far as to risk their seeing them. But we must take a look at the passage in the good old King James Bible first.

"Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold and said, it was necessary that the word of God should have first been spoken to you; but seeing you put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of ever-

lasting life, so we turn to the Gentiles, for so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the end of the earth. And when, the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed." Acts xiii, 46-48.

Now I think it a little remarkable that precisely "*as many as were ordained to life, believed,*" on hearing the word. Not one over nor one under. Can another in stance be found in the history of the Church, where on hearing the word, precisely "*as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed?*" I have always understood that we cannot certainly know who are the elect in this worlds But in this instance, if those ordained to life are the elect, they were every one known to be such, and every one of: them believed! There was no necessity for any burthened missionary efforts in that place. The elect were *all converted* and the balance never *could* be. This was making a short work of it in that place. But Paul and Barnabas give them a different reason, why no more of them were converted, than telling them they were *not of the elect*. They charged them, (verse 46), with "*putting the word of God from them;*" of "*judging themselves unworthy of everlasting life.*" These are justifiable reasons for turning away from them. But did Paul speak thus to them, when he knew they *could not receive the Gospel*; could not *judge themselves worthy of eternal life*? If he did, there was not one particle of sincerity in it. But he did not, as is clear from his language, (verse 47); "For so hath the Lord commanded us saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation *unto the ends of the earth.*" Now can any man with his eyes open, believe that Luke quoted the words, "I have set thee for a light unto the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation *unto the ends of the earth,*" and then, in the very next breath, teach that the few who first heard the word, were the special few, the favorites of Heaven, foreordained to eternal life, before the foundation of the world!

The gentleman was kind enough to inform us that the Greek word from which we have "ordain," occurs eight times in the New Testament, and that it is not translated "*disposed*" in any place. That is true, but it is equally as true, that it is not said that God "ordained" to eternal

life, in one place. It is simply "ordained" and not "foreordained." Who ordained them? Let us refer to the passages. 1. Mat. xxviii, 16: "The disciples went into a mountain, where Jesus had *appointed* them." Here we have *appointed* in the place of *ordain*, and the appointment took place at *that time*, and not before the world. 2. Luke vii, 8: "I am a man *set under* authority." Here we have "set under" for "ordain," and not "set under" *by the Lord* at that. 3. Acts xv, 28: the passage in dispute. 4. Acts xv, 2: "They *determined* that Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of them, should go up to Jerusalem." Here we have the word "*determined*" for "ordain," and the assembly of brethren were the persons who *determined*, and the question of going to Jerusalem was *what* was determined; and when 'the disciples were at Jerusalem was the time *when* it was determined. 5. Acts xxii, 10: "It shall be told them all things that are *appointed* for us to do." Here the Lord *appointed* or *ordained* the things Paul had to do to be converted. 6. Acts xxviii, 23: "And they had *appointed* him a day." Here the *people appointed* or *ordained* a day to hear Paul preach. 7. Rom. xiii, 1: "They have *addicted* themselves to the ministry of the saints." That is, "they have *ordained themselves* or *disposed* themselves to the ministry of the saints." How perfectly in keeping with all this, for Luke to remark that, "as many as were *disposed*, for eternal life, believed."

Wesley says, "St. Luke does not say foreordained. He is not speaking of what was done from eternity, but of what was there done, through the preaching of the Gospel, He is describing that ordination, and that only, which was at the very time of hearing it." What a slender proof to hang this doctrine upon! If the mere jingle of the words seem to suit, the gentleman at once seizes the passage as a proof, and presses it into the service.

The gentleman quotes the words, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren." Rom. viii, 29. But in this case, as usual with him, he appears to find Calvinism where no one else would think of looking for it. The Apostle is certainly speaking of no such doctrine in this passage. In verse 28, the Apostle lays down the consoling principle,

that "all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purposed Those called by the Gospel, or the teachings God had afforded before the Gospel, were called according to his purpose. All that God has done, he has done according, to his purpose. He has called men by the Gospel; that calling is according to his purpose. Concerning those thus called, and who love God, the Apostle affirms that all things work for their good. But he proceeds, "for," says he, "whom he did foreknow, he did also predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren." This must be "whom he did *before approve*, he did predestinate, to be conformed to the image of his Son," It would not do to say, *whom* he was before *acquainted with*, he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, for he was before *acquainted with all*, but certainly did not predestinate all to: be conformed to the image of his Son. There is nothing new nor strange in the doctrine, that those whom God *before approved*, and, of course, whose conduct had been worthy of approval, he should predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son. But he proceeds, verse 30, with the same persons, to inform us what had become of them: "Moreover," says he, "whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." This is all a very easy and plain matter. The proposition to be proved is, that "all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose." Where is the proof? The proof is in the fact, that the Old Testament saints, whose conduct he before approved, he predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son. These persons were called by him, justified and now *glorified*.

I will now inform the worthy gentleman, that any passage that he may rely upon, that may, for the time, escape my attention; all he has to do, is to mention it again, and show how he applies it to Ins proposition, and I will attend to it with the utmost pleasure. Meantime, I hope he will become more pleasant and agreeable.

I might exclaim, in the language of one of old, "O that mine enemy had written a book!" He has found a

precious document in the Monthly Age, not that will show that Calvinists do not hold the doctrine of infant damnation, but that I am no better than they. Of course, that will set the matter all right with them! But this is a total failure; 1. Because he has not attempted an examination of one of the quotations to show that I misapplied them. Nor will it screen him to condemn Dyer's Life of Calvin, nor the extracts from the Christian Teacher, for my most obnoxious quotations are from Calvin's Institutes, and his creed. If he will repudiate these too, I will cease to quote them, to his great annoyance. 2. He has not shown that I hold the horrible doctrine, that infants will be lost, or have given the least countenance to it. 3. If he had, it would not acquit Calvinism, of teaching the doctrine. But I must come to the quotation from Carson, but must give you first, a few remarks of the Lutheran Observer, as I found them in connection with the quotation from Carson. The observer says:

"DR. CARSON of England, who has distinguished himself by Ms controversial works in favor of immersion, has lately uttered a sentence which is full of meaning as to the tendency of his views on baptism, excluding infants from all interest in Christian ordinances."

Here follow the words of Carson:

"The Gospel has nothing to do with infants, nor have Gospel ordinances any respect to them. The Gospel has to do with those who hear it. It is good news; but to infants it is no news at all. They know nothing of it. The salvation of the Gospel is as much confined to believers, as the baptism of the Gospel is. None can ever be saved who do not believe it. Consequently, by the Gospel no infant can be saved."

To these words of Carson the Observer adds the following:

"If the Gospel has nothing to do with infants, then, it does not speak the mind of Christ, who said, 'Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.' One half of the human race die in infancy: and is it then that the Gospel has nothing to do with one-half of the race? What, have parents to say of a Gospel that has not provided for their children?"

To this I have added the following:

"The Observer makes a very true remark, when he states that the above remarks of Dr. Carson are full of meaning. They *are full of meaning* and suggest some very

important items; and the editorial remarks, though not so 'full of meaning,' are not without meaning; but, unfortunately, the meaning is not so favorable to fair investigation as we could wish. Especially have we a right to complain of his closing remark. He asks, 'What have parents to say of a Gospel that has not provided for their children?' Such a question may prejudice the mind, against hearing Dr. Carson, and against that Gospel which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes, without saving an infant or anybody else. But does he believe in infant faith, or that infants have the faith of the Gospel? Does he believe that infants repent or have Gospel repentance? Does he believe in infant regeneration? Does he believe in infant remission of sin, infant prayer, infant exhortations, infant contributions, and infant communion? The Gospel promises a blessing to the peace-makers, the merciful, those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, who suffer for righteousness' sake, who 'follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord;' but does the editor of the Observer appropriate these promises to infants? No sir, nor any other man who understands himself. Lutherans debar the dear little infants from the communion, though Christ said, 'Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven;' but Romanists, benevolent people that they are, permit them, with their believing parents, to come. That holy doctor, Pope Pius IX, believes in no Gospel that debars the dear little ones of believing parents, from the communion; but Luther and his hardhearted followers, believe in a Gospel that has made no provision for the infants of believing parents, at the Lord's table! No wonder that his holiness should be so highly incensed at a people, who preach a Gospel that has no provision for infant faith, infant repentance, infant remission of sins, infant communion, or infant anything else but *infant baptism*. His tender and fatherly heart, no doubt, has been moved, and his feelings roused even to the sending forth of many pious bulls and most solemn anathemas, for all the hardhearted heretics who teach a Gospel barring the little unconscious infants from any ordinance of the Gospel, except what they have decided, *not essential—baptism*. With what pious emotions he might exclaim, 'What



think you of a Gospel making no provision for children of believing parents but baptism? With what a holy horror, too, he might condemn it. But still, he could not prove that any provision is found in the Gospel for making infants believers, to make them repent of sins they never committed, or of pardoning them when they *need no pardon*, or of regenerating them, when they are as *pure without regeneration as the holiest are with it*, or even for their communion, before they have, any mind to look through the emblems to the sufferings of the Lord, which they represent. Let the kind editor show that infants are *lost*, before he excites prejudice against those who do not find any ordinances in the Gospel to *save them*, Jesus came to seek and save that which *was lost*, but he *did not pronounce infants lost*, but said 'of SUCH IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN,' and, to adults, except ye repent and become AS A LITTLE CHILD, you cannot enter into the kingdom of God. The Lord did not say, 'suffer little children to come unto me, *to be baptized, regenerated or saved*,' but he said, 'for of SUCH IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.'

Thus you see that the very article where I argue against infants being *lost*, their needing regeneration or any Gospel ordinance *to save them* from sins they never committed, has been garbled to prove that I believe they will be lost.

[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' FOURTEENTH ADDRESS.

*Friday, 4 o'clock, P. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I SHOULD feel sorry for the gentleman, after witnessing the agonized writhings and contortions of his last speech, were it not that he has only been compelled to drain the bitter cup which he had maliciously mingled for others. I have no doubt he thinks his present sufferings equal to those of Job whose language he so feelingly quotes: but he is only fulfilling the Scriptures, which say, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

Before noticing the gentleman's last speech, I will go on with my own argument on the sections of the Confession under discussion. The next point is the predestination of *angels*.

"Some men and ANGELS are predestinated to everlasting life."

On the subject of angels the Scriptures say very little to gratify curiosity: and if we leave the Scriptures and follow our own imaginations, our opinions will be as vain as useless. When they were created, we are not informed. But we know that, when created, they were all pure and upright: for God's handiwork, as it came from him, wag" all very good. It seems clearly implied, also, that the angels, like men, underwent a trial or probation. Some, we are informed, "kept not their first estate." But what was the sin by which they fell, and how it obtained entrance into their minds; or who tempted them, if they had a tempter, are questions respecting which the Scriptures say nothing, and conjecture were endless. Others stood,

"Faithful found among the faithless."

Now our position is that those angels who fell not, are confirmed in their state of rectitude, and will obtain eternal life. It is God who has confirmed them in holiness: it is God who will bestow upon them everlasting life. Whatever God does, he does in accordance with a previous purpose. All God's purposes are eternal—and an eternal purpose to bestow eternal life is Predestination. The arguments from the nature of God, and from the attributes of *omniscience, wisdom, power, and immutability*, already adduced in proof of the preceding point, are also in place here.

From the *omniscience* of God, it follows that he knows certainly every event that will come to pass. Every event is certain to come to pass just as God knew it would. *There must be some ground or reason for this certainty*, otherwise there will be an effect without a cause. That ground or reason must be in God himself, or in the nature of things themselves. But it cannot be in the nature of things, for this certainty existed *from eternity*, consequently before anything but God was in existence. The ground of this certainty must then be in God himself. *What was it?* unless his purpose to bring about, or permit to be brought about the events which he foreknew? Can the gentleman answer? Apply this argument to the point in hand, God foreknew from eternity that some angels would attain eternal life—it was then certain from eternity, or it could

not have been certainly foreknown. *What rendered it certain?* I say, *the purpose of God.* Has the gentleman any other answer? *This eternal purpose is Predestination.*

Vary the argument from omniscience. God, before he made the world, had before his infinite mind the entire plan of the universe he was about to call into being. He also comprehended in his infinite understanding all possible plans after which a world might have been made. He knew precisely how the creatures, which he was about to create, would act, if placed in certain circumstances, and endowed with certain powers. Out of all plans possible for infinite wisdom to conceive, and infinite power to execute, he chose the plan of a world that now exists. This act of choice is the reason why the world exists as it does, and not otherwise. But it is a part of the present plan of a universe that some angels should attain everlasting life. Therefore God chose, before all worlds, to create this world in such a way that some angels might obtain eternal life. *This choice before all worlds is Predestination.*

The *providence* of God extends to all God's creatures; to angels as well as men. Every act of every creature, and the eternal destiny of every creature, is comprehended in the scheme of Providence. But in the Providence of God some angels attain eternal life. Is God's Providence a blind impulse? or is it exercised in *wisdom*, and with design? You say it is the result of wisdom and design. *Then God designed some angels to attain eternal life*, for in his Providence they actually do attain it. *This design is Predestination.*

If God is *wise*, he has a *plan* comprehending every creature, every act, and every result in the system of things which he has formed. If God is *almighty* he will execute the plan his wisdom has formed. If God is *immutable*, he will never change his plans. Therefore whatever he does or permits in time, he does, or permits, in accordance with an eternal purpose. But he confers on some angels eternal life. Therefore it was his purpose from eternity so to do—and *this eternal purpose is Predestination.*

I would be glad to see my friend, who prides himself so much on his powers of argument, meet this argument fairly in the face, and show a flaw in it if he can. I assure the gentleman that all his abuse of Calvin, and

other servants of God—all his perversions of our doctrine—all his *scrap reading*, from the books of those no more to be relied on for honest quotations than himself, will have no effect on an intelligent community, so long as he leaves the *argument* of his antagonist untouched. The arts of the demagogue, this community perfectly understand. We have seen specimens before to-day.

The conclusion which we have reached from a consideration, of the attributes of God, are confirmed by the language of the holy Scriptures: for they expressly call some of the angels "*elect*." "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the ELECT ANGELS." 1 Tim. v, 21.

With these arguments, drawn either from the express declarations of the Scriptures, or by necessary inference from doctrines therein contained, I leave it to you to say, fellow-citizens, whether it is not clearly made out that "Some men and angels are Predestinated unto everlasting life," and consequently whether the bold assertion of the gentleman, that "this is not the doctrine of the Bible, nor anything like it," be not an assertion totally unsupported by the facts of the case.

I shall now review the gentleman's last speech. He says he has not troubled us with new translations! If he has forgotten that "*some of our best authorities*," give *rather* a queer translation of Rom. ix, 13, the audience has not. Neither have they forgotten the cruelty of the gentleman in refusing to tell us who those "best authorities" are!

The gentleman thinks it "a little remarkable that precisely as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed." Acts xiii, 48. I have no doubt that *these words of the Holy Spirit*, do not suit the gentleman's notions. But there they stand. The original word means appointed—determined—ordained. It is used in the *passive voice*, indicating *not what the persons themselves do*, but what is done for them by another. That other is God, for to him it pertains to bestow eternal life. The text, therefore, is a clear declaration of our doctrine in almost the very terms of the Confession.

The gentleman says that those who are "Predestinated," (Rom. viii, 29), are those who are said to be "called," verse 28. Precisely. But who are those persons said to be "called?" "Those called by the Gospel,"

says the gentleman. No, sir, not by a great deal. The Gospel call is *universal*: *this* calling is *special*. To those "*called*," in the sense of this passage, "All things work together for good." This is not true of all who hear the general Gospel call. They "love God:" all who bear the Gospel do not love God. They are "foreknown," *i. e.*, as the gentleman himself admits, in direct opposition to the definition of Foreknowledge given in his Sermon, and following the interpretation of Calvinists "fore-approved." But all who are called externally by the word are not "fore-approved." These persons are also "justified " and "glorified." But all who are called in the Gospel are not justified nor glorified. "Many are called, (in the Gospel), but few are chosen." The "calling" here spoken of is the special calling of God's grace and Spirit. Those who are "Predestinated " then, are the same as those "called " in this sense.

The gentleman says, no one but myself would think of finding Calvinism in this passage. The most eminent interpreters of the Scriptures understand it just as I do. But the gentleman has sometimes to whistle, and whistle *very loud* to keep up his own courage, and to cheer the drooping spirits of his adherents.

The gentleman hopes I will keep pleasant and agreeable. Most assuredly I will. I have felt no other than pleasant emotions since this debate began. I expect so to continue to its close. There has been a glow of excitement, I admit; but it has been just such excitement as arises from a clear perception of God's own grand truths, and a conviction that the evidences of those truths have, by his blessing, been made as clear to other minds as my own. My friends tell me that my style of speaking has been unusually animated; the elation of feeling, arising from my successful defense of the truth, is the explanation of this animation. I say this, not boastingly, but to guard myself from such imputations as the gentleman is in the habit of throwing out. But I understand all this matter. Whenever, by the force of truth, he is driven to the wall, and is vexed and mortified in consequence, he judges of my feelings by his own, and hopes I will keep pleasant and agreeable! A man who is dizzy thinks the world turns round.

He insinuates that he has quoted from the Confession

and from Calvin passages that teach infant damnation. Perhaps the gentleman will feel neither pleasant or agreeable, if I tell him, that no *quotations honestly made from these sources can teach any such doctrine*. For neither the framers of the Confession, nor Calvin, *believed* any such doctrine.

But I have shown, that according to his doctrine, the Gospel has no salvation for infants: that according to him, they will never rise from the dead—never stand in white before the throne—never join the song of praise to redeeming love! And what is his answer? Why he reads the article, which confirms every word I have said.

[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTEENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I FEEL not the least disposition to fasten on the worthy gentleman, doctrines which he does not believe. All I ask of him is, to renounce those doctrines I have quoted from his standard works, or not be offended at me for quoting them. I Have not said one word against the character of Calvin, unless it be to quote his own words. I am glad to hear the gentleman come out and indorse him so fully, and ask his attention *once more* to the following words: "I inquire again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of *any* remedy, should involve so many nations with *their infant children in eternal death*, but because such was the will of God." Inst., p. 170. Calvin is not speaking here of pardon from actual sins, or salvation from sins in this life, as Dr. Carson, and the remarks I made upon his words, or being unpardoned and unsaved from their sins and consequently in a lost state in this life, but he is speaking of infants by the FALL OF ADAM, being "INVOLVED *IN* ETERNAL DEATH." Is this a "contemptible scrap?"

We must have a lesson from the Confession to set things right. "The visible church, which is also Catholic or universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with THEIR CHILDREN; and is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ,

the house and family of God, out of which there is no ORDINARY POSSIBILITY OF SALVATION." Con., p. 134. Is

this a "contemptible scrap?" The Kingdom of Christ consists of those who profess the true religion, and their Children. There must be an immense number of *infants out of this church* with the most favorable construction. Well, what of them? For them there is "*no ordinary possibility of salvation!*"

Let us hear the Confession again: "There is no sin so small but it deserves damnation." Confession, p. 82. Are infants sinners according to the Confession? "Original sin is conveyed from our first parents unto their posterity by natural generation, so as all that proceed from them in that way are conceived and born in sin." Larger Cat., p. 184. These little sinners then, by the decree of the Confession, "*deserve damnation,*" though Christ said "*of such is the Kingdom of God.*" The worthy gentleman certainly does not believe this doctrine, but it is because he does not believe his creed. I have plenty more on this head if he is not fully satisfied.

He has given us satisfactory answer on the agency of man. He claims that man is a free agent; but I wish to know how free. Is he simply free to go to hell, without the power to go any place else? The criminal in the hands of the officers is that free. He is free to go to prison, but not to go any place else. Is this what he means by free agency? Can the non-elect serve God? Can they repent? Can they, by any possibility, avoid being *lost forever*? Was it ever, or will it ever be, in their power to serve God? Was it ever, or will it ever be in their power to escape the eternal burnings? Could Adam *have avoided the fall*?

*Mr. Matthews.*—Adam could have avoided the fall.

*Mr. Franklin.*—Calvinism is then virtually renounced. Calvin says, that "Adam *fell by the Divine will;*" and the Confession teaches, that "God unchangeably ordains whatsoever comes to pass." It was therefore, the *will of God, unchangeably ordained, that Adam should fall;* but the worthy gentleman admits that *he could have avoided the fall.* By the *will* of man, both the *decree* and the *will* of God may be broken then? Adam might have avoided both the *decree* and the *will* of God, that he *should fall,* by

obeying the commandment of God! But I cannot see how the *will* or *decree* of God, can so contradict his commandment. He *decreed* and *willed* that Adam *should fall*, and commanded him not to eat the inhibited fruit, by which he might fall as God had willed and *decreed*. There stands poor old innocent Adam, with the devil tempting him to eat and *fall*, according to the *will* and *decree* of God, and the commandment of God forbidding' him to eat.. If he eats he breaks the commandment of God. If he eats not, he breaks the decree of God. There is no alternative for Adam; the decree or the commandment must be broken; for he *must eat* or *not eat*. What a horrible dilemma! It is only equaled by that of the worthy gentleman, in the present instance. If he admits that Adam could have avoided the fall, he admits that the decree of God could be broken, and fail to come to pass. If he had not admitted that Adam could have avoided the fall, he saw that his admission that man is a *free agent*, was a perfect, farce. What to do was the matter. He exercised the very power that we are speaking of, *free agency* or *volition*, and *chose*, of the two horns, the one, as he supposed, that would gore the least. But I press the question upon him, not that he should answer it now, unless he chooses, but when he rises again, whether the non-elect have it in their power to avoid the eternal burnings? This is an awful matter, involving the character of the blessed and glorious Deity. Did he unchangeably ordain a portion of mankind to eternal death—so immutably fix their eternal state, that they *cannot, by any possibility on their part*, avoid., it? If he did, what becomes of their free agency? Remember too, that he did not decree them *to death*, because he *foresaw that they would sin*, but, as Calvin says, "from *no other cause* but to exclude them from the inheritance Predestinated to his children." Who is to blame them?

Does the gentleman quote, "Who art thou that repliest against God?" I am not replying against God, nor to any doctrine that God ever authorized, but to Rev. James Matthews, who is in about as much perplexity as any man I have found in many years. He undertook to make an argument upon the holy attributes of God; but it has sadly turned out that I am compelled to defend these attributes against impeachments of a most shocking



character. God has said, that he "*is no respecter of persons*, but he that feareth him and worketh righteousness In every nation, is accepted of him;" that he "has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but rather that all should come to repentance;" that it is "his will that all men should be saved;" that he stands all the day long, stretching forth his hand, saying, "Look unto me all ye ends of the earth, and be saved;" that he says, "what more could I have done to my vineyard that I have not done in it;" that he says, "Jesus came to seek and save that which was lost;" that Jesus stands inviting: "Come unto me, all you that labor and are heavy laden, and you shall find rest;" that "the Spirit says, come; and the Bride says come, and whosoever will, let him come;" that "Behold now is the accepted time, and the day of salvation," and commands men not to harden their hearts as in the day of provocation, etc., etc. But, notwithstanding all these holy expostulations, with a vast number more, to the same purport, as free to the race of man, as the atmosphere we breathe or the rays of the sun, the worthy gentleman appears vexed with me because he cannot prove that a portion of mankind were from eternity, unchangeably ordained to everlasting death. But, I ask him and this dense congregation, What becomes of the attributes of God, *upon* his hypothesis? And what becomes of the attributes of the Bible, too? He speaks of my making Scripture contradict itself. In this, he is mistaken; it is only Scripture contradicting Calvinism. He has admitted that passages of doubtful import, must not be so construed as to conflict with clear and explicit declarations. The Bible does not conflict with itself, though it does with Calvinism; and I can harmonize any passage he can produce, with my position; but I can produce numerous Scriptures that no man ever did or ever can harmonize with his position.

But he degrades the attributes of the holy and blessed God, beside the shameful absurdities already mentioned, in another point. The Bible everywhere speaks of punishing men *for sin*, but his doctrine destroys the very idea of punishing men for sin, or if it admits it, in form, it destroys it in fact. For it represents the wicked as performing the very sins to which they were unchangeably decreed, and

which they could not possibly avoid. Can a holy and a just God decree men unchangeably to sin, and then, punish them for those very sins which they could not avoid;? Yet this doctrine preaches it whenever it is heard, that God unchangeably decrees men to sin, and then punishes them for doing exactly what he decreed they should do // I have no fear that it can ever injure the name of Mr. Wesley, to read from his own words, his most manifest exposure of this doctrine. It is not that great man that suffers thereby, but Calvinism. Here too, is where my friend's tender sympathies lie. It is not my "veracity at stake," as he informed you, but the *veracity of Calvinism*.

The worthy gentleman promised to be "pleasant and agreeable," but I doubt his keeping this promise, though he says that he has had none other than pleasant and agreeable feelings since this debate commenced. He says, his friends have applauded him, and that they think that he speaks with more animation than common. You who are acquainted with him can judge of these matters better than myself. Is he in the habit, when he is *pleasant and agreeable*, of having such "peculiar feelings," as he spoke of, when pressed for speaking of the world being judged by the Savior in *Ms humanity*? Is it his *pleasant and agreeable style*, to call his opponent a "*demagogue*" and accuse him of *dishonesty*? If this is his manner when he is *pleasant and agreeable*, I must take it in that way, but I had well nigh been led to think he manifested a little of the *old Adam*. I am happy to learn that his friends are pleased with his effort. They certainly should be, for he has done well for so hard a case. When I need some encouragement, in the estimation of my friends, perhaps some one will impart it; and when I think it is necessary to tell it, to encourage any of my friends, it will be time enough to do it. At present, it is not needed, to keep up appearances', on my part. If my worthy friend, in his own estimation, needs material aid of this kind, he can use it without molestation from me.

His proof to sustain the definite number of angels predestinated to everlasting life, is a little difficult to comprehend. One thing I saw, viz: that he did not commence, as he did on the other point, by saying that it was almost in the *precise words of Scripture*, but he commences by ad-

mitting that the Scriptures say but *little about it*, and made his argument almost, if not entirely, independent of Scripture. This is much wiser and better than his former course. It has a sad aspect, to quote so many passages that say not a single word about the subject in hand, He finds "foreordained" in one place, "men" in another, "angels" in another, "everlasting life" in another, "before the foundation of the world" in another, and the "definite number" *nowhere*, thus clearly making out the doctrine in *almost the precise words* of Scripture! This is only equaled by the man who said, he could prove, by Scripture, that it was right for a man to hang himself. When called upon to do it, said he, "Judas went and hung himself, and the Scripture says, 'Go thou, and do likewise.'" Here was proof clear, without patching together half the number of passages the gentleman has on this occasion, and equally as conclusive. It is a likely presumption, that the spirit of all wisdom was laboring, in all these passages, to teach the doctrine of the gentleman's creed, but could express it no more clearly than it is found in any one of these Scriptures, nor is it anymore likely that the Lord would attempt to reveal such a doctrine, by dark allusions to it, in passages where he was always clearly speaking of something else!

We have an awful lesson on those doctrines, almost in the language of God. There was a clause in the first law ever given to man, that said, "Of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, thou mayst not eat of it, for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." An expounder came along with a doctrine almost in the precise words of the Scripture, only varying in a single word. His doctrine was, "Thou shalt *not* surely die." This was much nearer the language of Scripture, than the article under consideration, but had *the fall of the world in it*. I am awfully afraid of those doctrines so near in the language of Scripture, and not the language of Scripture itself. They are the most dangerous counterfeits, that so nearly resemble the genuine. But I think but few who hear this debate, will ever take the doubtful paper we are disputing about, in the place of the genuine—the Scripture.

The worthy gentleman is back on the Foreknowledge of

God again. His argument sounds so much of a piece with some I have heard from Universalians and skeptics, that I must give you a specimen. The Universalist says, God has power to save all men; if you say, then, that he *cannot save all men*, you deny his omnipotence. He is infinite in goodness; if you say, he is not willing to save all men you *deny* his benevolence. But when you admit his infinite goodness, you admit that he is *willing to save all*. When you admit his infinite power, you admit *his power to save all*. If then, he has the power and is *willing*, he will save all. I have seen such triumphantly exclaim, how can you avoid the conclusion?

Deists argue, from the attributes of God, that he could not have created myriads of human being's knowing that they would sin and be lost forever; that he could not have sent an army to destroy the Canaanites, etc., etc. But nothing can be proved by these wild and fanatical speculations, only that he who uses them is led away from the "sure word of the prophesy." Suppose God did foreknow all things, does it follow therefore, that he is the *cause of all things*? or may he not foreknow some things that are contrary to his will? It is God's *will* that some men should pray everywhere, but did he not know that they would not do it? Cannot the Omniscient see what a free and an accountable being will do?

I do not see why the gentleman accuses me of being proud of my powers of argument. I believe I said nothing about it. He is quite mistaken, if he entertains any such notion. I rejoice in the Lord's blessed truth, which can be sustained by a candid and honorable course of argument, and needs nothing else.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' FIFTEENTH ADDRESS.

*Saturday, 9 ½ o'clock, A.M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—

*Fellow Citizens*—I wish to express my obligations to Mr. Franklin for allowing me to occupy more time than the three days allotted me, in order that I may finish my argument on the clause of the Confession now before us. Though I fancied that his permission was given very reluctantly, still he has consented to an extension of the time, and is therefore entitled to our thanks.

The next clause of the Confession which is condemned by the gentleman in his Sermon, is thus expressed:

"And others, (i. e. angels and men), foreordained to everlasting death."

This is the point now before us. Before however, entering into an argument upon the subject, I wish to make a distinction between the *efficacious* and *permissive* decrees of God; a distinction which Calvinists always make, but a distinction which the gentleman, like other opposers of Calvinism, always overlooks or denies. Had the gentleman borne this distinction in mind, more than half of his abuse of Calvinism, as a horrid doctrine, might have been spared.

There are some things which God brings about by his own agency. He exerts a positive influence in causing them to come to pass. Of this nature is the act of creating the world. Of this nature, too, is the work of new creating saints in Christ Jesus. These works, God brings to pass by the exertion of a positive influence securing their existence. This influence he puts forth in accordance with a purpose; and a purpose which he has had from eternity. The purpose of God with respect to such acts is a positive decree.

But there are other events, of another nature. There are events which come to pass in consequence of the abuse of the freedom which God has conferred upon the creature; such as the first fall, and all other sinful acts of angels and men. These acts are, *in themselves considered*; contrary to God's will, and prohibited by his law. And yet, *a 11 things considered*, God does not see fit to interpose his omnipotence, as he certainly could, to prevent their occurrence. He wills to permit them to occur. He *determines* to permit them to occur. He always has determined to permit them to occur. This determination to permit such acts to occur is what we mean by *God's permission, decree*.

God *permitted* Adam to fall. He might have prevented the fall, had he so chosen, for he is Almighty; but he did not choose to prevent it. He determined to permit it. From eternity he had determined to permit it, intending to overrule it for his own glory.

God *permitted* the crucifixion of Christ. He could have sent legions of angels and delivered him from the hands

of his foes; but he permitted them to exert their malice to the utmost in putting him to death. They could have had no power at all, against him, unless it had been given them from above. God always had intended to permit this most, atrocious crime to take place. The Lamb of God was slain from the foundation of the world.

In one sense, then, every sin is against the will of Go. In another sense, no sin takes place, but by the permission of God; for he might have hindered all sin by an exercise of his omnipotent power.

When the gentleman makes a great ado therefore, about my renouncing Calvinism, because I say that Adam was free to stand or fall, and that no positive influence *was* exerted upon him by the decree of God, to compel him to fall; he only betrays the most lamentable ignorance of the doctrine which he pretends to discuss. Why, every *child*, brought up by Calvinistic discipline, knows that "our first parents were *left to the freedom of their own will.*"

Let this distinction, then, be borne in mind. The things that God does by a positive agency, he always purposed to do. This is a positive decree. The things which God *permits* to be done, by the agency of second causes, he always purposed to permit. This is his permissive decree. I will now proceed with my argument.

Before entering upon the work of creation, God certainly knew that if men and angels were created with certain powers, and placed in certain circumstances, they would certainly sin, and bring upon themselves everlasting ruin. The gentleman dare not deny this. Yet knowing certainly that this would be the result, God did create them with those powers, and place them in these circumstances. Can any one deny this self-evident truth?

God then, from eternity decreed to permit the fall of men and angels. But he determined that all should not perish in their sins. Viewing man as fallen, he purposed to deliver "a great multitude whom no man" can number from the guilt and power of sin, and to bring them, eventually, to the enjoyments of the heavenly world. The rest of mankind, not embraced in this great multitude, God leaves, and always determined to leave, in their fallen condition, and finally to inflict upon them the punishment which their sins deserve. *This purpose to inflict punishment upon the*

*fallen angels, and upon wicked men, being an eternal purpose, is their foreordination to eternal death.*

That there is such a purpose in the divine mind, we argue:

1. From the fact that God does actually leave the fallen angels, and a portion of the human family, in their sins; and does inflict everlasting punishment upon them for their sins.

Does the gentleman deny this? *He dare not.* He has fought the Universalists on divers occasions, as I am given to understand, and I cannot allow him to turn Universalist now. He must allow that, *in fact,* God does not save all men, nor the fallen angels; that he *does* condemn them to eternal death. *Now since God actually does this, he always purposed to do it.* God forms no new purposes. Whatever he does in time, he purposed to do from all eternity. And if it does not shock us to believe that God *does* certain acts; neither should we be shocked at the doctrine that God *always intended* to do those acts.

But, 2. I agree that "some men and angels are foreordained to everlasting death," because the Scriptures do expressly affirm the fact.

What! do the Scriptures teach that the fallen angels are foreordained to everlasting punishment? They do. Hear a few passages; "Everlasting fire, *prepared for the devil and his angels.*" Matt. xxv, 41. God did not prepare this place of punishment for devils without a fixed determination to consign them to it.

"God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." 2 Pet. ii, 4. Is their punishment in Tartarus to be eternal? The gentleman so believes. Did God *intend* to send them thither, or were they sent by accident? God intended it. Now *when* did he form this intention? Will the gentleman venture to tell us? Was it *previous* to the carrying of it into effect? If so, as he must admit, this previous intention of consigning the fallen angels to Tartarus, is a foreordination of them to everlasting death.

"The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."

Jude vi. Since God keeps them confined in a place of torment, we must believe that he *intends* to punish them; and as all the intentions of God are eternal, we have here an eternal purpose to punish the fallen angels; and this is a pre-appointment, or a foreordination to everlasting death.

But as the Scriptures teach that God has foreordained any of the human family to everlasting death? Listen:

"The Lord hath made all things for himself: yea, even, the wicked for the day of evil." Prov. xvi, 4. Learned critics inform us that the Hebrew word employed here, is not the word commonly used to denote *creation*; but that the sense is, the Lord hath appointed, or ordained the wicked for the day of evil. The word *poieo*, is used in the same sense in the New Testament. "He made (*epoiese*) i. e., ordained twelve." Mark iii, 14. "Faithful to him that made, or appointed him." Heb. iii, 2. The sense then is, that God hath ordained or appointed all things for himself, or for his own glory; yes, he has even ordained the wicked for the day of evil.

"Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured, with much long-suffering, the vessels of wrath, fitted to destruction." Rom. ix) 21, 22. In this passage all mankind are represented as being by nature in the same moral condition; they are all alike guilty and depraved. But a great difference afterward appears. Some are delivered from this corrupt mass. Others are left in the same wretched condition still. Who has made this difference? The Apostle here, and elsewhere, traces the matter back to God, who has a sovereign right to dispose of his creatures as he pleases. If he chooses to leave some to perish in their sins, he has a right so to do, and he inflicts no injustice upon any. If from the same guilty mass, he makes some vessels unto honor, no one has a right to reply against God. But here is the point: He leaves some in their sins, and he will punish them for their sins. Whatever he does he purposed to do beforehand. Therefore, he purposed beforehand to leave them to reap the reward of their own doings. And this is what the Confession means by preordination to wrath.



"Them which stumble at the word, being disobedient, *whereunto also they were appointed.*" 1 Peter, ii, 7, 8.

"For there are certain men crept in unawares, *who were before of old, ordained to this condemnation,*" Jude iv.: Comment on such passages, could not make them more explicit. "Whose names are not written in the book of life." Rev. xiii, 8. So it seems, some have not their names written in the Lamb's book of life; they are not of his sheep; they are left to themselves; they perish in their sins. But some names are enrolled in that book, and enrolled "from the foundation of the world." Chap, xvii, 8. Here is a distinction, then, *made in eternity*, before ever the earth was. Some names are written, and some names *are not* written in the book of life. What is the inference? Surely that these last, God determined to leave in their sins, and to consign to merited punishment. "Oh! the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out."

I have thus, item by item, with a single exception, gone over the 3d section of this 3d chapter of the Confession, and have shown its entire conformity to the teachings of the Bible, the gentleman's assertion to the contrary, notwithstanding. That exception is the item which states that the decree of God respecting angels and men, is for the manifestation of his glory. On this I will make a single remark. The promotion of the glory of God is the greatest good that any object can achieve. God in all his works has reference to this. Otherwise, he would neglect the highest good for an inferior. The Scriptures, also, are explicit on this point. "*That lie, might make known the riches of his glory, on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory.*" Rom. ix, 23. "The Lord hath made, or ordained all things for himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil." Prov. xvi, 4.

In conclusion, I remark upon this section, that it is scriptural in form, scriptural in substance, scriptural in idea, scriptural in language. And the assertion that it does not contain the doctrine of the Bible, nor anything like it, was either made for effect—*vox et preterea nihil*, mere noise, and nothing more—or it is a remarkable

evidence of the blinding power of prejudice, and the opposition of man's heart to the humbling truths of God's word.

The extracts from Calvin and the Confession, I will attend to after I conclude my arguments. For the present this must be my main concern.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S FIFTEENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

*Respected hearers*—My worthy friend is so addicted to opposing Free Grace, that he is hardly willing to enjoy it when it is bestowed upon him, without insinuations that it was reluctantly granted. He made, as you will recollect, on last evening, the almost unprecedented request, that I should allow him still further time, as his work was *not done*, though the time agreed upon in our rules was out. This request was left to the moderators; but as he had no 'right to it according' to our rules, they were not willing to act upon a mere matter of courtesy. The question fell back upon myself to decide. He claimed no more time by *right, works, or law*, but as a matter purely of *free grace, of mercy*. In this case, notwithstanding the hardness of his heart in opposing *free grace*, I acted in the same spirit that the Lord has shown to me, *freely granting* it when sought. I did this purely out of compassion, seeing that his time had expired, and he knowing that his work was not done, plead, as I thought, humbly, for a *little more time* as a matter of *grace, of mercy*. But now he shows his ingratitude in saying that I *did it reluctantly*. He is mistaken in this. I wished the same, by extending this grace to him, that the Lord intended in giving free grace to the world, to leave him *without excuse*. But now that this grace has been extended, the greater will be his condemnation if he does not prove his doctrine.

The gentleman presumes much upon my "*ignorance*" If Calvinism fares so badly in such ignorant hands, it is hard to see what the consequences would be, if it should ever fall into the hands of a well informed man! It would be scattered to the four winds certainly! But my position is withstanding the opposition of a most learned and able opponent, with no defense except the little aid such as my

"ignorance can afford. Truth is stronger in the hands of the *ignorant*, than error in the hands of the *learned*. God has "chosen the *weak things* of this world to confound the *'mighty*." This is one of God's evidences of the Divinity of his cause.

My worthy friend has split his decrees in two. One half he calls "*permissive* decrees," the other half "*positive* decrees." This, he informs us, is a distinction made by Calvinists, and if I had *known it*, I would not have abused the doctrine as I have done. I leave it to the audience whether I have used abusive language. The truth is, he 'feels as if Calvinism is abused when I read it from his own 'authorities. But he now says, God determined to permit Adam to fall. How then could Adam have *avoided the fall*? Where is the difference between his *unchangeably determining to permit* him to fall, and *positively decreeing* that he should fall? He now admits that Adam could have *avoided that very fall*, which God unchangeably determined to permit to occur.

"Does he now intend to come out and define *the "permissive decrees "* of God, to be no more than God foreseeing what a *free agent*, exercising the full manner of *volition* or *choice* will do, and that Adam, and all others to whom God has spoken, can *avoid disobedience* and consequently *punishment* and *be saved*? If he does, then there is no Calvinism in it. It is Free Grace; the very doctrine that I cannot get him to confess true. Why is his *tongue tied* when I ask him, if all sinners now to whom the word of God is preached, *can turn to God, can believe, repent and be saved*? Why can he not answer, when I ask him, *if they can by any possibility avoid hell*? Is it simply a *permissive* decree, that the non-elect should go to hell? Then why can I not induce him to admit that they could avoid it? If they cannot avoid it, who is to blame for their being lost? Will Almighty God punish them in the fire that shall never be quenched for falling into a hell they never had it in their power to avoid? ' Are the non-elect decreed to wrath by a *permissive* or a *positive* decree?

If the gentleman means, when he says, that "God determined to permit the fall of men and angels," that he determined to create them free moral agents, with the power to *obey* or *disobey*, and thus be *happy* or *miserable*

I have no objection to it, save that I am not bound to prove that it was "from eternity" that he determined this. I do not know when he determined, further than that it must have been before the creation of man. I am so *ignorant* that I cannot throw much light on the works of God back in eternity. I do not know anything further back than we read of in the Bible. Things back of that, my opponents must unfold. But I say, if he intends to say, that God determined to create man a free moral agent, with power to *obey* or *disobey*, and if man, thus endowed with the power of *choice* or *volition*, should listen to the Tempter, be voluntarily led into sin, sin which he has admitted he could have avoided, that God would thus permit him to *sin* and *fall*, I have no objection. But in this case, I see no use in all our speculations about this previous *determination* and *permission*. It is merely like the printed "two lines which look so solemn, put in to fill up the column."

But I now call upon the gentleman, to show, that when the grace of God came, he designed to pass by any portion of the human race, without offering it freely to all. I deny this in the roundest terms. This is no small matter, to cut off a part of the human race from the grace of God. I call for the proof. It is a great matter, and if there is one word in the Bible to that effect, I should like to see it. What sins will God punish them for? For rejecting Christ? It is not possible, for Christ was never offered to them, with power to receive him. What sins, I demand of the gentleman, are they to be punished for? Not for rejecting the love of God, for he never loved them. Not for rejecting the blood of Christ, for it was not shed for them. Not for rejecting the grace of God, for it was never extended to them.

I shall now proceed with "my independent argument against Calvinistic Predestination. My arguments already advanced in this series, are the following:

1st. The original intention or purpose of God, as set forth both in the Bible and the Confession.

2d. The promise to Abraham: "In thee shall all nations be blessed."

3d. The testimonies of the Prophets concerning this blessing for all nations.

4th. The testimony of John the Baptist, that Christ

is "the light of the world," that "the world through him might believe."

5th. The love of God—he loves all the world, and has exhibited his love to all the world.

6th. The death of Christ—he died for all, that they through him might live—he rose from the dead and secured a resurrection for all.

7th. The propitiation for all. If the Divine Father only intended preparing salvation for a part of mankind, he surely would not have made a propitiation for all the world. But this he has done. To the law and to the testimony we appeal. What says the word of God? Says Paul: "I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for Kings and all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." 1 Tim. ii, 1—6. This passage was never written by a man holding the partial doctrine of my friend, for several reasons: 1. He exhorts to "pray for *all men*." It would certainly be wrong to pray God to bless those whom God had ordained to wrath, for the "praise of his glorious grace." This would be praying against the ordination of God. Yet, I believe Calvinists are in the habit of praying for thousands whom they believe to be reprobates. This is praying against the decree of God. They labor to convert reprobates to God; this is laboring in direct opposition to the express decree of God. What a blind system!—to keep the servants of God praying for, and laboring to convert millions whom God reprobated to everlasting death before the world. Is this the way Calvinists do the will of God, praying and laboring against the express will and decree of God? But it is clearly stated in this passage, that it is the will of God that all men should be saved. This no Calvinist can be induced to admit, unless pressed by some Universalist, as in the case of Dr. Rice, when he said this passage "explained the *benevolent design of God to save all men*," The

worthy gentlemen dare not contradict Dr. Rice, for this would be preaching "all sorts of doctrine," or at least, *two sorts* in direct contradiction to each other. Does he intend to let this statement of Dr. Rice pass without any notice? I insist that he shall tell this people how he gets over this matter! The passage in Timothy goes further, and declares that "Christ gave himself a ransom *for all*, to be testified in due time." Why did Paul exhort the Disciples to *pray for all men*; tell them that it was the will of God that "*all men should be saved*," and that "he gave himself a ransom *for all*," if he had ordained a large portion of them to wrath before the foundation of the world? Can any man tell? But I proceed to another witness. "We have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." 1 John iv, 14. In this passage, Christ is declared to be the Savior of the world, and not merely the Savior of an elect few. Let us hear John again, 1 John ii, 2: "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Here it is, in so many words, declared that Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*. God has, then, made a propitiation for the sins of the whole world; which is a strange affair if he, before the world, ordained a portion of the world to everlasting death!

8. I found my next argument on the object of Christ's mission into the world. I shall go to no creed or human production to find that object, but to the Lord's own words. Let us hear him: "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost." Is this a fair statement of the object of his mission? Does the worthy gentleman believe that our Lord *came to save that which was lost*? If he does not, he should pray, as he has directed: "Lord, help thou *mine unbelief*." If he does believe this, then the question comes up, who were lost. The Scripture says, "He hath concluded them *all in unbelief*," and the gentleman himself has argued that all are lost. Well, the same that were lost, he *came to save*. The same that were under condemnation, he came to offer justification,

But the worthy gentleman will inquire, if he came to save all will not all be saved? I believe he has already given some intimations that he should have to go over to Uni-

versalism, if I show him that it was the will of God to save all. But for a reason on this point, I refer him to the same Scripture quoted by Dr. Rice, to meet the Universalists on the same point. "How often would I have gathered your children as a hen gathers her chickens, but *ye would not.*" This reason I shall elaborate more fully hereafter. For the present, let us ascertain beyond dispute, from the oracles of God, what God sent his Son into the world for. The following passage states, first, what he *did not send him for*, and then, what he *did send him for*. "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that *the world through him might he saved.*" John iii, 17. It is not only stated, that the *world, through him might be saved*, but that this was the object of his mission into the world. Calvinism defeats this object, as far as it has influence, by denying that "*the world through him might be saved.*" How beautifully this agrees with that statement, preceding the verse containing one of the gentleman's proof-texts, Acts xiii, 47: "For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth."

This is then, the object of the Lord's mission; to "save that which was lost;" "that the world through him might be saved;" that "he should be set for salvation to the ends of the earth." This grand, glorious and benevolent object, Calvinism denies, opposes and ridicules, as I think, thus clearly ridiculing and denying the great object of the mission of Christ. Calvinism is the doctrine that men should shed tears for preaching! But is it, not said, in the very next verse to your last proof-text, the Lord ordained some to eternal life before the foundation of the world? No, nor anything like it. There is not one word about the "*Lord ordaining,*" in the passage, nor is there one word about any ordaining "*before the world.*" The ordaining, as justly remarked by Wesley, took place when they believed; and there is not an intimation that the Lord ordained them at that. I ask for no new translation, but one just like you have of the same Greek word (*tattoo* or *tassoo*,) in two other instances in the common version. 1 Cor. xvi, 15: "They have *addicted* themselves to the ministry of the saints " or "ordained *themselves* to the ministry of the

saints," Again: "For I am a man *set under* authority," or "ordained to authority." In one case they ordained *themselves* and in the other they were ordained by *men*. The passage before us is as plain as either of these. When the people heard the saying of the prophet announced, "I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth," the "Gentiles glorified the word of the Lord, and as many as *were disposed* for eternal life believed. As I see it stated, in a foot note, in the comprehensive commentary, by the editor, "It would seem we must look elsewhere for the doctrine of absolute election."—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' SIXTEENTH ADDRESS.

*Saturday, 10 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I WAS well convinced, fellow citizens, at a very early period in my correspondence with the gentleman, that a fair and full discussion of the doctrines of our Confession, as set forth in the extract quoted in his Sermon, was very far from his desire. He manifested so strong a partiality for general and indefinite terms, in the proposition he proposed for discussion; so great a desire to stand on the affirmative, so that he might lead the way; and especially so fixed an aversion to extend the time to six days, which I thought necessary, to do justice to the subject, that I was fully convinced that a thorough canvassing of all the arguments, *pro* and *con*, was the farthest from his intention. His course, since the discussion began, has not changed this impression. I have the affirmative on the present proposition; it is my duty to lead the way, and offer arguments in support of my proposition, and his duty to meet those arguments and refute them if he can. Has he done this? Has he pretended to do it? Not at all. But taking advantage of the deep-seated prejudice of many persons against certain doctrines, because they have always heard them misrepresented and caricatured, it has been his chief, and indeed, I may say almost his sole study, to appeal to this prejudice, and excite hostile feelings against a doctrine, the positive proofs of which he cannot set aside. In order to this, he has misrepresented our views, charged



doctrines upon us which we never thought of maintaining, and, in every way possible, has sought to divert attention from the argument upon the real points of controversy. And this he has done, not when his own proposition is before us, and when I would have an opportunity fully to expose his dishonorable arts; but, knowing that I had my own line of argument to pursue; that my hands were tied, and therefore, that he would have little or no reply, he has gone on in his course of perversion, misrepresentation, and abuse.

But the matter is all explained now. The gentleman has only been acting in accordance with a previous plan. I this morning received a letter from a gentleman who was on the boat with my opponent as he came to this place, and who heard him tell what his plan of operations would be. He would come out very strong, and make a decided impression at the outset. He would show me that he did not regard me at all. And even so has he tried to conduct himself. But I can tell the gentleman that he is in for a thorough investigation of the subject. He shall not get off to-night as he wishes. I intend, before I let him off, to make him very sick of his bargain.

He says that he "*freely granted*" me time in which to conclude my argument! You who noticed his hesitancy, when I made the request; the shuffling proposal to refer to the audience, or the moderators what he alone had the right to grant; the fluttering and shaking of heads by some of his brethren. *You* can testify how freely this request was granted. All! the truth is, it was *wrung* from him by a dread of public sentiment. This community knew that my proposition was enlarged by the gentleman himself; that he tacked on it the doctrine of the Confession, which I wished confined to the second proposition. And if he now refused me time to get through my argument, he knew that public sentiment would condemn his course; and that all would see that a dread of a thorough discussion prompted it. This was the cause of such a magnanimous display of "free grace" in acceding to my request; a "free grace," which, like Arminian free grace, always turns out, on examination, to be just no grace at all.

But my time expired, and my work was not done, my doctrine not proved! Yes, and there are two reasons for

it. 1. I was compelled to spend nearly two days in begging, entreating, supplicating, and beseeching him not to leave his poor, deserted, friendless bantling, this Sermon, to the tender mercies of the wicked; but to stand up to it, and defend the doctrines which it taught. 2. The proofs of my doctrine from reason, and revelation, are *so numerous*, that I found it impossible to compress them into the time that remained. But I am now wasting' precious moments that ought to be devoted to the prosecution of my argument. Nothing but the disingenuous course of the gentleman, would have called forth this exposure.

I now call your attention to the next section of the Confession:

IV. "These angels and men, thus predestinated and Foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is So certain and definite, that it cannot; be either increased or diminished."

The hardest task that any man ever undertook is, to prove a self-evident truth. Des Cartes undertook to prove his own existence, but his argument is a miserable failure. The difficulty in proving such propositions is, that, the proposition to be proved is plainer than any argument that you can adduce to prove it. This section of the Confession, to my mind, approximates to truths of this description. And yet the preliminary correspondence, and the past speeches of the gentleman, would lead us to believe that he considers this the vulnerable point. Well, perhaps on *this* point he will attempt an argument. We shall see, what we shall see. In the meantime permit me to observe,:

1. It is *not* meant that any man can know his own election, except *by* his possessing that character which the grace of God produces in all the elect. Nor that any man can know that he is not elected, unless he has fully? and finally, made up his mind to neglect the great salvation of the Gospel. Nay, even in such a case, we might still hope that the grace of God would reach him, and change his determination. For,

"While the lamp holds out to burn,

The vilest sinner may return."

2. It is not meant that any human being knows, either the number, or persons of the elect; or, that any one, minister of the Gospel, or not, should act as if he could tell

who the elect are. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us, and to our children forever." ' The section has no reference, therefore, to man's knowledge, but to God's. And it asserts that *with God there is no uncertainty as to the number of the finally saved, and lost / that he knows, and ever has known, who and what they are.* That this is true appears,

1. From the very nature of the case. It is now certain that some of the human race will believe the Gospel and be saved. It is equally certain that others will not believe it, and be lost. It is now certain, with respect to each individual in this house, that he will be either saved, or lost, I speak not now of the *cause* of that certainty; nor of the *knowledge* of the fact by any being; but I insist that as it is a certain truth, that each individual will be either saved or lost, so it is now certain, with respect to each, whether he will be saved or lost. Of course, then, the number, both of saved and lost, is so certain that it cannot be increased or diminished. Otherwise, some of whom it is certain that they will be saved, might be lost; and some of whom it is certain that they will be lost, might be saved; which is absurd.

2. I argue from the attributes of God, that this section is true. He is *omniscient*. He knows all things. Therefore, he knows to-day what the future history, and final doom of each individual shall be. If he were ignorant of what the future and final condition of any soul shall be, he is not omniscient; he is not God. But what God certainly knows to be future, certainly is future. To *certainly foreknow* an event, which is *uncertain*, implies a contradiction and an absurdity. God, then, certainly foreknows the final destiny of every individual of the race; that destiny must be fixed, else it could not be certainly foreknown. Therefore in the omniscience of God, the persons finally saved and lost, "are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished."

3. I argue the truth of this section, from certain Scriptures that *imply* it. Though two sparrows are sold for a farthing, "one of them shall not fall on the ground without our Father." Matt. x, 29. If the omniscience and

universal providence of God extend to the fall of a sparrow, can we suppose the final fate of angels and men, undetermined by him? "The very hairs of your head are all numbered." Verse 30. Since God knows the number of our hairs, I think it will hardly be disputed that he knows the number of his intelligent creatures. And of these, he knows who are his chosen ones, and who are not. Now, since there can be no *uncertainty* in the Divine knowledge, the number of those thus known, must be certain and definite.

The Scriptures also teach that man's "days are determined, the number of his months are with God, he has determined his bounds that he cannot pass." Job xiv, 6, "He hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." Acts xvii, 26. Does the knowledge of God, and the determinations of God, extend to the earthly condition of each individual, and shall God have no knowledge, and no purpose respecting man's filial state? Does he care more for time than eternity? Does he exercise a more watchful control over man's earthly condition, than over his eternal destiny?

But 4. The truth of this section appears from *express declarations* of the word of God.

"The Lord knows them that are his." 2 Tim. ii, 19. "I know my sheep, and am known of mine." John x, 14; "I know whom I have chosen." John xiii, 18. To show the accuracy, the particularity, and certainty of this knowledge, God's people are described as having their names registered in a book. "Thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." Dan. xii, 1. The connection shows that it is an eternal deliverance that is promised. "Your names are written in heaven." Luke x, 20. "Whose names are in the book of life." Phil, iv, 8. "The general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven." Heb. xii, 23. "There shall in nowise enter into it—the New Jerusalem—anything that defileth, \* \* *but they which are written in the Lamb's Book of Life.*" Rev. xxi, 27.

Now the distinct personal knowledge of each of God's own peculiar people, which these passages clearly teach, necessarily *implies* that those, *not* his people, are also distinctly known. But I rest not upon this implication, clear

as it is. We have direct testimony upon this point. "Verily I say unto you I know you not;" Matt. xxv, 12; i. e. I know you not as of my sheep; I know you not as my people, which ye wish to be thought by calling me Lord, Lord. "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life, of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. xiii, 8. "And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life, from the foundation of the world," Rev. xvii, 8.

Here, then, we have two distinct classes of persons, each well-defined. Some whose names *are* in the book of life, from the foundation of the world; others whose names were not written in the book of life, from the foundation of the world. The one chosen; the other not chosen. The one his sheep, the other not his sheep. All these descriptions implying what was previously certain from the omniscience of God, and from the nature of the case, that the number of the elect, and non-elect is so certain and definite, that it can neither be increased nor diminished.

I do not wish to appear as triumphing over the gentleman who is so unfortunate as to be found battling against the impregnable fortress of God's own truth; but I do say, in all meekness, yet in the confidence of a man who feels his feet upon a firm foundation, I do say, I challenge special attention to the argument upon this point. I defy the gentleman fairly to meet it, and show that it is unsound in itself, or misapplied to the case before us.

One word on the gentleman's Greek criticism. Save the mark! In the passage he quotes, the verb is in the *active voice*, followed by the reciprocal pronoun *heautous*, and is properly rendered, they "addicted themselves;" but in Acts xiii, 48, the verb is in *fas passive voice*, and denotes that the action indicated by the verb was performed upon the subjects by another. They did not ordain themselves, "they *were ordained* to eternal life," The gentleman's criticism here is about as accurate as his logic, when he quotes Wesley as authority to decide a case in which he is one of the parties litigant.—'[Time expired.]

**MR. FRANKLIN'S SIXTEENTH REPLY.**

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I HAVE carefully listened to the argument of my opponent touching the "definite number of men and angels," and I am satisfied of one thing, as I have no doubt this audience is, viz: That he was perfectly correct in saying that there "was but little in the Bible about the *definite number*." What passage has he quoted that says anything about it? Can any man here think of one passage that says anything about it? Is there a passage in the Bible that proves that "these angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." I do not believe this doctrine, or anything like it, is taught in the Bible, and I challenge him to produce a passage that he is willing to rely upon to prove this doctrine, and pledge myself to join issue with him upon it, and show that this doctrine is not contained in it. And if he cannot, as I am assured is the case, find a single passage in the Bible teaching it, he is bound in all fairness to give it up.

He admitted in the forepart of the debate that the case of Jacob and Esau, did not mean that Esau was ordained to eternal death, or Jacob to eternal life; but now he is back quoting that very case and applying it to the eternal state. He has become so habituated to a certain routine, that he quotes it whether it has any bearing on the case or not. Turn over and look at it, if you please. Rom. ix, 11, 13: "For the children not being yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Now, the decree of the Confession is unto *everlasting life* and *everlasting death*. But there is not one word about everlasting life or everlasting death in the passage, nor in the 9th chap, of Rom. How, I ask, can a passage prove anything about everlasting life and everlasting death that does not say one word about either? "That the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;" that is not of the

works of the law of Moses, for it was long before the law was given, and could not, therefore, be *by* it, or the works required in it. Well, what purpose does he here refer to? What did God do, that his purpose might stand? Paul says, "He said unto Rebecca, the elder shall serve the younger." This has reference to an earthly transaction, and not at all to the eternal state. Not only so, but there is not a word about angels in any shape or form in the passage. How does it, then, prove the doctrine of the Confession? It has the word "purpose" in it. So it has, but I defy any man to show that it is the same as the "purpose" of the Confession, nay, I think I can show that it was a transcendently better purpose, if the gentleman, wishes it. But the word "election" is in the passage. So it is, but not election unto everlasting life or everlasting death, and therefore, not to the point. There is no better assurance that a man has no clear proof than to see him quoting things that have no reference to the point.

He has found the "fire prepared for the devil and his angels." What does that prove? That a fire was *prepared* for the devil and his angels. But it does not show *when it was prepared*, whether before or since they sinned, nor does it say anything about any *definite number*. I ask, then, what it proves? But there is a passage that speaks of "elect angels." There is; but not one word about their being elected to *everlasting life*, or what, nor the time when they were elected. All this the gentleman guesses at, and wishes us to consider it proof.

My friend has come to Jude iv, to those who were "before of old ordained to this condemnation." It is a wonder the gentleman did not give us his usual objections against New Translation. I suppose he forgot it. I must insist on his listening to a few other translations, to show how uniformly they agree upon it.

1. John Wesley, "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were of old described, with regard to this condemnation."

2. The Douay Bible, "For there have crept in, some men" (who were written of long ago unto this judgment).

3. Geo. Campbell, "For certain men have come in privily, who long ago were before written to this very condemnation."

4. Wm. Jenks says, "But what if our translators had thought fit to render the word in the original, '*of old forewritten of,*' as persons who would, through their own sins and folly, become the proper subjects of this condemnation." Com. Com. under the passage.

5. Bloomfield says, "The expression, therefore, does not imply any *Predestination* of the persons, but merely imports that they were long since *foretold*, and thereby designated as persons who should suffer." Com. Commentary

It must be a hard doctrine to prove, that requires so many arguments that prove nothing. If he will furnish one good argument, I will be silenced; but it only satisfies me the more that I am right, to find so many appeals to Scripture, saying nothing to the point. His proof must contain the *terms of the proposition* or others of the *same import*. Those he has produced, contain neither.

The gentleman cannot see why I am not a Universalist, as I believe God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; that it is the will of God that all men should be saved; that he takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked; that he loves all; that Christ died for all; that Jesus is set for salvation to the ends of the earth; that his tender mercies are over all his works, etc., etc., etc. If, however, he will not regard it invidious for one so "ignorant" as myself, to attempt to enlighten a mind already so fully stored with knowledge as his own, I will proceed to give him a few reasons in this case.

1. The reason given by Paul, why some "once enlightened," who had "tasted of the heavenly gift," were made "partakers of the Holy Ghost;" had "tasted the good word of God;" felt the "power of the world, to come," and were "sanctified by the blood of the covenant;" I say, the reason given by Paul, why such should not be saved, or rather should suffer a sorer punishment than death without mercy, is given in the words, "IF THEY SHALL FALL AWAY;" "IF WE SIN WILLFULLY." Heb. vi, 6, and x, 26.

2. "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." From this passage we learn that one member of the church, by a factious spirit about eating meat, may lead a brother, for whom Christ died, astray, cause him to



sin, and thereby *destroy him*. This is the reason why it is such a dangerous thing to preach heresy—it may *destroy some for whom Christ died*.

3. " But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers also among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction." These persons the Lord loved, bought them with his own blood, and was not willing that they should perish. Why were they destroyed? By their heresy, they BROUGHT UPON THEMSELVES SWIFT DESTRUCTION. Here again is the danger of heresy. Heresy could do no harm, if Calvinism were true.

4. "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! how often would I have gathered your children," etc. In this case, the Lord was willing to save them. Why were they not saved? He answers, "but YE WOULD NOT." Here stands the reason; and here it will stand in the great day of God Almighty.

5. "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth them to repentance?" Here the Apostle sets forth the riches of the goodness of God; his forbearance and long-suffering, as being designed to lead certain wicked persons to repentance, whom he speaks of in the very next verse, as "treasuring up to themselves wrath against the day of wrath." How could the goodness of God lead them to repentance, if he had never been good to them? No man in creation can show how this can be, nor can any man show that, according' to Calvinism, God has ever been good to the non-elect. But God had been good to the persons spoken of, Rom. ii, 4; and Paul argued his goodness as a reason why they should repent, although they were what my friend would style reprobates. The reason why they are appointed to wrath, is that they *despised the goodness of God*, in the place of being led by it to repentance.

6. " He that overcometh shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels." Rev. iii, 5. None but the elect certainly ever had their names in the book of life. God loved these. Christ died for them. They had believed, repented,

and it was the will of God that they should be saved. But still, it is shown that their names might be blotted out of the book of life. For what reason? Through negligence, *failing to overcome*.

7. "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord; looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God." Heb. xii, 14, 15. Here it is seen that persons may fail of the grace of God. But none only persons that God loved, that Christ died for, and those who have the grace of God, can fail of it. Such as these would be elect persons with Calvinists, and such can *fail of the grace of God*. For what reason can *such* fail of the grace of God? For want of *holiness and peaceful lives*.

8. "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." John xvii, 2. Here were persons given to Christ One of these persons was lost. See verse 17. For what reason was he lost? "He BY TRANSGRESSION TELL." See Acts i, 25. His name was Judas Iscariot.

9. "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away." 1 Cor. ix, 27. Here we have a man, beyond all dispute, for whom Christ died, whom God loved, who had received grace and apostleship, but who confesses that he *might be a castaway*. By what means, or for what reason? *For not keeping his body under subjection*; a reason, as I solemnly believe, for which thousands for whom Christ died, will be lost.

10. "Yet you say, the way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel; is not my way equal; are not your ways unequal? When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done, shall he die. Again, when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." Ez. xviii, 25, 27. Here we have a righteous man turning away from his righteousness, doing iniquity and dying in it. He must be lost. For what reason? *For turning away from his righteousness, and doing iniquity*. Notwithstanding this clear statement of the possibility of a righteous man doing

iniquity and being lost, only two verses before, the Lord asks the following question: "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? Saith the Lord God, and not that he should return from his ways and live?" Am I asked, how the wicked could die, if it was not the will of God? I answer that it could not consistently be avoided; and what cannot consistently be done, or whatever cannot be done in harmony with the works and government of God, cannot be done at all. It is not the *will of God that any should sin*, but when they *sin contrary to his will*, they must be punished, not because he takes pleasure in their death, but because a worse consequence would follow if they were not punished.

If any one doubts the correctness of this, I call his attention to the following: "What could I have clone more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?" Isa. v, 4. The Lord explains this vineyard, verse 7, to be the house of Israel. He claims that he has *done all for it that could be done*, and yet, that the fruit was *still not good*. He asks the question, what shall be done with it, and answers, that it shall be *laid waste and trodden down*. In the 7th verse he explains the "wild grapes," to be "oppression" and "crying," and proceeds to threaten the most awful denunciations against them. What was the cause of their punishment? *Oppression, and other sins*.

The gentleman has received a letter explaining the whole secret of my dishonorable course. I know not who this letter can be from, but I am certain the information in it is not true. I had no such conversation with any one, before leaving the city, on my way, or since arriving, nor had I even the most distant idea of such a course as that imputed to me. I see three persons in this assembly, and I think I uttered not a word while on the boat, that they did not hear, as I was in their company all the time. If he would give us argument in the place of these little passing matters with which he occupies so large a portion of his time, he would make the debate' much more agreeable, and have much less cause to complain of the shortness of his time. He is constitutionally a *complainer*. He had all the time agreed upon in our rules. When that time

was out, and his affirmative not proved, and he plead for a *little more time*; I granted it. He now complains, that I did not grant it *freely*, and tries to prove it by my referring it to the moderators. They said, and the gentleman himself said, he had no *right* to it, and threw the whole matter back upon me. I then, *freely*, as a matter of *gratify* and not of *debt*, gave him the time, that he might be left *without excuse*. But he need not trouble himself about time. He shall have all the time he desires. He will not alarm me with the idea that he has such a superabundance of matter. I can certainly talk as long as he can, and as much to the point.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' SEVENTEENTH ADDRESS.

*Saturday, 11 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

AN unfortunate fellow-countryman of my own and Mr, Young's, was once arraigned on the charge of stealing some shirts; two witnesses swore that they saw him steal them; but he offered to introduce *two dozen* men who were willing to swear that *they did not see him* commit the theft. The gentleman is even more fortunate than the ingenious Son of Erin; he has *three* witnesses, and I have no doubt, he could find three dozen, who *did not* hear the conversation, to my *one who did* hear it!

That the gentleman can talk longer, and louder, and with a more musical intonation than myself, I freely admit. Whether all his talk comes within gunshot of the real points in controversy, is another question.

The gentleman is also very happy in the ability of making *strong assertions*. The great misfortune is, that whether he undertakes to tell what his opponents have *said*, or what they *believe*, he asserts things a very great way from the real facts in the case. For instance, he asserted in his last speech, that I admitted that there was but little in the Bible about the definite number of men and angels; I admitted no such thing. He says I admitted that Esau was not ordained to eternal death, or Jacob to eternal life; I admitted nothing of the kind. Sometimes the eyes of the gentleman, usually so dim, have a preternatural power of vision; for

"Optics sharp they have, I ween,  
Who see what is not to be seen."

The gentleman has also another very happy talent. He can, with the utmost seriousness, quote *Arminian* critics, such as Wesley, Bloomfield, the *Popish* Bible, etc., to sustain his positions! If he were debating on baptism, I have no doubt he could find authority for his position, in the works of Alexander Campbell! The gentleman is mistaken in attributing the sentiment he quotes, to Dr. Jenks. And beside, how could persons be before written, or before described, as devoted to condemnation, unless it was *certain* and *fixed* beforehand, that they would be condemned?

The gentleman is back again on falling from grace. This is prudent. He has no opponent there now. *Bid he has forgotten, up to this time, to tell us, whether it is possible for persons who fall from grace to be restored.* But while he fills up his time with these matters, my last speech on "the definite number of men and angels," remains unanswered. On this subject, he was "full of matter;" so full that he could not contain himself, but was still leaking it out, *when other points were before us;* but when it comes regularly up, in course, he has not a word to say. Most likely, however, *when we have passed to other matters,* the gentleman will find it convenient to make some allusion to the argument on this point. With him, "Discretion is the better part of valor."

I now proceed with my argument on the next section of the Confession. "5. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, *before the foundation of the world was laid,* according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory."

The point now before us is, that *God's decree of election was not formed in time, but "before the foundation of the world was laid," i. e. from eternity.*

First. To deny that God's purpose of election is eternal, is *dishonoring to the Divine character.* To suppose that God's original purpose was to save all men, but that he *changed* that purpose, after men had sinned, and formed new purposes with respect to them, implies:

1st. A want of *wisdom:* the only reason why man finds

it necessary to change his plans is, that, not being perfect in wisdom, his first plans are often defective, and require amendment. To attribute to God a change of purpose, attributes to him the same imperfection.

2d. This supposition involves a denial of the *Divine Omniscience*. No being would deliberately form a purpose, which he knew at the time, he could not carry into execution. The reason why men change their original plans and purposes is, that they were not aware at the time of forming them, of all the obstacles those plans would encounter, and, as they gained *new information*, they modified their plans accordingly. Is God under such a necessity as this? Were not all the facts of the case as fully before the Divine mind, at the original formation of the plans, with respect to this world and its inhabitants, as at any subsequent period? Is it conceivable then, that he ever cherished a purpose different from that which he executes; a purpose which he was compelled to abandon? A purpose which he had not power to execute?

3d. The supposition that the purpose of God is formed in time, implies that God is *mutable*. An abandonment of the original purpose, would be a change in the Divine mind; the formation of a new purpose would equally imply such a change. Or if God had *no* purposed originally, with respect to the salvation of men, the *formation* of such a purpose, would be a change in the mind of Deity. But he is the Lord Jehovah, and changes not. Therefore, all the purposes of the Divine mind are eternal.

*Secondly*, The Scriptures do, in many instances, by clear *implication*, teach, that God's purpose of election was formed "before the foundation of the world." "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." Acts, xv, 18. This passage shows that there is no such thing as *chance*, no such thing as *accident*, nothing unpremeditated, and undesigned, in the dealings of God with men. "All his works are known to him from the beginning:" of course then this is true, of his work of new-creating the soul in Christ Jesus. This is the noblest of all his works; the work from which he will derive the most glory. In fact it is this work, as respects the Gentiles, that James has specially before his mind in giving utterance to this sentiment. The work of

new-creation then, is known to God From the beginning. But how known to him, unless as that which, *from the beginning*, he had '*purposed* to perform?

"According to the ETERNAL PURPOSE which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, Eph. iii, 11." The plan or purpose of God to save sinners of all nations, Gentiles as well as Jews, is here called an "*eternal purpose* " If any of God's purposes, relating to man's salvation, be *eternal*, why not all? Is it strictly correct to speak of *purposes*, in the plural, in relation to God? Is not the whole plan of the universe comprehended in his infinite mind *at once*? "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own *purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began.*" 2 Tim. i, 9,

"The lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. xiii, 8. "Christ verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world." 1 Pet. i, 20. What was the object of the death of Christ? "He gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." To redeem to himself a peculiar people was the *end*, then, of Christ's mission and death. Now since the *means* to this end was ordained "from the foundation of the world," and since his people had "grace given them in Christ, before the foundation of the world," is it not manifest that the *end* must have been *designed* before the foundation of the world?

*Thirdly*. I argue that God's purpose of election was formed before the foundation of the world, because such are the *express* declarations of the word of God.

"Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you *from the foundation of the world.*" Matt. xxv, 34. The plan of salvation then is not a new plan; it was not formed in time. The eternal abode of the righteous was prepared "before the foundation of the world." Of course then it follows, that God designed to bestow this kingdom upon them from eternity. The judgment will not be of *nations*, as such; nor of *churches* as such; but of *individuals*. And in the day of judgment, Christ will say that the *kingdom of glory was prepared for these very individuals* "from the foundation of the world."

"*He hath chosen us in him (Christ) before the foundation of the world.*" Eph. i, 4., so says St. Paul. "*God before the foundation of the world was laid, has chosen the elect in Christ.*" So says the Confession of Faith. *Common* minds would see a remarkable *similarity*, if not an *absolute identity of expression*, between Paul, and the Confession. But *uncommon* minds, like the gentleman's see no resemblance. To their vision the doctrine of the Confession, though expressed in the very language of Paul, "is not the doctrine of the Bible, nor anything like it!"

"God hath, *from the beginning*, chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the spirit, and belief of the truth." 2 Thes. ii, 13.

Here we find, 1st. Certain persons *chosen* or *elected*; these persons are, *not* "apostles or prophets," but the brethren at Thessalonica.

2d. They were chosen *not* "to preach the gospel;" not to the enjoyment of external privileges merely, but "*to salvation.*"

3d. They were *not* chosen irrespective of *means*, so that "they would be saved do what they may," but the *means* and the end are both included in the decree. They were "chosen to salvation, through *sanctification of the spirit, and belief of the truth.*"

4th. This act of choosing was not after they had believed, or formed a certain character, but "*from the beginning.*" This is the point now before us. But how interpret the phrase "from the beginning?" By referring to other passages where it occurs. "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." John, i, 1. "The beginning" here was prior to creation, before time; consequently in eternity.

"I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was." Prov. viii, 23. This sufficiently explains the phrase. These individuals then, were "chosen to salvation from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was."

This concludes my argument on this point. I now submit it to the gentleman, that he may admit it, refute it, or, if he judges it most prudent, pass it by in expressive silence.—[*Time expired.*]

Adjourned until Monday, 9 ½ o'clock, A. M.



### MR. FRANKLIN'S SEVENTEENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

*Dear Hearers*—I cannot recollect all the passages quoted by my opponent, so as to reply to them in the next speech, nor does it suit my course of argument so to do. When I begin a point, I aim to make thorough work of it. I shall proceed to collect some items in the previous speeches of the gentleman, and, I hope, satisfy his most ardent desires by way of replying. He says, "the hardest task ever any man undertook, is to prove a self-evident truth," and "Des Cartes undertook to prove his own existence, and it proved a miserable failure." I do not agree with the notion that his position is a self-evident truth, but I have no doubt the result will be the same as with Des Cartes: "a *miserable failure*." He certainly bids fair for that result.

He has made an attempt, whether intentional or not, to misstate the present issue entirely. The question is not whether a definite number will be saved, and a definite number lost, nor whether God foreknew this; but did God foreordain or unchangeably predestinate this number before the world, without any foresight of faith and good works? And are faith and good works the *result* of this Predestination, and not the *cause* of it? Are sinful men such *because not predestinated*, or are they not predestinated *because they are sinful*? If they are not predestinated to life, because *they are sinful*, the cause lies *in themselves*, If they are sinful because *not predestinated to life*, the cause of their sinfulness *lies in God*, who could, but would not predestinate them to life; who could, but would not give them that grace, by which they could avoid sin, and be saved, and who, Calvinism would have us believe, will punish men forever in hell, for the very sins they could not avoid!! This is no misrepresentation of the doctrine. The doctrine is, that God ordains men to wrath, *not because they are sinful*, but they *are sinful because thus ordained*, and shall be punished in hell forever, for the sins they were ordained to, and could not possibly avoid. This is Calvinism, but even, not yet stated in its strongest terms, as I will show, if the gentleman desires it, from their standard works,

This horrible position of Predestination, he has swapped off for the more pliable doctrine that a certain number will

be saved, and a certain number lost, and that God knows that number; and I think he is proud of the bargain. Having done this, he proceeds to give us a rule by which we may know the elect and non-elect. The elect man is known "by his possessing' that character which the grace of God produces in all the elect." I think that is a good evidence that such a one is elected or called by the Gospel, and, as Peter says, he should "make his *calling arid election sure*," for if he does "these things *he shall never fall*." But the evidence of the non-elect is that "he had up his mind to reject the great salvation of the Gospel." This sounded rather strange on my ears. Is there a great salvation in the Gospel for the non-elect? If there is not, how can it be rejected? Can the non-elect reject a salvation that was not intended for them, and that cannot be given to them? Did the blessed God offer them a Gospel that was never intended for them? And knowing at the same time that they could not receive it. I do not wonder at the gentleman's consciousness that the hearts of this people will revolt at such a doctrine.

But he says, "Even in such cases," where they have the above evidence of being non-elect, "we might still hope that the grace of God would reach him and change his determination; for

While the lamp holds out to burn,  
The vilest sinner may return."

This is an amalgamation of Calvinism and free grace, of a rare serving up. The free grace part of it is a little freer than true. Those whom Paul said, it is "impossible to renew again to repentance;" those for whom nothing "remains but a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall destroy adversaries;" those "whose names are blotted out of the book of life;" those who have "failed of the grace of God;" those "trees twice dead and plucked up by the roots," CAN NEVER RETURN. Does he believe that a man ordained to wrath may return? If not, how can the "vilest sinner *return*?" or is the "vilest sinner" one of the elect? Here lie the merits of his doctrine. He may avoid this point as much as he pleases and try to prove something entirely different, but the real doctrine of the Confession itself can never be proved. But I proceed to notice his Scriptures.

"Not even a sparrow falls without his observation." What does that prove? Is there anything about a definite number of men and angels in this? But "the hairs of your heads are all numbered." What does that prove? Is there anything about our proposition in that? These passages may show that the Infinite one takes cognizance of the smallest matters, but that it has any hearing upon the question of foreordaining men and angels to everlasting life, or death, or anything about a definite number thus predestinated or foreordained, I did not think any intelligent man would attempt to make this audience believe. He has certainly forgotten that "the court *knows something!*" He quotes the words, "man's days are determined, the number of his months are with God, he has determined his bounds that he cannot pass." Job xiv, 5. Is there a solitary word in this about Predestination of men and angels, in any shape or form? Not the first word. Such horrid applications of Scripture, I have rarely found in any place. They have not the most distant bearing upon the subject, in any respect. He proceeds to quote the words, "He hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation." Acts xvii, 26. But this is talking about man's earthly habitation and the times before appointed, and has nothing in it about the definite number of men and angels.

He passes from this passage to the words: "The Lord knows them that are his," and "I know my sheep and am known of mine." But where is the proof in these scraps of Scripture? These Scriptures are true, but there is nothing about ordaining or foreordaining men and angels, or their definite number. The same is true of the words, "I know whom I have chosen." He quotes from Dan xii, 1: "Thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." These words he connects with Phil, iv, 3: "Whose names are in the book of life," and the "general assembly whose names are written in heaven." Heb. xii. He partially quotes with these passages, Rev. xxi, 27: "They which are written in the book of life." Now the reply to all those passages that speak of "the names being written in the book," is the same. I have already shown you, from Rev. iii, 5, that those who have their names written in the book of life, may have

them blotted out. When he says, "He that overcometh shall be clothed in white raiment and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life," does he not teach, in the most forcible manner, that he who *does not overcome he will blot out his name?* Again, "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophesy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and out of the things written therein." Rev. xxii, 19. No doubt men have, a thousand times, taken away from this book, and all such, it is declared, shall have their part taken out of the book of life. This shows that nothing can be proved from the names written in the book at some former period, for some have had, and others will have their names blotted out of the book. This spoils the definite number and proves that men may fall from grace! From every prospect, we look for the "miserable failure," on the part of the gentleman, mentioned by him, of the man who attempted to prove his existence.

He proceeds with the words: "Verily I say unto you, I know you not." Matt. xxv, 12. This passage he expounds thus: "I know you not as my sheep;" "I know you not as my people, which you wish to be thought by calling me Lord, Lord." His memory must be defective; for he contended in the forepart of this debate, that the word know was here used in its common signification; that the Lord spoke *as man* here, and that he was not *acquainted with them*. But now he sings a different tune entirely, and explains that he knew them not as *his sheep*, or as *his people*, Is he converted from his ridiculous position? He is, or he interprets the same passage differently on different subjects. His interpretation now is equivalent to the One he opposed so bitterly, in the Sermon he so politely calls a "bantling." "I never *approved you*, is the same in substance, as "I never *knew you as mine*." But this only in passing. We are now looking for proof of the definite number of men and angels. That there is nothing about their Predestination either to life or death, in this text, is clear to all, and may answer the purpose of a man *pressed for time*, to fill out his half hour, though it can never prove his doctrine.

It is not so much my loud voice that troubles the gentleman, as the cogency of my arguments, nor is it so much the musical intonations of my voice that disturb his peace,

as the fact, that he sees that I am convincing the people, that his arguments are not to the point, and that Calvinism is an antiquated doctrine, better suited to the days of Augustine, when errors and superstitions of the most gross land abounded; or to the time of Calvin, when they opposed what they called error with fire and fagot, than to the enlightened regions of this, the greatest and happiest land on the Lord's earth. In order to make his doctrine as palatable as possible, he gives it in perfect Homoeopathic doses, so that if it can do no good, it *cannot kill*. He is aware that to take it as a whole, and ask us to swallow it down; would not be agreeable, but appears to think if we swallow it in broken doses, its effects will not be so perceptible.

But the mere fact of its being easier to take it in small doses, is but a minor advantage. The great advantage

Consists in its being easier to make it look scriptural. If the whole passage were divided off into words, and these words not taken together as they stand in the Confession, they are mostly very good words, and many of them can be found in the Bible. Not only so, but in one or two instances, we can find as high as three or four of these words standing together in the Bible. But I doubt whether he can find a *single line, in the whole article* headed, "God's eternal decrees," in so many words, *in all the Bible*. The heading itself is not in the Bible. Nor can any man show such an unmeaning bombast in all that Holy Book, as the words: "God from all eternity did." Anything that *God did*, was an act. When was this act performed? "From all eternity." When was that? Can my learned opponent tell? If God did something, he did it at some time. The Confession attempts to give the time. That time was "from all eternity." But I shall not attempt to comment upon this language throughout, at present; but as the gentleman gives me credit for making strong assertions, I do assert it, fearless of any successful contradiction, that the whole article under consideration is as far from truth as any doctrine I am acquainted with. He has attempted to prove that God had a purpose, but this was labor in vain, for I had proved that God had an "eternal purpose," and have shown what that purpose was. I have shown this from his own confession, and

from the Bible, but have not been able to elicit from him the least attention. But he assumes for God such a purpose as is not mentioned in the Scriptures, and assumes such a purpose for our Lord's mission into the world, as he could not find, if his life were at stake. God had an "eternal purpose;" and when he was manifested in the flesh, his purpose remained the same. That purpose was not to *pass by any*, but to "save that which *was lost*." This was the purpose of Jesus. God's "eternal purpose" has not changed. This the gentleman will admit. Well, hear him set forth his own purpose for which he sent his Son into the world. Did he send him to pass by any nation of the world? Jesus says, and I intreat of the respected gentleman to hear him, and reason upon his words, "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the WORLD THROUGH HIM MIGHT BE SATED." John, iii, 17. Here is the purpose of our gracious Lord, and a purpose it is too, worthy of his glorious and blessed name. This perfectly agrees with Paul's statement, showing, that "all men should *seek him and find him*," but which could not be the case, if there were any that could not seek the Lord and find him. This was the intention of the Lord when he made man, and every step he has taken from that time to the close of his revelations, was but the development of that eternal purpose. He promised a blessing to *all nations*, That promise contained the Messiah and his Gospel, showing, that God would justify the heathen through faith. The Prophets announce concerning him, that "he is set for salvation to the *ends of the earth*." John the Baptist testifies, that "*all men through him might believe*." His own testimony, as I have already shown, was that "God sent him into the world \* \* *that the world through him might be saved*." The angel of God announced his birth, as "*good news of great joy to all people*" which would have no truth in it, if my friend's doctrine had been true. In the very first announcement of the Gospel, after his resurrection, Peter declared the promise to be not only to his audience and their children, but to *all that are afar off*" And Paul, as if determined that no man should circumscribe the grace of God, declares, that "where sin abounded, *grace did much more abound*," And, as if Peter foresaw that some

partialist would say, Christ had *passed by a part of mankind*, he says, "I perceive of a truth, that God *is no respecter of persons*, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." Here I say, are all so many developments of the eternal purpose of God. All this I shall exhibit in full when I have more time.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' EIGHTEENTH ADDRESS.

*Monday, 10 o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

*Fellow Citizens*—I am sorry the gentleman has contracted so great a dislike for my company. I would be glad exceedingly to have him with me, but all my pressing invitations are of no avail. He is either far ahead, as at the beginning of our discussion—on Friday he told me he was then discussing the 2d. Proposition!—or far in the "rear, as at present. He thinks it safe to keep a speech or two at least between us. I have advanced some way in the proof of the 5th section of the Confession: he has got to my argument on the 4th! But he apologizes for his course—his *memory* is bad! he "*can't recollect*" all the passages I quote, "so as to reply in his next speech," but *after I have passed to another point*, and am fully occupied with the argument upon it, *then* he can recollect a few of the passages! The gentleman has the most accommodating memory of any man of whom I have heard!

The gentleman kindly offers to prove some points for us from standard Calvinistic works; and as they are new to me, and I presume to all Calvinists here, I must call upon him to prove them.

1. He says, Calvinism teaches that "God will punish men forever in hell for sins they could not avoid."

2. That "the doctrine (of Calvinism) is that God ordains men to wrath, not because they are sinful, but they are sinful because thus ordained."

I also, have a few authorities which I will read upon these points at a convenient time. In the meantime I say that the charge is *utterly destitute of truth*, I call for his standard authorities.

The gentleman seems to admit that the number of the

finally saved and lost is certain and definite. I felt sure he could not deny it in the face of the argument upon that point. But to relieve his distressing apprehensions lest I should prove something else than the doctrine of the confession, I will tell him that the number of the finally saved, and lost, precisely corresponds with the number of the elect and non-elect. And he admits *that* number to be certain and definite, and so yields the question on this most obnoxious point,

The gentleman runs over a few of my proof-texts, and declares most solemnly that they do not prove my point. Of course, then, that is an end of the matter. True, the most eminent expounders of God's word, have thought that they taught the doctrine, I adduced them to prove. But what is their opinion worth, when opposed to, the solemn assertion of my very disinterested opponent?

In my last speech, I entered upon the fifth section of this third chapter of the Confession, and proved that "God hath chosen the elect, in Christ, before the foundation of, the world." A second point remains to be proved—

5. "Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life God \* \* \* hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory. Out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the conditions or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace."

This, I apprehend, is the real battle-field; upon the point here presented, the whole question turns. Wesley avows his belief in both *predestination* and REPROBATION—a word, by the way, not found in the Westminster Confession, though it has played a very important part in this discussion. He believes in a predestination and reprobation from the foundation of the world—but he believes that the cause or power of them, is foreseen faith and good works, or the want of them. Let us then enter upon this question with that care which its importance demands. By way of explanation then, I observe:

1st. It is not taught that God has *no means*, for his selecting those whom he does select; that his choice of the elect is capricious, or arbitrary. We believe that he had the highest, and holiest, and best of all reasons for this



gracious selection. But we maintain that these reasons were *not* faith, good works, or any other superiority foreseen in those chosen, over those left.

2d. It is not meant that those who are elected will not, in due time, believe and perform good works, but that those acts of obedience are not *the causes or conditions* of their election.

3d. It is not meant that God did not have full and perfect foresight of the faith and obedience of those chosen, but that this foreseen obedience was not "*the cause or condition moving him*" to the choice.

Let these explanations be carefully noted, for on this point our adversaries seem determined not to understand us. I now proceed with my argument in proof of the point before us.

I argue then, that election does not proceed from the foreseen faith and good works of the chosen, as its causes or conditions:

1st. From those passages of Scripture which describe all mankind as equally guilty, equally lost, and equally helpless, by nature.

"That which is born of the flesh is flesh," *i. e.* is *corrupt*. John, iii, 6.

"What then, are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin," \* \* \* "That every mouth may be stopped, and the whole world may become guilty before God." \* \* \* "For there is no difference." Rom. iii, 9, 19, 22.

Since then, all are in the *same* lost condition by nature, there can be no ground of preference in the creature himself: the elect are "by nature, children of wrath even as others," the cause of God's distinguishing favor to him cannot, therefore, be any superiority in himself over others in the same state of moral degradation.

2d. From all those passages of Scripture which make the *grace of (rod* the ground of distinction between the saved and lost,

"For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst riot receive?" 1 Cor. iv, 7. "Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works *but according to his own purpose and*

*grace*, given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Tim. i, 9, "Being justified freely *by his grace*." Rom. iii. 24. "A remnant according to the *election of grace*. And if by grace then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace: but if it be of works, then it is no more grace: otherwise work is no more work." xi, 5, 6. "By grace are ye saved." Eph. i, 5. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Ver. 8.

Now, if it be by the grace of God that some are made to differ from others; if it is that grace which lies at the foundation of salvation; it follows that they are not saved on account of their own foreseen faith and good works. The very idea of grace absolutely excludes all idea of merit. "If it be of grace then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace."

3d. From all those passages of Scripture which explicitly declare that election is not on account of any good in the creature.

"For the children being not yet born, *neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to the election might stand, NOT OF WORKS, but of him that calleth.*" Rom. ix, 11. Also, 1 Tim. i, 9. Rom. xi, 5, 6, as quoted under the preceding head. "*Not of works, lest any man should boast.*" Eph. ii, 9. Comment is needless;

4th. From those Scriptures which teach us that God chooses us *before* we choose him.

"Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." John, xv, 16. It may be thought that this refers to the Apostles, *as such*. But compare xiii, 18. "I speak not of you all; *I know whom I have chosen.*" "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; whereunto he called you by our Gospel." 2 These. ii, 13, 14. God's choice of these persons was prior to their being called by the Gospel; of course prior to their reception of that Gospel. Now their faith and obedience being posterior to God's choice of them, could not be the cause of that choice. The cause is before the effect.

5th. From all those passages of Scripture which represent Faith, and the disposition to perform good works as produced by God himself in the heart of his people.

"Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; *for it is God that worketh in you to will, and to do, of His good pleasure.*" Phil, ii, 12, 13. "Giving thanks unto the Father, *who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.*" Col. i, 12. "Without me, ye can do nothing." John, xv, 5. "Thou also hast wrought all our works in us." Is. xxvi, 12. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. ii, 10.

Election, we are sometimes told, is *conditional*; well, what are the conditions? The formation of a certain character.. But we find from these Scriptures, that it depends upon God whether that character will be formed. The conditions are as much in his gift as election itself,

6th. From these passages which describe the elect as *chosen in Christ*.

"According as he hath chosen us in him." Eph. i, 4. If the ground or reason of their being chosen be in themselves, why are they said to be chosen "*in Christ?*"

7th. From those passages which explicitly teach that the possession of Christian character is not the "*cause or condition,*" but the *effect* of Predestination to life.

"For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate *to be conformed to the image of his Son,*" Rom. viii, 29. They are predestinated, not because God *foresaw* that they *would* be conformed to the image of Christ, but *that they might be* conformed to that image. "He hath chosen us in him, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love." Eph. i, 4. Chosen its not *because* of our holiness and blamelessness, but that *we should be* holy and blameless. "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." 2 These. ii, 13. Chosen *not on account of* sanctification and faith, as "causes or conditions," but *through* sanctification and faith, as *instruments* or *means* of salvation. "Elect according to the Foreknowledge (or *predetermination* as Mr. A. Campbell renders it) of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." I Peter, i, 2. Elect *unto* obedience, not *on account* of obedience. Such is the explicit teaching of God's

word upon the point before us. Faith and obedience, are not the causes, but the effects of Predestination.

8th. From all those passages of Scripture which ascribe the election and salvation of those who are elected and saved, to the *purpose, will, or good pleasure* of God as the cause.

"Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, *but of God.*" John, i, 13. "That *the purpose* of God according to the election might stand, *not of works, but of him that calleth.*" "I will have mercy upon whom *I will have mercy*, and I will have compassion on whom *I will have compassion*. So then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, *but of God that showeth mercy.*" "Therefore hath he mercy ON WHOM HE WILL, and whom he will he hardeneth." Rom. ix, 11, 15, 16, 18. "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, *according to the good pleasure of his will.*" "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, *according to his good pleasure, which he hath PURPOSED IN HIMSELF.*" "Being predestinated *according to the PURPOSE of him WHO WORKETH ALL THINGS AFTER THE COUNSEL OF HIS OWN WILL.*"

Eph. i, 5, 9-11. "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, *but according to his own purpose and grace*, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." 2 Tim. i, 9.

The cause of election then, is *in God*, in his own *will; purpose, and good pleasure*, and not at all in the *will, purpose, or obedience* of the creature. Why contradict God's own word? Why seek to obscure the free, the mighty, the distinguishing grace of God in the sinner's salvation? Let God be true, and every man a liar. Let God's grace be manifested, and the pride, and self-sufficiency of man humbled in the dust.

9th. I argue, that faith and good Works are not the causes of our salvation from the sovereignty of God.

"He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand or say unto him what doest thou?" Dan. iv, 35. "Whatsoever the Lord pleased that did he in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and in all deep places." Ps. cxxxv, 6,

In the works of creation he is a sovereign, giving to some of his creatures a high rank, and others a more humble and obscure lot; endowing some with glorious intellects; bestowing upon others the most humble capacities. Yet none can say to him, what doest thou? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?

In the works of Providence he acts with equal sovereignty, He setteth up one, and pulleth down another. He sends one prosperity, another adversity. He casts the lot of one in a Christian land, others he places in the dark places of the earth, filled with the habitations of Cruelty. Some are born of Christian parents, and carefully trained in the ways of piety, others are the children of infidel or heathen parents, and are brought up in ignorance of God and his Christ, in ignorance of a future state, and the way of escape from the wrath of God. God is a sovereign in the dispensations of his providence.

And shall we deny his sovereignty in the dispensation of his grace? It is here alone that the King of kings may not do what he will with his own? Though he discriminates both in creation and providence, must he make no discrimination in the dispensation of his grace, without being charged with injustice, and a respect of persons, by puny worms of the dust? God *is* sovereign in the work of redemption, and bestows his grace on some and not on others, because thus it seems good in his sight.

10th. I argue the same truth from the objections brought against the doctrine taught in the Scriptures.

The doctrine of the sovereignty of Divine grace has ever been an unpopular doctrine. For preaching it in the city of Nazareth, his early home, the blessed Savior well nigh lost his life—Luke, iv, 23-30. Paul encountered the utmost hostility on account of it. There were two prominent objections urged against Paul's teaching. 1st. *That it rendered God unjust.* Rom. ix, 14; and 2d. *That it destroys free agency and accountability.* Ver. 19. The gentleman makes the same objections to my doctrine now. But what is Paul's answer? Does he vindicate himself and his teaching, by showing that he had been misunderstood; and that in reality he believed that God made distinctions among men only on the ground of their character? This,

as an honest man, he was bound to do, *if such had been really his belief*. But no, we find nothing of the sort. He only asserts God's absolute right to do as seemeth him good, and shows the presumption of a poor short-sighted creature of a day, arrogating the right of sitting in judgment on the ways of the Most High! Would to God, this class of objectors had been confined to the days of Paul. If Paul had preached the "smooth things" which "*the people*" love, no such objections would have been made to his teaching. And the fact that the same objections are now made to our doctrines, shows that they are identical with that taught by the Lord himself, and his servant, Paul.

This closes my argument upon the point before us.

[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S EIGHTEENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

MY worthy friend is getting well up to dodging. The very first thing he did, after introducing the fifth section of the eternal decrees, was to misstate the question, thus changing the whole issue. Here is the position laid down in the Confession:

"Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen Christ unto everlasting glory."

Upon this he remarks: "*The first point now before us, is that God's decree of election was not formed in time, but before the foundation of the world was laid.*" This point is not the first point, nor any other point in this discussion. This has not one word in it about "everlasting life, or everlasting glory." If he could prove the position he assumes, in the place of the one contained in the fifth section of the Confession, it would establish nothing in this controversy. Let him prove the section as found in the creed. This stating something else to prove in the place of it; looks suspicious. It shows a disposition not to come right up to the work. But I proceed to examine his proof.

I have not said that "God's original purpose was to save all men, but that he has changed that purpose."

His original purpose was not irresistibly to save all men, by some lurid of an eternal necessity; but to give a Savior to all men; through him to give grace, mercy and truth to all men; to give the entire remedial scheme to all men; freely, without money and without price; that he would address this ample system to man, containing the entire means for man's complete recovery and restoration to his Father and his God; to put it completely within the power of man to believe, repent, yield implicit obedience to the Lord. It was his purpose to bestow on such as yielded this submission, the pardon of past sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and upon such as continue faithful to the end, eternal life. But those who would despise the Redeemer, who died for them, the God who loved them, the Holy Spirit who reproveth the world of sin, the blood of Christ shed for them, the glorious Gospel preached to them, the kind invitations of the word of grace, and the unfading glories of the world to come; he purposed to punish, not for not doing what they could not do, but for despising all these mercies of a gracious God. He condemns them for not believing a Gospel, which God had put it in their power to believe, for not repenting, when he had granted them repentance.

From this, you perceive, there is no dispute between us, whether God had a purpose, or whether it was an eternal purpose; but our dispute is about *what that purpose is*. If what I claim for the purpose of God, is that purpose, then the Gospel is mainly a history unfolding it. But if what the gentleman claims for the purpose, is that purpose, the Bible not only fails to unfold it, but unfolds quite the opposite. Nor is there any dispute *when* God formed this purpose, for the fact that he has revealed such a purpose, shows that he must have formed it before he revealed it. This is quite sufficient for me. Indeed, the eternal purpose of God can be set forth no way better, than I have command of, than to say that the New Testament, with its proffers of grace, mercy and pardon; with all its rewards and punishments, is the eternal purpose of God, revealed, fully unfolded, and published to the world. If it in all its amplifications, is not the eternal purpose of God, then no man can show that he had any.

As to the "*secret* counsel of his will," I do not suppose

the framers of the article in dispute know anything more about it than I do myself, and the gentleman himself has shown that we have nothing to do with any "*secret* counsel," for Moses says, "secret things belong to God," We have nothing to do, then, on this occasion, with any "secret counsel" or "purpose," but we have to do with one that was kept hid for ages, "But now is made manifest, by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith," Rom. xvi, 26, "to make *all men see* what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God who created all things by Jesus Christ; to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." Eph. iii, 9, 11. From these Scriptures, it is clear that it was "according to the eternal purpose of God;" not his *secret* purpose or counsel, for of that we know nothing; but his revealed purpose, most clearly and explicitly expressed; that the mystery which had been kept hid since the world began, "should be made known for the obedience of faith;" to "make *all men see* what is the fellowship of the mystery." This shows that the "purpose" of the Confession is not the "purpose of God," for the "counsel or purpose" of the Confession is *secret*, while the "purpose of God" is *revealed*, and the "purpose" of the Confession is to make men believe that a large portion of the race never can *see* or *obey* the Gospel, but the purpose of God is "for the *obedience of faith among all nations*" and to make ALL MEN SEE what is the fellowship of the mystery. This purpose runs through the whole revelation of God, while the purpose of the Confession is unknown to it. Which will the gentleman hold on to, the *purpose* of the Confession, or the purpose of God? Will he try to make *all men see* according to the purpose of God? or try to make us believe that a large portion *never can see* according to the purpose of the Confession.

The Lord has not at all changed his purpose. It is precisely the same yet as it was when first formed. But the Confession has changed the purpose of God, and the gentleman himself is trying to make us believe the changed



purpose. His purpose, when he created man, was to grant all men the privilege of *seeking the Lord and finding him*. His purpose, when he made the promise to Abraham, was to bless all nations. His purpose was, when he sent the Apostles to preach the Gospel, the "*obedience of faith among all nations;*" to give all men the privilege, or to *make all men see*. But the changed purpose of the Confession, sets forth the partial doctrine that God *passed by* a large portion of mankind, that he *never gave them power to see, to believe, to repent and obey*. This manifestly *changed purpose*, I argue from the immutability of God, should be abandoned and rejected by all who fear God, and work righteousness. The arguments of the gentleman to show that the purpose was before the foundation of the world and immutable, I need just as much as he does. If the *eternity* and *immutability* of the purpose, or the *purpose* itself, were denied, I should be compelled to prove them. But at present, my opponent admits these points, and, as he denies enough that is *true*, to furnish matter for argumentation, I shall not detain this audience to prove what he admits.

He quotes the words, "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." How can that prove that the elect were chosen in Christ to eternal glory, before the foundation of the world? There is not a word in it about the elect or "eternal glory." As I contend, there is nothing in the passage, so far as quoted, except that the "Lord approves his works," but, as he contends, that the "Lord is acquainted with his works." This is *far fetched*.

Another proof-text is, Eph. iii, 11, the one I have quoted, showing what the purpose of God is, but his quotation is extremely short, and needs no further comment from me. It speaks of the purpose which I have just explained.

He relies much upon the quotation from 2 Tim. i, 9: "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." But this contains nothing in favor of his changed purpose, but is in perfect harmony with what I have already said of the purpose of God. All are called with a holy calling, who are called by the Gospel to the Christian calling, and that not according to their works;

whether Jewish or pagan, but according to the purpose or plan, which God had kept secret for ages, but now revealed among all nations, for the obedience of faith, and not according to this purpose only, but his *purpose and grace*, which abounded even more than sin abounded, which purpose and grace were given us through Christ before the world; that is, of course, prospective!

My friend quotes two passages, in his ordinary scrap style, Rev. xiii, 8: "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," and 1 Pet, i, 20: "Christ verily was foreordained before the foundation;" but if he can see anything in these isolated scraps, about "electing men to everlasting glory," or "ordaining them to wrath," he is sharper-sighted than I claim to be.

Another passage quoted is, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you before the foundation of the world." Matt. xxv, 34. This proves nothing, only that from the foundation of the world, God knew that he would have a blessed people, and prepared a kingdom for them. Who has ever denied this? What is for him to do, is to show that that people were unchangeably designed or decreed to that kingdom, that therefore, Christ died for *them*, while he passed by the rest of mankind, and gave them power to believe, nay, more; not only gave them power to believe, but irresistibly made them believe and repent, while he never gave the balance the power of believing, but damned them for not believing. This is Calvinism.

He proceeds: "He hath chosen us in him (Christ) before the foundation of the world." Eph. i, 4. But I have already shown that the "us" spoken of in that passage, were the Apostles and prophets, and that they were chosen in view of a certain purpose, viz: "*to make all men see.*" Has the gentleman forgotten the unenviable position he fell into on this passage; that different persons are spoken of after the sixth verse? If he has, I shall have to refresh his memory.

One proof-text is, "God hath, from the beginning, chosen you to salvation." 2 These. ii, 13. He then asks; "How interpret the phrase, 'from the beginning?'" To do this he refers to other passages, such as, "in the beginning was the word;" "from the beginning, or ever the

earth was," and allows this as sufficient! Indeed, and Is there but one "beginning" in the Bible. Let us see: Matt. xxiv, 8: "The beginning of sorrow;" Mark i, 1: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ;" John ii, 11: "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana;" Acts xi, 15: "The Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning;" Luke i, 2: "Which from the beginning were eye-witnesses;" Luke xxiv, 7: "Among all nations beginning at Jerusalem," etc., etc. From which one of these *beginnings* were the Thessalonians chosen? None of them reach back to "*all eternity!*" Is it possible the gentleman intended to have this audience believe there was but one beginning mentioned in the Bible? He has ceased to presume that the "*creed knows something!!!*"

" But what beginning does the Apostle refer to, 2 These. ii, 13? Let us hear the passage: "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the "Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to 'salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of 'the truth.'" How were they chosen? "*Through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.*" Is this the way they were chosen? They must have been chosen, then, when they were *sanctified by the Spirit and believed the truth*. Were they sanctified by the Spirit, and did they *believe the truth*, before the foundation of the world? I think not. The "beginning," then, when "they were chosen, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," must have been the beginning of their religious career.

As I believe, I have observed once before, the gentleman is constitutionally a *complainer*, I have done my utmost to please him, but still he is murmuring and complaining. When I am ahead of him, he grumbles that I do not *keep back*. When, to please him, I fall a little back, he complains that I do not *keep up*. When I am side by side with him, quoting from Calvin and his creed, he murmurs at "these contemptible scraps." When I am examining' his proof-texts, he dislikes my interpretations. His continuous murmuring and complaining, is the strongest evidence I have seen of *fate* and *necessity*; he appears to be under a dire *necessity* to complain.

He says, I seem to admit the definite number of men and angels predestinated to everlasting life, and ordained to

everlasting death, I have not admitted anything kind. If I should admit it, I should do it without deuce, for he certainly has not proved it, and cannot. If he has any proof I should like to see it.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' CLOSING ADDRESS.

*Monday, 11 o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

THERE is but one point in the 'last speech; of my opponent, which demands any notice. He thinks I misunderstood his "original plan or purpose." I certainly *did* understand him to teach, that God's original purpose was that all men should seek, find, and fully enjoy him forever. And to this I objected, that as many do *not* seek, find, or enjoy God, either God had *failed* in his plan, or he has *changed* that plan for something else. But just here the gentleman's nerves began to fail him; he does not like to face this music; he sees that it renders God a *weak and changeable* being, who forms plans which he cannot execute and which he is therefore obliged to change. He sees, moreover, that it contradicts numerous passages of Scripture, which teach that his "counsel shall stand"—"that he worketh all things after the counsel of his own" will," etc., etc. And he gives us a *modified* interpretation of God's "original plan or purpose,"

*Now* we learn that the "original purpose was to give it Savior to all men—to give grace, mercy and truth to all men—to give the entire remedial scheme to all men—to put it completely within the power of man to believe, repent, and yield implicit obedience to the Lord."

Well, now, I am so unfortunate as not to be able to see that this *modified* "original purpose," helped the matter in the least. If it was God's purpose to do all this for all men, *he has failed to do it*, and must surely have *changed* his purpose. There are certainly hundred of millions of human beings now on the earth, beside the millions of millions in past ages, who have *never heard* of "the Savior, and of grace, mercy and peace through him;" who have *never had* "the remedial scheme" offered to them; *who have never had the power of believing*, repenting, and yielding "implicit obedience to the Lord." For, "How

SHALL THEY BELIEVE IN HIM OF WHOM THEY HAVE NOT HEARD? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" Rom. x, 14, 15. God then has FAILED—the OMNIPOTENT JEHOVAH FAILED! in his purpose, and has been *compelled* to CHANGE it, O! the beauties of this system of "universal free grace!" Why is it that all do not, embrace a doctrine so honorable to the character of the Almighty? But just look at it again. Here are some who CANNOT BELIEVE, because they are without a preached Gospel to believe. And will God forever damn men for not believing when, they cannot believe? Horrible! horrible!! O! for the power of feigning horror and dismay, possessed by the gentleman. I might make quite a *display* on these beauties of HIS system.

I shall briefly sum up the argument on the first proposition, and leave the whole matter with you.

That proposition embraced the *doctrines*, the *interpretations*, and the *assertions* of my opponent in his Sermon on foreknowledge and Predestination.

I need hardly repeat what has been so manifest to all, that he made *no effort* to sustain the doctrines as stated in the words of his Sermon, but gave a *new version* of that Sermon, and attempted to show that it was what he *meant*; acknowledging that I had refuted the positions which I assailed.

1st, The statement of the Sermon on the first point is, that when God is said to know certain things, it is meant that he approves them or makes them known as his. This *unrestricted* proposition, he will not defend, but says that *sometimes* when God is said to know, it means that he approves. This is a position which no one ever denied.

2d. "The Foreknowledge of God is the knowledge which God has before given in the Scripture respecting Christ and his sufferings." When this point came to be examined, he found out that his God knew as much as mine, and had known it as long. For this, however, he has failed up to this hour to find a "thus saith the Lord;" and he winds up by giving the word "Foreknow," in Rom. viii, a totally different meaning from that which it was the object of his Sermon to establish.

3d. "The elect are the Apostles and Prophets." This, he says, is "*the Bible doctrine of election*;" it was all that the Bible taught on the subject at the time of writing his dis-

course. But after it had been shown that not a single instance is found in the Bible, where the term elect is applied to the Apostles and Prophets, he discovers that he meant that the "elect " in Eph. i, and John xvii, were the Apostles and Prophets. I showed him that the word *did not occur in either* of those chapters, and gave him some light from his brother Burnet, on the subject of the genuine meaning of the first chapter of Ephesians, which I hope will help him to a better understanding of it.

4th. On this point the gentleman was very brief and very obscure. He says the object for which the elect were chosen was to preach the Gospel. Paul says it was "to be conformed to the image of God's Son"—"to be holy and without blame before him in love," that they were "chosen to Salvation."

The argument on the interpretations of Scripture, I will not attempt to sum up. But I call especial attention to these interpretations. They show the straits to which men are driven, when, to avoid the difficulties of the plain interpretations, they fly to something fanciful and new.

I would just allude to the gentleman's position on falling from grace. He quotes Heb. vi, 4-6 to prove that converted men may now fall away totally and finally from the grace of conversion. I pressed him for answer to the question whether such persons could return. He declined to answer at the time, but it has leaked out since that he thinks when they fall away once there is for them no hope of restoration. Now David, and Solomon, and Peter, are usually given as examples of those who have fallen away. David, Solomon and Peter, therefore, are now in the world of woe. He says it is not true that the vilest sinner may return while the lamp of life continues to burn; that there are some who cannot repent; for whom no sacrifice for sin remains; who cannot be saved. Why the gentleman has surely forgotten his "Free Grace." Is it possible that there are men who cannot repent; who cannot believe; who have no more sacrifice for sin? Does he *limit* the grace of God? Is not the Gospel to be preached to all? What are we to think of those poor "REPROBATES" whom we have found lurking in a dark corner of the gentleman's system?

Is it their duty to repent? God commands all to repent.

But they can't repent the gentleman says. Horrible! horrible! O! for the powers of a—*Franklin*—to depict the enormous cruelty and injustice of God in punishing men for not repenting, when they cannot repent!!

The next matter was to disprove an *assertion* of the gentleman, that the doctrine of the Confession was not the doctrine of the Bible. This I did by taking up the doctrine of the Confession item by item, and testing it by reason and the word of God. I proved that God had decrees or purposes; that in these decrees was included the foreordination of some men and angels to everlasting life— also, the foreordination of some men and angels unto everlasting death; that this was done for the manifestation of the Divine glory; that the number of those thus predestinated as certain and definite; that they were predestinated from the foundation of the world; and that they were not chosen on account of their foreseen faith and obedience as the cause. These were the points included in the part of the Confession to which the assertion of the gentleman had reference. These points I discussed in their order. I shall not attempt, because I cannot fully make a recapitulation of all my various arguments on each of these points. They are to go to the world in a volume; those who desire to know them, can refer to the place where each point is discussed. I can only now say, with respect to them, that these arguments were honestly offered, to sustain positions which I do most sincerely believe; positions, so vital to the system of Divine truth, that if they cannot be sustained, the Divine character must suffer, and every essential doctrine of our faith suffer disastrous eclipse.

While I was engaged thus in establishing the proposition I was pledged to sustain, my opponent was attending to divers matters in his own way. Part of the time he was manfully fighting a "horrible system," which represents God as a monster worse than Moloch, and man as a helpless machine. As to the *result* of this fight, we have only the gentleman's own account of it, there being no one to speak for the system he was attacking. *He says* that he gained glorious victories at every onset. As the gentleman is exceedingly *modest*, and never *boasts* of what he has done, can do, and will hereafter do, we are bound to believe in these victories on his statement.

Part of the time he was engaged in erecting an "*independent argument*" to prove the universality of the atonement; a doctrine held by Dwight, Richards, Barnes, Thos. Scott, the distinguished commentator, and hosts of other genuine Calvinists, and believers in Predestination; but it turns out, finally, that he was doing this by way of showing how well he could fight on both sides of the same question, for he had proved, in March last, that fully one third of the human family, to wit: infants dying in infancy, had nothing to do with the Gospel, or the Gospel with them.

He proved that Calvin taught infant damnation, by quoting a passage where Calvin says that if it had not been for the remedy of the Gospel, the whole race would have been lost; infants and all. But he forgot to tell us that Calvin believed that a remedy had been found in the Gospel, through which all that believe, and all that die incapable of belief, shall be saved from the state of condemnation into which they were brought by the fall. These are his words: "I DOUBT NOT, WHEN GOD REMOVES INFANTS FROM THE WORLD, THEY ARE REGENERATED BY THE SECRET OPERATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. 1, p. 59.

He also proved that the Confession of Faith taught the same doctrine, by quoting the definition given of the visible church, and the words that out of this church "there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." But he forgot to tell us that, the case of infants is "*no ordinary*" one; and that according to the Confession, some men and all infants are saved by the *extraordinary* operation of God's 'spirit! "who worketh when, and where, and how he pleases." Con. of Faith, chap, x, sec. 3.

He also quoted Dr. Watts, who denied that infants are raised from the dead.

But in all this, he was only trying to get *himself* into *good company*, and as he would riot, rise to the doctrine of Calvin and the Confession, he sought to drag them down to the pit where he himself lay floundering. The Gospel, he says, has nothing to do with infants. Again he says, "IF THERE BE ANY THAT CUBIST DID NOT DIE FOR, THEY WILL NOT BE RAISED FROM THE DEAD." Put that and that together, and if it don't leave infants to perish, without hope of resurrection, I cannot tell the meaning of language.



This is not the first time that men have dug pits, and fallen into them first themselves.

The gentleman also spent much of his time in complaining that I did not prove the three sections of the Confession *all at once*. He had a great horror of my separating them into their component parts, and proving each doctrine separately. Well, the gentleman is fond of *lumping* things. He cried out most piteously against my attacking the doctrines of his Sermon separately. And now he is equally disturbed at my proving the doctrines of the Confession, one at a time. I have only this to console me under the gentleman's disapprobation, that what is false in detail is false in mass, and what has been proved to be true in all its parts, is true as a whole. The first is the case with the doctrines of his Sermon which I attacked—the second of the doctrine of the Confession.

The gentleman also has kindly informed you that I have given up my doctrine; that I have exchanged it for something else; that my proofs don't apply, etc., etc., for all of which information you doubtless feel your obligation to him, as you certainly would never have found it out for yourselves.

The argument is closed. It is for you to decide in the fear of God, where truth lies. Be not afraid of Bible truth. Embrace it, however contrary may be carnal reasonings, and preconceived opinions. Let the question be, not, is it popular? is it smooth doctrine? is it in accordance with my notions of what is right? but, is it revealed in the Bible? is it true? Receive every doctrine contained in God's own word, and let God take care of the consequences. Whatsoever he has revealed is worthy of belief, whatever difficulties it may seem to involve, simply because He has revealed it.

And now may the God of truth lead us unto all truth, Amen.

*Mr. Matthews*,—I hope, before the gentleman proceeds, that the Moderators will read the rule governing the closing speech.

*Moderator*.—The rule reads thus: "In the closing speech, no new matter shall be introduced."

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

WE have the gentleman's argument now before us, both against my Sermon and in favor of his creed. He finds but one point in my last speech deserving reply. This audience is getting to understand him. With *him*, when A speech deserves no reply, it is one containing arguments that he *cannot* answer. When a speech deserves reply, it is one where he sees an opportunity to make some little quibble, in appearance, at the expense of his antagonist, Of this latter land, was the only point, in my last speech, "deserving reply." This is a small comfort, it is true, but small as it is, and standing *alone*, as it does, I am compelled to take it from him, thus leaving him comfortless.

He says, I have changed the purpose of God! He did not, however, proceed but a few words, till he admitted that the change did not "help the matter," which, was virtually admitting that the change was no change at all. All that was said about the *change*, was then, merely for *effect*. He proceeded to quote my statement, that "the purpose of God was to give a Savior to all men; to give grace mercy and truth to all men; to put it completely within the power of all men to believe, repent, and yield implicit obedience to the Lord." This he does not believe,; But have I not shown from the word of God, that Jesus is the "Savior of the world?" that it is the "will of God that all men should be saved?" that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound?" that "God reckoned all under sin, that he might have mercy upon all?" that he commanded the truth, the Gospel, to be preached to "all; the world" —to "every creature?" He is so unfortunate,

that he cannot see how this can be! Is he so unfortunate that he *cannot believe* these most clear and explicit declarations of Scripture? The Lord spoke of some that *would not come to him*, but he never spoke of any who *could not come*,

The gentleman has discovered a plain contradiction in my arguments. I have argued that God had put it in the power of all men to repent. Yet I have contended that the apostates mentioned, Heb. 6th and 10th chapters, could not repent. He would have you forget that I have shown you, that these very persons had previously had the power to repent, had believed, repented, received the Holy Spirit, and felt the powers of the world to come; and that Paul informed them that "if they should fall away," "if they should sin willfully," it would be "*impossible to renew them again to repentance*" He does not believe this statement of the Apostle, but quotes the old discarded words,

"While the lamp holds out to burn,  
The vilest sinner may return,"

to disprove it. But *uninspired* poetry does not disprove *inspired* Scripture. I do not suppose that every little inadvertency in a Christian's life; that being surprised into a fault, is "falling away" or "sinning willfully," in the sense of the Apostle here, but still, he is speaking of such an apostasy as a man may fall into, after grace, mercy and truth, all had been given to him, and from which he never can return. Suppose I cannot describe precisely to what extent a man must go, before he falls into this condition, it alters not the fact stated by the holy Apostle. I suppose the Apostle describes that state in other places, where he speaks of men being "given over to reprobacy of mind," and becoming "past feeling;" which could never have been the condition of any, unless they had been in a different condition previously.

The fact that "every creature" has not the Gospel now, is no evidence that it was not commanded to be preached to "every creature;" no more evidence that it is not the will of God that, every creature should have it, than the thousands of suffering widows and orphans, are an evidence that it is not the will of God that Christian people should

relieve them; or than the fact that all men do *not pray everywhere*, is an evidence that it is not God's, will that *they should*. The fact that rich men oppress the poor, is no evidence that it is the will of God that the poor should be oppressed. It is the will of God that all men should have the Gospel, but the mission of Calvinism, is to convince as many as possible, that God never intended to confer one spiritual blessing upon one portion of mankind.

1. I shall now review the argument. The first attack was upon my remark, that, "when God is said to, know certain things," the word "know" means *approve*. This remark, the gentleman attempted, in his reply to the Sermon, in the presence of some in this audience, to disprove by finding the word "know" in other passages, where it did not mean *approve*, among which he edified his audience with the words, "Cain *knew* his wife." This, since his "peculiar feeling's" have gone off, he was ashamed to mention. But when the Sermon is looked at with ordinary candor, it is seen that all that is asserted or was ever intended, was that the word, "know," in some instances, means *approve*, which the gentleman admits to be correct. But he fought against the word having that signification, in the specimens in the Sermon, until he had well nigh denied the doctrine of the Trinity; at least, he went so far as to attempt to prove that Christ will judge the world in *his humanity*, or *as man*, in which he contended he was "weak" and "ignorant," not knowing everything. But on another part of the argument he quoted the words, "I never *knew you*," and paraphrased them, "I never *knew you as mine*," thus virtually approving all he had opposed, and yielding all he had said.

2. Our second issue was on the Foreknowledge of God. My position, that what is in the Bible called the "Foreknowledge of God," is that which was before, shown by the prophets, was denied and attempted to be refuted. But how was it refuted? Did he show that anything else in the Bible is called the Foreknowledge of God? You know that he did not. Did he not argue that God must have foreknown the things revealed by the prophets, or that they could not have foretold them? He did, in doing which, virtually admit my position to be correct, that what the prophets have predicted, is, to say the least

of it, "Foreknowledge." This point in the Sermon then, stood the test, and came out only the brighter for having been tried.

3. The worthy gentleman proceeded to assail my position, that the words "us" and "we," Eph. i, 3-12, mean the "Apostles and prophets," or they are the elect there spoken of. It appears that he became convinced before the debate, that he could not refute any position I had taken. He accordingly made a position entirely different and ascribed it to me, viz: that the word "elect" everywhere in the Bible, means the Apostles and prophets. He then learnedly and logically referred to many places where it was clear it did not mean the Apostles and prophets. But he found that he could not make you believe that I had taken any such position, and he ascertained that the word "elect" was not in Eph. 1st, though quoted and applied to the doctrine six or seven times in his Confession. His next twisting was to apply the first 6 verses to the elect and the remaining six to Paul and the Disciples at Ephesus. But in this, he found himself at variance with his creed and other authorities. On this chapter, I showed, as I had done in the Sermon, that the elect were Apostles and prophets, and that they were elected for "the adoption," not merely of themselves, but "*of children through Christ*;" that "in the fullness of time, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ;" to "preach the unsearchable riches of Christ," and "make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery." No harm has happened to the Sermon thus far,

4. John, 17th chapter, was assailed, but the gentleman soon found it convenient to admit that those "given to Christ," from the 6th to the 19th verse, were the Apostles, although his creed quotes verse 9th, and applies it to all the elect. He denied that those spoken of, verse 2d, were different persons from those spoken of to verse 24, but without any argument to the contrary. Here, then, he differed from his creed without disproving anything we had said.

5. My worthy friend assailed, with great determination, my remarks upon Jacob and Esau, but soon said he did not say that Esau was ordained to death, or Jacob to life, thus again flinching from his creed, which applies it, as he

did afterward, to foreordination to everlasting life and death. We showed that Esau had a birth-right, which, according to Calvinism, no reprobate person has; and that he lost it by despising and selling it, which, according to Calvinism, no elect person can do, and that Paul made it an argument against apostasy. We showed that this election related entirely to matters in this world, such as Esau's right to be enrolled in the genealogy and the servitude of his descendants to the descendants of Jacob, and that the expression, "Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated," was said in view of the characters of the descendants of the two men after the development of many centuries.

6. The gentleman assailed our remarks upon the "potter and the clay." He complained much of my going to Jer. 18th. At this I was not surprised, for there, as in 1 Tim. ii, 21, we find the reason why some are made vessels to honor and others to dishonor, most distinctly set forth; and that reason, not some previous decree of God, but because they do good or evil in the sight of God.

7. My friend also took exceptions to my remarks upon the words, "he will have mercy on whom he will have mercy." He was not willing that I should refer to those passages where God tells whom he will have mercy upon and the reason why he will have mercy upon them.

Nor was this any wonder, for the doctrine of the Bible is vastly different from that of his creed. On this point he did not expose or disprove any position of the Sermon.

8. He made some attack upon my argument to prove that men may fall from grace. On this point, he involved himself in the greatest absurdity of any mart we have heard in Debate. Those persons to whom Paul said, "if they shall fall away;" "if we shall sin willfully," Heb. 6th and 10th, chapters, he insisted had never been converted; that they were reprobates; thus representing the Apostle as saying, "if you shall fall away" from this reprobacy; "if we sin willfully," it will be impossible' to renew you again to repentance, or to that reprobate state of "total depravity," from which you have fallen. But the argument only need be referred to here, as you all recollect it well, and evidently put it down a failure on his

part. He never showed, nor can any man show, how any person can have his part taken *out of the bonk of life*; how a brother for whom *Christ died, can perish*; how persons can deny the Lord that *bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction, and fail of the grace of God*, if there be no falling from grace. This argument stands and ever must stand in defiance of all attempts at refutation.

9. My friend attempted to disprove my assertion, that the doctrine of the Confession, on Predestination, is not the doctrine, of the Bible, nor anything like it. In this attempt his failure was as complete and full as I have ever witnessed. At one time the doctrine of the Confession was self-evident, and it was difficult to prove a self-evident proposition. At another time, it was almost in the identical words of Scripture. We challenged him to find *one line* in the precise language of Scripture. This was never done, and never can be. We insisted that his proof must contain the terms of his proposition, or others equivalent to them. He never attempted to produce either. But he found the word "predestinate," in one place, "foreordain" in another, "elect" in another, "everlasting life" in another, "everlasting death" in another, "before the foundation of the world" in another, and *passing by one part of mankind, in no place*. While he was thus dividing his doctrine into small doses, so that you could take it, and seeking small scraps of Scripture, where he thought there was some analogy in *mere jingle of words*, though *not in sense*, I showed from Calvin, Watts, Toplady and his creed, that they inseparably connected *infant damnation* with Predestination and made God the author of sin. This the gentleman tried to counteract by an attempt to prove that I have taught the same doctrine touching infants, but in the very article quoted by him for this purpose, I have shown that infants are not guilty of actual sin, that "of such is the kingdom of God," that adult persons are required to "be converted and become as little children, or they cannot enter into the kingdom of God," and that Christ has secured a resurrection for them; a redemption of their bodies, which, as their souls are not sinful, is all that is requisite to their eternal happiness. But how did the gentleman rid himself of the difficulty? By ill-

tempered remarks, such "contemptible scraps," his "bantling of a Sermon," his "puny efforts," "demagogue," and "ignorance of Calvinism," etc., etc. These remarks I have endeavored to bear with patience, knowing that they only fall upon the head of my antagonist, but never can affect myself or brethren. I am willing to make all reasonable allowance for such invidious expressions, as the gentleman has acknowledged his "peculiar feelings" when he hears "the devil reprove sin." It is hard to be stripped of long-cherished doctrines, true or false. I feel no disposition to wound his feelings or those of his brethren, as I certainly have none other than the kindest feelings for them. I solemnly believe that their doctrine, on this question, saps the whole foundation of the Christian argument. We can neither refer to the glories of heaven, nor the terrors of hell, as an argument for obedience, but must continue the old song, preaching to sinners, that they cannot come to the Lord, unless irresistibly drawn, thus justifying them to all intents and purposes, in remaining in disobedience, for they cannot do otherwise.—[*Time expired.*]



**MR. FRANKLIN'S FIRST ADDRESS**

*Monday, May 31, 2 ½ o'clock, P. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

WE have no new subject, though the manner of investigation is changed. Precisely the same passage of the Confession we have been investigating, continues to be the subject of dispute. The only change made is, that I am placed in the affirmative and the worthy gentleman becomes the respondent. I affirm the absurdity of the article in his creed styled, "God's eternal decrees," and shall now proceed to prove it. Heretofore I have been the respondent, and, in that position, I had the right to either of two courses: 1. To follow my worthy friend and show that his proofs were not conclusive, or 2. To establish the opposite, of his doctrine, by an independent course of argument. If I succeeded in either, my opponent has been defeated. I claim that I have done both, and if I am right in putting in this claim, he is doubly defeated. I have, in the first place, followed him, and shown that his arguments are not only inconclusive, but destructive to his position. But in addition to this, I have established an independent argument, in opposition to his position, that he has been unable to answer, and, I am satisfied, will be to the close. This independent and affirmative argument I intend to continue to the end of the discussion.

I have granted that God had a design, plan, or purpose, and that every step he has taken, in his dealings with his creatures, has been in strict conformity with his "eternal purpose." The difference between the gentleman and myself, is not that he believes in *a plan or purpose*, and that I do not believe in it; but, while we both believe in the purpose of God, we disagree about what that purpose is. To settle this question, I have gone back, to see if we could learn from the Bible what the purpose of God is, and that my argument may appear in an unbroken form, I shall restate and prosecute it in order to the close. I suppose that my friend means, by "plan," the same he does by *decree or purpose*. Did God decree unchangeably whatever comes to pass? or did he decree to give to the world a gracious and free plan of salvation? This latter, I claim is what he intended, and what he has done.

1. The first thing, then, in order, is to recapitulate this affirmative and independent course of argument, so far as I have progressed. My first argument is founded upon the design of God in creating man. This I have shown both from Scripture and the gentleman's creed. Heb. ii, 5-8: "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak; but one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man that thou art mindful of him? or the Son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." This is a quotation from Ps. viii, 3-5. But in the very next verse, we have the object of the Almighty in creating man, distinctly stated, in the following words: "*Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things' under his feet.*" This is stated of the race, and this language can never be true and it also be true that God decreed unchangeably any portion of the race to wrath, "for no other cause," as Calvin says, "but to exclude them from the inheritance predestinated to his people."

To get back to the intention of God, in creating man, I quoted Paul in the Athenian court. Acts xvii, 26, 27, as follows: "And hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and determined the times appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should *seek the Lord*, if haply they might, feel after him, *and find him*, though he be not far from every, one of us." The force of this passage is very clear. If the Lord made all nations that they might *seek the Lord and find him*, none were decreed to be blinded, so that they never could seek the Lord and find him; for the Lord did not make man for one purpose, when he had decreed him for another; otherwise his decree would contradict his design. Whatever men may assert of God's decrees, they will never be able to make reasonable persons believe that God decreed man to *one end*, and made him for *another*. This original purpose or design of God, in creating all men that dwell on all the face of the earth, that they should seek the Lord and find him, if not itself the eternal purpose of God, cannot contradict it.

But I have shown that the worthy gentleman's creed asserts substantially the same. The first question in the Larger Catechism, reads as follows: "What is the chief and highest end of man?" The answer is, "Man's chief and highest end is to glorify God, and fully to enjoy him forever." I take it, that "man," in this passage, means the human race, and that "end," means *objector design*; the *object* or *design* of God in creating the human race. No one can doubt, I think, that the intention of the language, is to assert that the chief object of God in creating the human race, was that the race might *glorify God and enjoy him forever*. If this is the meaning of the language, it corresponds with the intention of God as set forth in Scripture, and is correct. But if this be the meaning of it, who can harmonize it with that passage, where it is said, "from all eternity, he hath, for his own glory, unchangeably foreordained whatsoever comes to pass in time, especially concerning angels and men!" It has come to pass concerning angels and men that they have sinned. Did God foreordain unchangeably *that they should sin*? If he did, how is it "the chief and highest end of man to glorify God and fully to enjoy him forever?" His decree, as set forth in the creed, contradicts his design, for he decreed or *ordained some to wrath*, but designed all to have the *privilege to enjoy him forever*.

2. My second argument is founded upon the promise to Abraham: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen: xii, 3. This passage is quoted and commented upon by Paul. Gal. iii, 8, as follows: "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." The Scripture foreseeing, I have shown to be the Foreknowledge of God. His Foreknowledge must agree with his purpose. His purpose, as we have seen, both from the Bible and the Confession, was that all men *might seek the Lord and find him*. To provide for this, the Lord promised a blessing to all nations. That blessing is Christ, and through him a plan of justification for all nations. This promise does not contemplate a decree "*without any foresight of faith*," as the article under consideration has it, but foreshows that God will justify the heathen *through faith*. It also prom-

ises a blessing to all nations, whereas the article in the Confession, promises no blessing to any but the elect. God then, made man with the design of granting him the privilege of enjoying him forever. The first step in carrying out this great design, was the promise of a blessing to all nations, to enable them to seek the Lord and find him.

3. My third argument is founded upon the testimony of the prophets, which shows that the provision is for all.' "To him give all the prophets witness that through his' name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins." Acts x, 43. This condensed statement of the testimony of the prophets, made by Peter in his first remarks to a Gentile audience, shows that the provision is universal and is presented to all upon the condition of faith in the Messiah. Let us, however, hear a few expressions from the prophets: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out of my *Spirit upon all flesh*" Joel ii, 28. This expression shows, that whatever blessing is conferred by the miraculous gift of the Spirit, was freely and graciously extended to all flesh. Let us hear Isa. xlv, 22, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else." This expression can never be anything but a false pretense, if Calvinism is true; for Calvinism denies that the non-elect can look to God and be saved; yet the blessed God calls to the ends of the earth, saying, "*be ye saved.*" The doctrine of my friend represents the holy God as exclaiming, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth," when he has given them no *power to look or come.*

Let us hear Isaiah liii, 6: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Now it is evident from this passage, that the Messiah died for the same number that had gone astray. The benefits of the death of Christ, and the benefits conferred by the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, are free to all flesh, and the ends of the earth are invited to *look to the Lord and be saved.* Calvinism denies this, and therefore cannot be true,

4. My fourth argument is founded upon the testimony of John the Baptist. John, the Apostle, says, of him, John i, 6-9: "There was a man sent from God, whose name

was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light. That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Again, said John the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away *the sin , of the world.*" Now can it be true that Jesus is the light of the world, that lighteth *every man that cometh into the world*; that he is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, that aft! *men through him might believe*; and yet, that God from eternity ordained some men to wrath?

5. My fifth argument is founded upon the love of God. My first proof is found, John iii, 16, 17: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world, through him, might be saved." In this passage, it is asserted that God *loved the world*, and that *the world through Christ might be saved*. The Lord here states his object in giving his Son, viz: that the *world through him might be saved*. I should like to hear the worthy gentleman say whether he believes this passage.

Again the Apostle says, that "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners Christ died for its." Rom. v, 8. David says, "The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." Ps. cxlv, 9. This expression is true, but not if Calvinism be true; for it denies that God is, in any sense, good to all, or that his tender mercies are over all. No man can show how he can be good to those whom he has unchangeably ordained to wrath, or how his tender mercies are over those. The original intention or purpose agrees with his promise to Abraham; the promise agrees with the testimonies of the prophets; the testimony of the prophets agrees with the testimony of John the Baptist, and the testimony of John agrees with the love of God.

6. My sixth argument is founded upon, the death of Christ. I invite the gentleman's attention to 1 Cor. xv, 21, 22: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam, all die,

even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Whatever death came by Adam, we are made alive from it by Christ. It is evidently the death and resurrection of the body, the Apostle is speaking of. If then, Christ did not die for all, how shall all be raised by him? If the wicked are not raised from the dead by Christ, what evidence have we that they will ever be raised at all? The same "all who die by Adam, shall be made alive by Christ." But we have the clearest and most explicit statement of the Scriptures, that he did die for all. "But we see Jesus," says Paul, "who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory, and honor, that he by the grace of God should *taste death for every man.*" Heb. ii, 9. Again, says Paul, "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one *died for all*, then were *all dead*. And that he *died for all*, that they who live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose again." The same "all" that Christ died for, are the "all" that were dead. The gentleman admits that *all*, in the broadest sense, were dead, but denies that Christ *died for all*. He is universal in the distribution of *death*, but partial in the offer of *life*. He is universal in his sentence of condemnation, but partial in his proffers of justification! The Apostle makes the grace to abound even more than sin has abounded.

[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' FIRST REPLY.

*Monday, May 31st, 3 o'clock, P. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I congratulate you and this audience on the prospect of our, at last, having something like a discussion. Heretofore the gentleman and myself have rarely met. Instead of meeting my affirmative arguments, and showing that they were unsound, or misapplied, he carefully avoided them, and occupied his time in building up, what he calls, "an independent argument" of his own. He was always either far in advance of me, or far in the rear. But rarely did I find him on the portion of the field which I occupied for the time. He preferred to be anywhere else than

there, and generally, he selected the most remote corner. Yet he now tells you, that he has "followed me, and shown my proofs are inconclusive!" This assertion is only a strong proof that the *memory* of man has not escaped the ravages of the fall!

But the state of affairs is now altered. The gentleman has a proposition to prove—though he has not thought worth while to read it, or even to state what it is—I follow as respondent, and follow him I shall in all his dodgings to the end of the chapter. I think the speech just delivered, is the best by far that we have had from the gentleman since this discussion began. It has but one fault. It establishes nothing that the gentleman wishes to establish. But it does prove a great deal more than he wanted to prove. It is in fact quite a strong Universalist sermon.

He admits that God had a design or purpose, and that every step he takes is in strict conformity to that purpose. He then, as his first argument, refers to the Bible, and the catechism, to ascertain what that purpose was, as respects man, and concludes that God's design was, that the whole human race might find God—glorify him—and fully enjoy him forever. Very good. Will God accomplish his purpose? If he does not, it must be either because it is an unwise purpose, which he sees must be changed, or because he is unable to carry it into execution. But neither idea can be admitted. He is infinitely wise. He is immutable in his counsels. He is omnipotent. Therefore, "His counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure." "He is of one mind and who can turn him? What his soul desireth, that he doeth." God's design is, that the whole human race should find him, glorify him, and fully enjoy him forever. But God will accomplish all his designs. Therefore, the whole human race shall find him, and enjoy him forever! This will do for a start!

His 2d. argument is from the promise to Abraham. Gen. xii, 3. This he understands to be a promise of spiritual and saving benefits to every individual who ever has lived, or whoever shall live upon this earth. Very well. God has a purpose, which he revealed to Abraham, in accordance with which he will, through Christ, the promised

seed, convey spiritual and saving benefits to every member of the human family. This purpose, being God's, will be accomplished. He has even bound himself by promise, and by oath—"two immutable things"—that it shall be executed. All men therefore will have spiritual and saving benefits conferred upon them! Such are the legitimate consequences of the premises the gentleman lays down.

His 3d. argument is from the testimony of the prophets', "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh." "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." It is then the eternal purpose of Jehovah to bestow the converting influences of his spirit upon every human being, in consequence of which, they all will look to him and be saved. God's "counsel shall stand." Therefore, all men shall look and be saved! This is "a short and easy method" to prove Universalism.

His 4th. argument is the testimony of John the Baptist. He bore witness of Christ "that all men through him might believe." It was the purpose of God in sending John, that the whole human family should hear his testimony respecting Christ, and believe upon him. Every step that God takes is in accordance with this purpose; therefore, all men will believe and be saved!

His 5th. argument is founded upon the love of God. God loved the world, and sent his Son "that the world through him might be saved." By "the world," "the gentleman understands every human being. God then, sent his Son into the world, with the purpose of saving every human being through him. His purpose shall stand. "As I have purposed so shall it stand."; Therefore, every human being shall be saved!

His 6th. argument is founded upon the death of Christ. He quotes "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," and comments upon it thus: "Whatever death came by Adam, we are made alive from it by Christ." And again, "The same all who die by Adam shall be made alive by Christ." But every human being dies in Adam—then, according to the gentleman, every human being will be made alive by Christ *from whatever death came by Adam*, Natural death came by Adam, this he admits, and this is all the death he admits as the result



of Adam's sin. But whether he admits it or not, there is also a "spiritual death"—a death "in trespasses and sins." This also comes by Adam, for, "by one man sin entered into the world," and had there been no sin, there could have been no *death in sin*. There is also an *eternal death*, "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life." There is an antithesis here between "life" and "death." It is an established law of language, that the words on both sides of an antithesis are taken in the same extent of meaning. But the "life" is *eternal* life; therefore the "death" is eternal death. It is also called an "everlasting destruction from, the presence of the Lord," and "the second death." Death natural, spiritual, and eternal, came by Adam. But whatever death came by Adam, every human being is made alive from by Christ—says the gentleman—Therefore every human being shall be raised from the grave, and enjoy spiritual and eternal life through Christ. This would pass for tolerable Universalism anywhere.

Now I beg leave to say to the gentleman, that he has overshot the mark. It is a law of logic that an argument which *proves too much* proves *nothing*. These six arguments prove far too much for him. He cannot therefore use them against me. I therefore respectfully hand them back to him that he may reconstruct them if he can, and render them available in this discussion. The course pursued by the gentleman is a most singular one. He is pledged to prove that certain sections in the Confession, of Faith are "unreasonable, unscriptural, and in opposition to the spread of the Gospel." Now I would have supposed the proper course to be, to read those sections; and then compare them point by point with the Scriptures, and test them by the deductions of reason. But no. The gentleman pursues an entirely different course. He does not quote the language of the Confession; he attempts no direct argument against its teachings; but goes on in an "independent argument" (so called as I have said, because there is no dependence of the conclusion on the premises), to establish *universal salvation*. But no doubt he has done the best he could.

The gentleman has quoted a variety of passages of Scripture, but unfortunately for the impression he wished

to make, many of them are misapplied; some prove doctrines that we both admit, but have no pertinency to the present issues; some are point blank against his own position; and some must have been quoted just to show that he knew they were in the Bible. Of this latter kind are, Heb. ii, 6-8, and Ps. viii, 3-5, showing that God made man the lord of this lower world. I think none but an original genius, like the gentleman, would have quoted Acts, xvii, 26, 27, to *refute* the doctrine of Predestination; a passage which teaches that God HATH DETERMINED THE TIMES BEFORE APPOINTED, AND THE BOUNDS OF THEIR HABITATION; thus surrounding the human family with proofs of his providence and goodness, in order "that they might" seek him;" and be "*without excuse*," for remaining ignorant of "his eternal power and Godhead." Rom. i, xx.

Most of the passages quoted by the gentleman contain the phrases "all families of the earth"—"all men"—"the world"—"the whole world" etc.; and on these general expressions rests the whole force of his Universalist argument. On these phrases, I remark, once for all, that they are commonly used by the inspired writers, *not as denoting an absolute universality, but an extension of blessings of Messiah's reign to the Gentile nations, as well as to the Jews*, This was the great question before the minds of the prophets and Apostles. Not whether all men should be saved; nor yet whether it was the design of God to render the Atonement efficacious for the salvation of all; but, are the Gentiles entitled to share these blessings with the Jews, to whom the blessings of the old economy were restricted? *The Jews* thought that they, and they alone were to partake of the blessings of the Gospel. It is this erroneous conception which the inspired writers are combating. And it is in *this connection, and with this question before their minds*, that they use those general expressions, so often perverted to a sense which they never intended. Taking this principle as our guide, we have a key to the most intricate mysteries of the whole matter.

Take the promise to Abraham for example; "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." On this we have the advantage of an inspired commentary, a passage quoted, and quoted, and quoted again by the gentleman, without his seeing that it was fatal to his whole

argument. "The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen—*ta ethna*—*the nations*—THE GENTILES—through faith preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying", in thee shall all nations be blessed"—*panta ta ethna*—ALL THE GENTILES be blessed. This then was the Gospel which was preached to Abraham, that *the Gentiles* as well as the Jews, should be blessed in Christ. This explains the phrase "all the families of the earth."

Take another proof-text of the gentleman's—"I will pour out my spirit on all flesh," On this also we have an inspired commentary, which I much prefer to the notions of the gentleman. At the day of Pentecost "there were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men out of every nation under heaven"—note the strong expression—stronger cannot be found than "every nation under heaven." But we are told what nations are meant—"Parthians, Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and the strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes, and Arabians. A glorious outpouring of the spirit was enjoyed, and Peter by the spirit exclaims, "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: 'I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh.'" According to Peter then, "all flesh" meant people "out of every nation," and "every nation under heaven," meant the fifteen or sixteen nations mentioned. How fortunate for truth, but how unfortunate for the gentleman's argument, that God sometimes explains his own language, thus showing us how all similar expressions are to be understood.

He quotes the passages—John "came to bear witness of the light that all men through him might believe"—and God sent, his Son into the world "that the world through him might be saved." Will he please tell us for what purpose he quotes them? Millions and millions had died before John came, and never heard his testimony. Millions and millions on earth at that time, knew not that such a man as John existed. Millions and millions that have since lived, and that now live, are in the same predicament. Could these believe that Christ was the Messiah, on the testimony of a man whom they never either saw or heard? Oh, but says, and sings the gentleman *that* "ALL

MEN MIGHT believe!" In an unrestricted sense he don't believe it himself!

"But the *world* through him might be saved." Does the gentleman understand by "the world," every member of the human family. If he does *not* the passage has no force against me. If he does, he don't believe, any more than I do, that the advent of Christ rendered it possible that all men should be saved. The antediluvian world had sinned, died, and went to the prison house of despair. "Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them, \* \* were set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." "The wicked" of the old world, had been "cast into hell with all the nations that forgot God." Was it possible for them to be saved by Christ? Did God send his Son with the intention of saving them? Comparatively a small portion of our race now on earth, or that has ever been on earth, have heard the name of Christ. And "how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard; and how can they hear without a preacher, and how can they preach except they be sent?" How, I ask the gentleman, is it possible for them who never heard of Jesus to be saved by him? He will understand me as speaking of adults. Respecting the salvation of infants, I have a long score to settle with him hereafter.

I shall now present a few objections to the Arminian system set forth by my friend.

I. I object to the system of the gentleman, that *it makes the gift of Christ the greatest curse ever inflicted upon the world*. According to that system, it is the height of injustice in God to condemn those who "had no chance of being saved." Now if Christ had not come, no man could have had a chance of salvation. It would then have been unjust in God to send any man to hell. But Christ came, and as the result of his death every man has "sufficient grace" to be saved, which *sufficient* grace is yet *insufficient* in many cases to save men, and they are therefore damned. Had they never had grace they would not have been lost, it would have been unjust. But obtaining grace in consequence of Christ's advent, they can justly be damned, and are damned to all eternity. Damnation by grace! Such is the *grace* the "*free grace*"—the *insufficient*, "*sufficient grace*" which the system of the gentleman

presents. If Christ had not come, all would have escaped hell, but in consequence of his death millions and tens of millions are punished there to all eternity. Surely the gentleman's system demands that one of the texts he is fond of quoting should be read backwards—" God sent not his Son into the world, to save the world, but that the world through him might be damned."—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I BEGIN to fear the results, if my friend should change, for it appears impossible to get him to receive the truth, without tacking on a false appendage. He seems now set upon it, if I convince him that the grace of God is as free to all the world as to himself; that God loved all the world as much as himself, to leap into Universalism. But what I dislike in the matter is, that he intends to insist that I have made him a Universalist. In this he is mistaken. It is his notion of *eternal necessity*, that is leading his mind to Universalism. In the several debates I have had on that one-sided system, I have always met this same doctrine of necessity, and find Universalists quoting Calvinistic authorities to sustain them, in denying the *agency of man*, or the *freedom of the will*, and making God the author of sin. Calvinism approbates the whole principle upon which Universalism is based, and so has the gentleman in this Debate. His arguments will be quoted to prove that system, from this debate, when we shall be in our graves. Upon the same principle that Calvinism saves the elect, Universalism saves all. The only difference between them is in the number elected. One claims *all* for elect, the other only a *part*; and Calvin, says my friend, admits, that the elect were fallen, sinful, and no better than the balance of the race, and the reason why they were elected, was not because they were *better than others*, but because so it *seemed good in the sight of God*,

Here then, Calvinists come to the feet of Universalists, and yield up all the arguments that ever have, and ever can be offered against the injustice of a system that has no regard to the characters of men; that strikes a blow at the very basis of all rewards and punishments, in referring

the distinction between *good* and *bad*, back to the *intention of God*, and charging that it is not the *characters of men*. Calvinism and Universalism agree in the doctrine, that sin is unavoidable; that God designed it and overrules it for good, and yet that he will *punish the sinner*, for the very sins which he *designed him* to commit, and which he *could not avoid!* One confines this punishment to this world, the other refers it to the world to come. Both find the cause of sin in the *intention of God*, and not in the *intention and practice of the creature*. Here I leave them, in sweet harmony for the present, and if tire gentleman would prefer living a Universalist, to giving up the doctrine of fatality, his own one-sided method of reasoning is accountable for it, and not any truth advanced by myself;

I shall not attempt to follow the gentleman and correct all the unfair statements and false issues of his reply, but shall trust to the intelligence of this audience and those who may read the debate, to see that they are no replies to my arguments. One attempt he made had the appearance of argument, and I am willing to allow him all due credit, when he attempts anything like a fair issue, and shall meet him at every such point. He claims that those expressions that I have referred to, expressive of *the race*, simply mean Jew and Gentile. If he can sustain this, I will grant that it is an argument. I give him the following as specimens: "As in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ *all* shall be made alive"—"he hath concluded *all* under sin, that he might have mercy upon *all*"—"all men that dwell on *all the face of the earth*"—"if he died for *all*, then were *all* dead"—"should taste death for *every man*"—"sent not his Son into *the world* to condemn *the world*, but that *the world through him might be saved*"—"now he commandeth *all men everywhere* to repent"—"he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also, for the sins of *the whole world*"—"the promise is *to you and to your children*, and to *all them that are afar off*"—"he will have all men to be saved"—"he is not willing that *any* should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance." Let him try this key to these passages and show that they simply include the Gentile as well as the Jew, or that they do not mean *the race*.

There is one other point I must notice briefly, viz: That

thousands died before the Gospel, and thousands since the Gospel, who never heard it; therefore, the death of Christ could not affect them. In this he forgets his own doctrine; doctrine in which he is taught, as well as in all others called orthodox, to believe that those saved before Christ, as much as those saved since Christ, were saved through him or through his death; that the blood of all the sacrifices before Christ "could not take away sins," If Christ had not died none would have been saved before or since. I challenge him to deny this. But suppose he had not died for all the race before, as well as since Christ then their infants could not have been saved, for nothing is more certain than that they are saved through him; that he secured a resurrection for them, when he unlocked the grave, as he did for the race. Had he not done this, neither those before nor since Christ would have been raised from the dead. His death reaches back then, and covers the race, and, as Jesus said of infants, "of such is the kingdom of God," and as they were free from *personal* or as the schoolmen call it, "*actual sin*," when their bodies were redeemed from the grave, they were as holy and spotless as any saint in Heaven. But if Christ had not died for all, even the most wicked, before the Gospel, they could not in justice be condemned, for the plea could forever have been offered, that had they lived the most righteous and holy lives, they could riot have been saved, for no offering had been made for them. The same is true of all who have lived since. If there are any for whom no offering has been made, that fact would forever stand as an unanswerable argument against the justice of their punishment. The reason of their condemnation would not be their sinning, in rejecting the offering made for them, nor anything else they could have avoided, for they never had it in their power to avoid sin. But are there not thousands now, who never heard the Gospel? Certainly, and thousands who hear what is called Gospel, who are misled by *blind guides*, who will fall into the ditch with them, This only shows, that man has the power in religion, as in other things, to cheat his fellow-man out of what God has graciously and freely given him. It is the fault of wicked men, that the Gospel was ever taken from any portion of our race, for God commanded it to be

preached to all—to every creature, and it was, in apostolic times, "preached to every creature under heaven." I shall now proceed with regular course of argument.'

7. My seventh argument, founded upon the propitiation has been fully laid before you. I will, therefore, simply recapitulate it here. On this point I have shown that there was a "ransom for all to be testified in due time." 1 Tim. ii, 6. That "he is the Savior of the world," 1 John iv, 14. That "he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the *sins of the whole world*." 1 John ii, 2. This saps the foundation of all Calvinism. The blessed God made propitiation for the *whole world*; for all the neighbors of the gentleman, as well as himself and brethren, his efforts to circumscribe notwithstanding.

8. My eighth argument was founded upon the object of Christ's mission into the world. This I have amplified pretty fully already; so that I need not add anything more than recapitulate the argument here, for the sake of having it in an unbroken form. The object of Christ's mission is clearly set forth in his own words, John iii, 17, as follows: "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved," Also, Acts xiii, 47: "Christ is said to be set for salvation to the ends of the earth." The object of the mission of Christ in coming into the world is here set forth in his own language, and it may do the gentleman some good, if he does not pervert it, and try to prove Universalism from it; that object is, "that the world through him *might be saved*." should like to know whether my friend believes this passage. If he does, he does not believe his creed, for it declares that he "passed by" a portion of the world. One or the other is not true. It cannot be true, that God ordained unchangeably a portion of mankind to wrath, and that the world through Christ *might be saved*. No two sentiments are in more direct contradiction.

9. Argument is founded upon the preaching the Gospel "to every creation"—to "all the world." "Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Mark xvi, 15. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations," Mat. xxviii, 19 Such was the command of the Lord to the Apostles, when he first sent them into all the world. Calvinists admit that the Gospel was to be preached to all, but



they deny that it contains any salvation to all. The word Gospel means *good news*—good news was to be preached to all the world, but I defy my friend to show that his doctrine has any *good news to all*. Was the Gospel preached to all? Paul shall answer: "If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I, Paul, am made a minister." Col. i, 23. It is not only asserted in this passage, that the Gospel was preached to every creature, but the *hope of the Gospel*. Let us hear Paul again, Rom. x, 18: "But, I say, have they not all heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." Well, if, as is the case, it is *proved* and *admitted* that the Gospel was not only commanded to be preached to all, but *was* preached to all, what was it for? Luke ii, 10; we have an expression to the point, from an angel of God: "And the angel said unto them: Fear not, for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." My friend has nothing of this in his system. I defy him to show any "*good tidings of great joy, to all people*" in his system. 10. Argument founded on the design of preaching the Gospel to all. What was the Gospel to be preached to all for? I call your attention to John xx, 30, 31: "Many other signs truly did Jesus, in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in his book, but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through his name." When he says, "these are written," it is equivalent to *these are published or preached*, for they were written to *publish* or *preach them* to the world. 1. To whom were these things published or preached? Calvinists admit, *to all*. What were they published or preached to every creature for? John says, "that *ye might believe*," or to give all power to believe. Here, then, it is proved beyond dispute, that the arrangement of God was, that all *might believe*; and wherever that arrangement has not been carried out, it has been owing to the wicked interposing in opposition to the will of God. What was the object of believing? The Apostle says, "that believing ye *might obtain life through his name*." Here, then, the Apostle asserts as his design

in publishing the Gospel, that the reader *might believe*, and that *believing he might obtain life*. Just as certain, then, as it was the will of God, that the Gospel should be *preached to all*, it was his will that all should believe, and thus *obtain life*.

This agrees with the design of preaching set forth by Paul, Eph. iii, 9: "to make *all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery*, which, from the beginning of the world, hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." *No* two systems can be more directly in opposition to each other than the Gospel and Calvinism. The Gospel is "to make *all men see*," and the other to make them believe that a part of mankind, *never can see*. Let us hear Paul again: "By whom we have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all nations, for his name." Ro. i, 5. This he states as the design of the apostolic mission, at the beginning of his letter. Let us now hear him at the close. He says: "Now, to him that is of power to establish you according to my Gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations, for the obedience of faith." Rom. xvi, 25, 16. The object, then, of preaching the Gospel among all nations was for the "*obedience of faith*" This is a rational object. But I hasten to another argument.

11. Argument founded upon the fact, that all men are commanded to repent. Let us hear the word of the Lord: "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness, but is long-suffering toward us, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Did the Lord ordain some men to wrath, and then turn round and say, "he was not willing that any should perish?" Who can endure such an impeachment of the attributes of the Holy God? Did he say, he was willing "*that all should come to repentance*," knowing that he had ordained some to wrath, and that they could not come to repentance? No wonder that Mr. Wesley called this doctrine, "horrible blasphemy."

God is then, willing that all should come to repentance. Has God given them power to repent? Calvinists say, that he could have done so. Has he done all that could

be done? "What could I have done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" Isa. v, 4. The Lord could have given all power to repent, and he has done all that could be done. Has he commanded all to repent? "In the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now he commandeth all men everywhere to repent." Acts xvii, 30. It is God's will that all men should repent; he has given all the power to repent; he has commanded all men everywhere to repent, therefore, they will be justly damned if they do not repent.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' SECOND REPLY.

*Monday, 4 o'clock, P. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I BEG leave to remind the gentleman that he is pledged to prove to this audience that "the doctrine of Predestination, as set forth in the Confession of Faith, and defined in chapter third, sections 3d, 4th, and 5th, is unreasonable, unscriptural, and in opposition to the spread of the Gospel." This is the question now at issue. Any argument which does not bear upon this question is impertinent. Has the gentleman touched this question? Has he even stated what the proposition is which he is bound to prove?

Has he read the sections of the Confession which the proposition refers to, and taken them up, point by point, and attempted to show that they are "unreasonable, unscriptural," etc? Nothing of the kind. His whole effort has been to destroy a monster, the offspring of his own brain, never having had an existence outside the imaginations of some over-heated and prejudiced polemics, a monster which they are pleased to term *Calvinism*. Now there never was a man, woman, or child, so far as known to me, that ever believed, or pretended to believe, in the system which the gentleman is opposing. There never existed a Confession, or creed that contained such doctrine. Certainly the doctrine of our Confession is the poles distant from any such system. What does the gentleman propose to gain by lighting a mere chimera, a phantom.

"Monstrum, horrendum, ingens, cui lumen ademptum?" I can assure the gentleman that the course which he has

pursued on this occasion, will go far to confirm Calvinisms in the truth of their views, and in the conviction that their arguments are unanswerable, when they see that the only hope which our opponents have, is to misrepresent our sentiments and carefully avoid our arguments.

The gentleman was evidently startled at the exposition which I gave in my last speech, of the real tendency of his arguments. It was shown that so far as those arguments prove anything against Predestination, they do it by establishing Universalism. The gentleman makes no effort to show that my deductions from his arguments were not legitimate; but he makes a lame effort to establish a similitude between Calvinism and Universalism. This attempt, I invite special attention to, both because it shows that the gentleman felt himself reduced to a strait, from which a desperate effort was necessary to deliver himself, and because it exhibits in a beautiful light, the disposition of the gentleman, when he attempts to state the sentiments of Calvinists.

He informs us that he has had several debates with Universalists, and he found them "quoting Calvinistic authorities to sustain them in denying the agency of man, the freedom of the will, and making God the author of sin." Now I boldly and unhesitatingly brand this statement of Calvinistic doctrine as a SLANDER. *It is not true* that we deny man's free agency, or the freedom of the will, or that we make God the author of sin. So far from this being true, each of those errors is distinctly condemned in the Confession of Faith. Any minister who should promulgate among us any such doctrine would be deposed immediately from his office.

The gentleman goes further. He asserts that "upon the identical principle that Calvinism saves the elect, Universalism saves all." This also I brand as a SLANDER. Calvinism saves the elect upon the principle of the vicarious atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ, who made a complete satisfaction to the law and justice of God in the stead of the sinner; and upon the principle of the direct, supernatural work of the Holy Ghost upon the heart, in regeneration and sanctification. Universalists agree with some of the leaders of *a certain sect*, which sprang into existence in this 19th century, and which arrogates to itself the

name of *Christian*, in *repudiating* both these doctrines, as well as the Supreme Deity of Jesus. Is it true, as I have heard it intimated, that these "free grace" gentry, as soon as they attempt to give a statement of the doctrine of their opponent, practically exemplify the truth of their doctrine of *falling from grace*? It is certainly difficult to imagine how any man, *with grace in exercise*, could so shockingly pervert and misrepresent the doctrines of an opponent.

I can assure the gentleman that the Universalists are delighted with the course of argument which he is pursuing. They have no preachers of their own in this Community; and why should they have, when they can have their preaching done by *proxy*? One of them told me to let the gentleman alone, that he was preaching good Universalism, and if I stopped him he would not come to hoar us any further. Another of them, took a little different view of the matter, and insisted that I should stop the gentleman, saying that he did not like to hear Universalism preached by a man who did not believe it? These facts show whose system is in 'sweet harmony' with Universalism. Beside, Universalist books teem with abuse of Calvin and Calvinistic doctrine. The very choicest morsels of detraction and misrepresentation, which the gentleman has treated us to, can all be found in Mr. Pingree's arguments against Dr. Rice, a work lying at this moment on the gentleman's table. The same passages of the Confession quoted by Mr. Pingree the gentleman quotes: the same *omissions* of sentences and parts of sentences made by Mr. Pingree, the gentleman makes; the same texts of Scripture quoted by Mr. Pingree, the gentleman quotes. I have no doubt that arguments from the book will be quoted by Universalists, but they are those which the gentleman has borrowed from their storehouse for this special occasion, that therewith he might demolish their common enemy, *Calvinism*.

The gentleman has given me a few texts by which to try the key with which I furnished him in my last speech. Some of them, I find, it fits, and opens beautifully; but others it will not fit at all. How is this? Why simply for this reason, the gentleman has been employed so long in FORGING Calvinistic articles of faith, that he has tried his hand at FORGING TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE!! He asks me to

explain, by my key, the text, "He hath concluded all under sin, that he might have mercy upon all." *There is no such text in the Bible.* It is a spurious issue of the gentleman, to sustain his spurious "free grace," no grace system. I beg leave respectfully to remind him that "adding to" the words of Scripture is one of the sins for which he told us there was no repentance.

There is another of these texts which I cannot find. "All men that dwell on all the face of the earth." I do find a passage *almost* like this, in Luke, xxi, 35, *which passage must be limited to a small portion of the human family.* Did the gentleman refer to it? There is yet another *forgery* in this batch of texts; that is, if clipping a word or figure out of a note be forgery, equally with adding a word or figure to it, as I believe it is. He quotes, "The promise is to you and to your children, and to all them that are afar off." The genuine text reads, "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 ii, 39. The Calvinistic appendage which restricts the meaning of the whole verse, the gentleman lops off as inconsistent with *his* free grace. For *all* men are not called, but, "*whom he did predestinate, THEM HE ALSO CALLED.*" Rom. viii, 30. I think the gentleman has quoted, more than once, that passage, "*If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophesy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life.*" And I think he told us too, that for such a crime, though thousands have committed it, there is no forgiveness. My key then, fits every *genuine* text, and only fails with the "*free grace*" *forgeries* of the gentleman.

He makes a lame effort to evade the fact that in direct contradiction of his whole argument, from the promise to Abraham, the testimony of the prophets, the mission of John, etc., etc., thousands of thousands never heard of Christ and the way of salvation through him. He says those saved before Christ, were saved through him. Grant it. But how does that affect the case of those who never heard of a promised Savior, who consequently never could believe upon him? Let him fairly meet the difficulty, for if he does not, it destroys the force of every argument he has offered on this occasion. He says God

promised Abraham to bless the whole race in his seed. Did he include those who were in hell at the very time the promise was made? Did he include those who lived and died without ever hearing of the promised seed? He says John testified of Christ that *all men* might believe. Does "*all men*" here include those who were in their graves before John was born, and who consequently could not hear his testimony? and those who have jived since, without John's testimony ever reaching them? Or is the "*all men*" used in a restricted sense? Let the gentleman meet this fairly if he can. If he cannot, let him admit that there is no force in his *eleven* arguments already offered, or in eleven times eleven such arguments, with such a difficulty unsolved.

The gentleman finds the ground he stands on giving way, and he begins to plunge and struggle to extricate himself, every plunge only sinking him deeper in the mire. He says man has the power to cheat his fellow out of what God designs for him. Of course, then, he cheats God too 1 Genuine Calvinism denies that man can cheat his fellowman out of the blessing God purposes to bestow. "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is Christ Jesus our Lord."

He also says that the Gospel, in apostolic times, was preached to the entire, race, and quoted Paul's expression, "preached to every creature under heaven." Now a system which is under the necessity of assuming that before the year A. D. 61 or 62, when this epistle was written, the Gospel had, as a matter of fact, been preached to *the race*; to the inhabitants of China, Japan, India, Scythia; to the interior and Southern portions of Africa; to the Aborigines of North, South, and Central America, and to the Islands of the sea; is a system most manifestly false, for it can only be supported by assuming the most enormous fictions. Only the pressure of circumstances could drive any man, pretending to ordinary intelligence, to assume such a position, in utter contradiction of all history, or probability. But does not Paul say, "every creature under heaven?" Yes, and Luke says that Augustus Caesar issued a decree that

"ALL THE WORLD should be taxed." Though all the world; was not known to the Romans, and much that was known, was not subject to the Roman Emperor. Such passages only prove, what I have all along maintained, that these general expressions of Scripture are mostly to be taken in a restricted sense, as indicated by the subject of discourse.

The gentleman says that it was owing to wicked men that the Gospel has not been preached to the whole world. Will the gentleman be good enough to tell who these wicked men that oppose missions, are?

The gentleman *now* says that "nothing is more certain than that infants *are saved* through Christ." But in March last, he said that the Gospel had nothing to do with infants; that there was no provision in the Gospel to save them; that Christ came to save the lost, but that infants were not lost, and of course were not of those whom Christ came to save.

Now, I would most heartily congratulate the gentleman on his conversion from these erroneous views, were it not for a slight suspicion that when he gets away from this discussion, and out of the corner which he finds somewhat narrow, he will *fall from grace*, and return like the dog to his vomit, and like the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire. I always suspect the genuineness of a conversion made from such obvious motives as those of the gentleman, in *now* repudiating his article in the "Age."

The gentleman has gone on with his "independent arguments," independent of any particular proposition, for they seem to suit any side of any question; he uses them when in the negative; he serves them up again when he is in the affirmative; they are in order on the first proposition; they are just the tiling on the second. Independent of any special bearing on the point now in controversy; independent of the real meaning of the Scripture; independent of any connection between premises and conclusions; independent of the real sentiments of the party adducing them.

His seventh argument is founded upon the propitiation of Christ. In fact all his arguments are but reproductions of one thought in varied phraseology. So that an answer to one is an answer to all. Now, before I could in justice



be expected to answer any argument of the gentleman, I ought to know that he believes it himself. The amount of them all is that Christ made an atonement for the sins of the whole world. Now it is a well known fact that there is a great diversity of sentiment upon this subject of Atonement in the denomination to which the gentleman belongs. It is a well known fact that a denial of Christ's vicarious and sacrificial death, was one of the first steps which B. W. Stone took in error. His theory upon this subject he never retracted. Nor am I aware that any of his followers have. *His theory excludes the idea of propitiating or pacifying our heavenly Father toward any sinner.* Before then, I answer further, any argument based on the propitiatory nature of Christ's death, I must know to which wing of the harmonious party of "Christian Union" he belongs, and whether he believes that Christ does propitiate God to any man, by atoning for his sins to offended justice. In the meantime I will tell him that the text upon which he relies, is beautifully opened by my key. "He is the propitiation for our sins," but his work is not confined to *its Jews*; "not *for ours* only, but also for the sins of the whole world;" it extends to men of all countries and climes. Gentile and Jew alike share it.

His eighth argument is based on the design of God in sending Christ: "Not to condemn the world but that the world through him might be saved." I have already shown that the gentleman's system compels him to read the text backward, as a witch says her prayers. *According to his system, God sent his Son into the world that he might have an excuse to damn a large portion of the world to all eternity!!* I challenge the gentleman's attention to this point. He expressly said that "if Christ had not died for all men, they could not in justice be condemned." I ask then, in the name of God, why, why did he die for any? If none could be justly damned, except those for whom Christ died, why did he die for any, *thus making damnation possible, which, without his death, would have been impossible?* This is the "*glad tidings*" which the gentleman has "for all nations;" that, now Christ having died, God may justly damn them! This is the "gentleman's "free grace;" a grace "sufficient to procure the damnation of thousands, but insufficient certainly and efficaciously

to secure the salvation of any! From *such* grace, may God deliver us! Another argument is that all are commanded to repent; and yet the gentleman tolls us some *cannot* repent! Why, this is as bad as *his* Calvinism.—

[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

My worthy friend well-nigh renounced his doctrine in the speech you have just heard. The Calvinism I am opposing, he insists, is not really Calvinism; but my statement of it is a *slander!!* He says, with emphasis, that my statement of it is *not true*. So far, then, as I have stated Calvinism in this debate, he repudiates it. In this, he virtually repudiates the very doctrine he has engaged to defend. The Calvinism quoted over and over again, from his creed, is the Calvinism I have stated and refuted in defiance of any defense he *has* or *can make*. But it looks so miserable to him, when set forth in its true light, that he calls it "imaginary," and regards it a "slander." He need not be surprised if others repudiate, it, when they read these admissions from him. But after thus denying, in a wholesale way, Calvinism as I have stated it, he specifies a point, viz: that Universalists quote Calvinistic works, denying the agency of man and the freedom of the will. Upon this he became quite warm. But I would admonish him to keep cool, and see what the result will be

What freedom of the will has he admitted since this controversy commenced? Has he admitted that the non-elect are free to believe the Gospel? Are they free to repent? Are they free to be saved? Are they free to serve God? Can they serve him? Can they *will* anything but sin? Can they will any good thing? Can they be saved? Can they avoid the eternal burnings? He is bound to answer no, or renounce not *imaginary* but *real* Calvinism. In what does his freedom of the will consist, then? It is free, I suppose, to sin and lead the creature to hell, without the power *to will* or to do anything else! That is, it *is free*, but under such an eternal necessity that it can act in no way but one! The non-elect are free to go on down to perdition, without the power of turning to the *right* or *left*, to turn *back* or *stop*. The mill-wheel is

just as free and just as much to praise or blame. I did not think that the gentleman wished anything move on this point. If he does, I will give him a few words from, some of the Calvinistic books lying before me.

The gentleman asserts that I have slandered his doctrine, in saying that upon the same principle that he saves a part, the Universalists save all. Of course, I did not assert that the two theories are the same, but the great *principle*. That principle is, the *sovereign will*. From it everything flows, and according to it everything must come to pass. Both Calvinists and Universalists insist that all that God *willed* to be saved, must be saved. Universalists say that he *willed all* to be saved, therefore, all will be saved. Calvinists say, that he only *willed* a part to be saved, therefore, only a part will be saved. I assert again, that upon the identical principle that Calvinists save a part, Universalists save all, viz: the *sovereign will of God*. This determines the whole matter. They both agree that it is through Christ: but I pretend not to say, that the whole theory of these parties is the same.

I think it will avail but little for my worthy friend to throw out insinuations against persons denying the Supreme Deity of Christ, after his effort in the forepart of this debate to show that Christ was not *acquainted with, certain things, and would not be when he would sit in the judgment of the great day!* I defy him to produce anything from those to whom he made such sarcastic reference, half so dishonorable to the Lord Jesus or so injurious to the character of Divine Revelation, as his own remarks in this discussion.

I am kindly informed, by the gentleman, that the Universalists are highly pleased with my argument. He appears to be upon very intimate terms with Universalists. Not one has so much as spoken to me since I have been in the place. If they are so highly pleased with my argument, I should think they would give me some expression of their feelings, and not keep up such intimacies with the gentleman, who is so far from them in doctrine. But he is not so far from them as he thinks he is, for his own intimations have already give them some encouragement, that ere long he will be with them.

My friend appears to be harder pressed at present, than

heretofore, for he has not only repudiated Calvinism, but some clear passages of Scripture, and says he cannot find them in the Bible. The words, "He hath concluded all under sin, that he might have mercy upon all," he denies to be a text of Scripture. Now I invite the attention of the gentleman to his Bible, Rom. xi, 32, "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." Now by comparing the text with my quotation, made from memory, you will find that I have it word for word, except that I have the words, "under sin," in the place of the words, "in unbelief," which could make no possible difference in the use I was making of it. But this is not the worst. The very words, "hath concluded *all under sin*," are Scripture. See Gal. iii, 22, Now here I leave the matter, and I call upon him, with his key, and all the learning he can command, to meet me at this point. Gal. iii, 22; Paul says, "The Scripture hath concluded all *under sin*." The other passage says, "God hath concluded them all *in unbelief*." Rom. xi, 32. I referred to this quotation, to find a universal expression, as he had challenged me to do, that means *the race*. Now, I challenge him to deny that either of these expressions means the race. The "all under sin," are the "all in unbelief," and are the race of man, as admitted by John Calvin himself, Inst. page 174, where he quotes the passage, as follows, "God hath concluded all under sin, that he might have mercy upon all." Why Calvin, are you trying "your hand at *forging texts of Scripture*?" Your worthy son says, "there is no such text in the Bible." "God hath concluded *all in unbelief*, that he might have *mercy upon all*," Let the gentleman try his key upon this "all" and deny if he dare that it means the *race*, or let him deny the object of concluding all in unbelief, viz: that he might have mercy upon all.

He cannot find the words, "All men that dwell on all the face of the earth," as quoted by me from memory. Let him then, turn to Acts xvii, 26, and see the precise words. They read as follows: "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." This means the race, beyond doubt, and is a clearer evidence to the point for which it was quoted, than my quotation from memory. Let him show that I have

done injustice to any text quoted. His language about "forging Scripture," only shows the vitiated state of his feelings and the want of loveliness. He tries to make a little show, by finishing out the quotation from Acts ii, "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." 2 These. ii, 14, Paul says, "Whereunto he called you by our Gospel." Who were called? Those to whom the promise was made. The promise was to all the families of the earth. The Gospel was commanded to be preached to "every creature," and Paul says, it was preached to "every creature under heaven." Every "creature under heaven," then, was called. Jesus is yet calling; "Come unto me," etc.; the Spirit says, Come, and the Bride says Come, etc.

The gentleman is still in trouble about those who never heard the Gospel. Suppose I cannot tell how the blessed God will deal with such, what does that prove? The doctrine of his creed? or is it opposed to the whole scope of Divine Revelation. It is as clear a fact that "Christ died for all," as that "all were dead," and the "all" in one case is as large as the "all" in the other, and what has he done in unlocking this passage? The "all" that die by Adam, is the same "all" that shall be made alive. This *all* is the race, therefore; the doctrine that God passed by a part of the race is not true. Let him try his key here. Does he believe that "by Adam all die?" Was not that the human race? Does he believe that by Christ all shall be made alive? Could any be made alive through, or by Christ, for whom Christ did not die? Does he believe the very words of Scripture, that he "died for all?" If he does, there is an end to the argument. I deny the doctrine of his creed that Christ passed by any portion of the race; he believes it. The simple matter to decide is, whether God intended to have mercy upon all; whether Christ died for all; tasted death for every man; is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; whether all men everywhere are commanded to repent; whether Jesus came to seek and save that which was lost, or whether the Almighty Father intended to pass by a large portion of the human race, without ever offering them any grace, mercy or truth. Can he believe that "God is not willing that

any should perish," and yet believe that he passed by a portion of the race, without ever putting it in their power to be saved? If he can, it is no wonder that he can believe that a man is a *free agent*, and yet that he is forced, by an eternal and an unavoidable necessity, to sin all his life and be lost in hell forever in the world to come.

The gentleman, by some of his inquiries, has shown a much less profound understanding of the Bible than I could have anticipated. He thinks strange that those in hell, when the promise was made to Abraham, should be included in that promise. This only shows how little he has devoted himself to the study of that great sin offering made by God in the end of the ages. If that offering had not been made, none before or since Christ could have been saved. But, thanks to heaven, God made an offering for all, in all time, sufficient to save all who used the light heaven afforded them, to the best of their ability; and I now deny that God ever did or ever will punish any in hell, who did the best they had it in their power to do, with the light God gave them, during their pilgrimage in this world. Had not an offering been made for all, every wicked and lost spirit that shall stand before the throne in judgment, could forever have urged the righteous plea against their condemnation, that they never had it in their power to be saved, for God had made no offering, for them. But God took away that plea. Every offering, from the beginning of the world, pointed to the great sin-offering. And it was not a mere pretense with God that he was to make an offering", but he did make it, and made it for all. Therefore, this condemnation will be just, if they reject the offering made for them. God is a holy God, and can do nothing contrary to his holy attributes. He cannot preach a Gospel to a sinner, that he knows the sinner cannot believe, and damn him for not believing it. He cannot condemn sinners for not loving him, when he has not first loved them. He cannot condemn them for not receiving grace that was never offered to them. He cannot condemn men for rejecting Christianity, who never had any power to receive it. But Calvinism does, gloss it over as he may, keep it constantly before the mind, that men will perish if they do not repent, when they never had it in their power to repent; that men

will be damned for not believing, who never had it in their power to believe—that men will be cast off forever for not loving God, when God never loved them—that God is partial, in passing by some, leaving them in their sins, and punishing them for the sins they could not avoid, while he saved others *no better*, for no reason only because he determined to exclude the non-elect from the inheritance predestinated for his children.

When Jesus is called "the light of the world," it does not mean that he was a part of the light, nor was his birth the beginning of his light. All the light before and since his death, from heaven, was from him. All the faith before as well as since his birth, was from him, and the wickedness before as well as since his day, was sin against him. Consequently "through him the world might believe," and "through him the world might be saved," and by him the world will be judged. This is Heaven's truth and Heaven's order of things, and when my friend will find his non-elect, who are not included in the "all" that die in Adam,—in the "all in unbelief"—the "all upon whom mercy comes," and the "all for whom Christ died," I will show him the same number that will not be raised from the dead, and not appear in the judgment of the great day. What an unreasonable thought, that all the family of man shall be judged by law that never proposed the first blessing to only a small portion of the entire race. Such, however, is the absurdity of Calvinism.

My worthy friend makes strange of the idea, that man can cheat his fellow-man out of what God freely gave him, and allows he cheats God too. Genuine Calvinism, he says, denies this. That is not the first truth it has denied. Calvinism would no doubt deny that a man could "rob God," yet the Bible charges this sin upon some. But if Calvinists do not believe man can be cheated out of the things God bestows, why are they so awfully afraid of heresy? Why hate poor Servetus? Why are Calvinists afraid of being deceived? Paul said, "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." Calvinism does not believe such a thing could be done, for this would not only cheat man but God, according to Mr. M. Paul believed that, a "brother for whom Christ died" could be *destroyed*, and admonished those who could destroy him,

not to do it. Mr. M. does not believe this, not because he *cannot* believe it, but because he *will not*. This is what I call not "sound in the faith." Men may cheat themselves out of heaven. Can I get the gentleman to say he believes the following: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even *denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.*" Can heretics deny the Lord that *bought them*? Can persons whom the Lord bought, bring upon themselves swift destruction? Then, there is no truth in Calvinism, for it denies all this. Whenever Mr. M. shall say he believes this passage, we may take it, that he has give up Calvinism.

I am sorry to find that the gentleman does not believe Paul when he says, "The Gospel was preached to every creature under Heaven." But it appears he does not. That is a question between him and the apostle. I am with Paul. He is against him.—[*Time expired*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' THIRD REPLY.

*Thursday, 9 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

*Fellow Citizens*—Instead of reviewing particularly at this time the gentleman's speech of last evening, I propose to review in detail, the objections urged against the doctrine of Predestination, and to show that those objections are unfounded.

We have this one general answer to make to all the accusations of our adversaries, that *the fruits of our doctrine disprove their allegations, and show them to be calumnious*. If our system inculcated the "*horrible blasphemies,*" which the gentleman has charged upon it, or with so much zest, has quoted from oilier heated partisans, as imbittered and prejudiced as himself, then is it in truth the most horrid doctrine that ever was preached; and its practical effects on human character must be most deplorable. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." This is the Savior's rule for testing a doctrine. We admit its authority. We are willing our



doctrine shall be tried by it. We humbly, yet confidently, challenge a comparison of the fruits of our system with those of its opposite.

We sometimes hear the disciples of a faith not yet half a century old, calling our doctrine "antiquated," "unfitted for these enlightened days." That it is an *ancient* doctrine, we freely admit. If *later origin* be an advantage, Calvinism must yield to its opposing systems. That it has no affinity for the "new light" of modern divinity is freely conceded. But here is a pregnant fact to which I ask special attention. *Just as those doctrines, now called Calvinistic, began to be obscured in the early ages of Christianity, just in that proportion did superstition, ignorance, and corruption prevail: Whereas every prominent friend of God's truth in the dark ages, and down to the period of the Reformation, including the authors and prime supporters of that glorious work, embraced those doctrines.* I would be glad if my time allowed me to read some of the noble confessions of the true faith, made by Augustine in the fifth century, Fulgentius, and the council of Orange in the sixth, Goteschalch in the ninth, Radulph in the tenth, Anselm in the eleventh, the Waldenses, those noble confessors of the thirteenth, and following centuries, Wickliffe, the morning star of Reformation in England in the fourteenth, the Lollards, and John Huss in the fifteenth, until in the sixteenth, the truth, as proclaimed by Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Zuingli, and their illustrious compeers, gained such glorious victory over the Pelagianism, and semi-Pelagianism of the Church of Rome. Our doctrines have ever been found precious to the most eminent servants of God and his Church; and ever in conflict with superstition and error. I would love to show how, from the *Republic of Geneva*, the seeds of civil liberty spread, took root in the breasts of the *Puritans* of England, and at length were transplanted to this country, thence to be disseminated over the earth. While we enjoy civil and religious liberty, let us not forget that, to our *Calvinistic* Puritan and Huguenot ancestors, we are indebted for the boon. Do you ask what is the influence of Calvinistic teaching upon morals? We point to Holland. Switzerland, Scotland, England, when Puritanism was in the ascendant, New England, and to the descendants of the "Scotch Irish," wherever they are found in the other

States of this Union. Do you ask what fruits of practical benevolence (his system brings forth? Who were the most active in founding, and who are the most liberal in supporting all the great benevolent movements of the day? *Not* those who follow the teaching of the "*Christian Baptist*," but Calvinists. Their missionaries have penetrated every clime. Bibles have by them been translated into the various dialects of the heathen. Schools have been established to train the heathen youth in the faith of the Gospel. Do you ask what are the fruits of this doctrine on the piety of the heart? We mention the names of Rutherford, Howe, Baxter, Edwards, Bunyan, Payson, Chalmers, and McCheyne; these men, so eminent for godliness, found in the truths which have been so stigmatized, the very *pabulum* of their spiritual life. We say then, not boastingly—our system excludes all boasting—but in all confidence, to our opponents, you have mistaken the character of the system which you oppose. It is not, it cannot be, the "horrible, blasphemous" system which you represent it, otherwise: it would not produce such fruits. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

But I will not permit the matter to rest here. Justice to the cause of truth, and to the slandered Church of my fathers requires that the specific charges which have been brought, should meet a specific denial and refutation.

1st. It is said that the doctrine of Predestination *makes God the author of sin*. Predestination has nothing to do with the *origin* of sin; it is God's purpose to deliver men from its effects. Predestination *presupposes* sin, and man's exposure to punishment on account of it, and is merely the purpose of God to save some from that punishment. This objection, then, is only evidence of the loose thinking, and loose speaking in which the opponents of our doctrine habitually indulge.

But, the gentleman will say, do you not believe that "God foreordained whatsoever comes to pass?" I might properly decline to enter upon this subject, as it is not included in the sections of the Confession under discussion; but, willing to sift the matter to the bottom, I answer, with the limitations thrown around the proposition in the Confession of Faith, *I do believe it*. "Very well," the gentleman retorts, "sin comes to pass. You believe that He

foreordains sin, and therefore he must be the author of it." Let us look at this a little. Do you believe, Mr. Franklin, that sin is in the world? "I do." Do you believe that God foreknew that sin would come into the world? "*My God knows as much as your God, and has 'known it as long.'*" Very well. POM believe, then, that God created the world, knowing at the same time, that if he formed it as he did, sin would exist. "I do," Well, now, Mr. Franklin, do *you* believe that God is the author of sin? "No: God's foreseeing that men would sin did not force them to sin." *Neither did God's decreeing TO PERMIT men to sin force them to its commission.* What do you mean by the phrase "the author of sin?" Do you mean that God creates evil desires in the heart of the sinner? Calvinists deny that he does. Nothing but holiness can emanate from Him. Do you mean that by any *positive agency*, exerted by Him on the minds of men, they are induced to sin? *Calvinists deny that He exerts any such influence.* Do you mean that God is the author of a system of things which involves sin, and which he knew, at the formation of it, would involve sin? If *this* be all you mean by saying that "God is the author of sin," you had better drop the odious and blasphemous expression, and choose words better suited to express the idea. If *this* be all you mean, *you believe it as well as Calvinists.* Did not God decree the sin of Joseph's brethren in selling him into Egypt? "Ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good." Was not the crucifixion of Christ a sin unparalleled in enormity? Yet, "both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together, *to do whatsoever God's hand and COUNSEL DETERMINED BEFORE TO BE DONE.*" In all these cases the sin, as to its guilt, has for its sole author the man whose heart conceived, and whose hand perpetrated it. *The decree of God exerted no influence upon the mind of the man, impelling him, to the act; it was permissive merely, not efficacious.* Yet, these sins formed a part of the series of events which the Providence of God extends to, and which He had from eternity determined should come to pass.

When the gentleman has cleared away all difficulties here, as they bear upon his own system; when he has reconciled the existence of sin with the divine purity, in view of the fact, that He chose to create a world in which

he foresaw that sin would certainly exist; when he has vindicated his own doctrine from all possible objections, it will be time enough for him to urge against us the same difficulties that bear down upon him in all their force. But before I leave this matter, I wish to repeat again, a point which the gentleman has done his best to obscure. *It is not, it never was, the doctrine of Calvinists, that the decree compels man to sin.* Yet, this the gentleman constantly assumes; and when I told him that Adam might have stood, he asserted, and really seemed to believe, that I had yielded the whole doctrine. Let us hear some authorities.

"God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass, *yet so AS thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established.*" Confession of Faith, Chap. 3, Sec. 1.

"Ye created man, male and female, \* \* having the law of God written in their hearts, *and power to fulfill it;* and yet under a possibility of transgressing, *being left to the liberty of their own will,* which was subject unto change." Chap. 4, Sec. 2.

"The sinfulness (of the first fall, and other sins of angels and men) *proceedeth ONLY FROM THE CREATURE, and not from God,* who being most holy and righteous, *neither is nor can be THE AUTHOR or approver OF SIN.*" Chap. 5, Sec. 4.

"God hath endued the will of man with that *natural liberty* that it is *neither forced,* nor by any absolute *necessity* of nature *determined* to good or evil. *Man in his state of innocency had freedom and power to will and to do that which is good and well pleasing to God; but yet mutably, so that he might fall from it.*" Chap. 9, Sees, 1, 2.

"God gave to Adam a law, \* \* and endued him with power and ability to keep it." Chap. 19, Sec. 1.

From these explicit declarations of the standards of our Church, it is plain that if any man in her ministry taught the doctrines which the gentleman insists we do, and must believe; such as that God is the author of sin; that his decree compels man to transgress; that Adam could not have avoided the fall, etc., etc., he would be teaching

heresy, and would be at once deposed. Accordingly all the gentleman's argument, based on the supposition that these are our doctrines, are absolutely worthless.

2d. It is objected to the doctrine of Predestination, *that it is inconsistent with free agency*. Let us define our terms, and know exactly what is meant, before we enter into a controversy. What is free agency? Does it consist in a supposed power of choosing contrary to the strongest motive, or entirely irrespective of all motives, and of acting contrary to the prevailing disposition of the soul? Is *this* what is meant by free agency? And is it to *this* that Predestination is said to be opposed? If so, I answer that whether Predestination be opposed to it or not, I neither know nor care. *Man never had such a power*. If, then, Predestination be opposed to this supposed power, it is opposed to an unsound theory; and, therefore, being opposed to falsehood, is most likely true. But, if what is meant by free agency be *spontaneous action—voluntary action—the power of doing what one wills, or chooses to do*—and this, after all, is free agency—then I take issue with the objector, and maintain that Predestination and free agency are perfectly harmonious. Those who are saved are perfectly voluntary in embracing the Savior; they do it of choice; they are not dragged, or forced, or driven to become religious. They "*choose the good part,*" and they choose in view of motives, freely and rationally. Those who are lost *choose the way of death*. They *will not* come unto Christ that they may have life. Sin is the object of their delight; holiness their aversion. They are not driven to hell by an iron necessity; they are not forced the downward road by the impelling power of aught without themselves. They deliberately, and *voluntarily* walk the broad road to ruin. *And since they are voluntary, they are free*.

Facts prove that Predestination and free agency are not inconsistent. That the Bible teaches Predestination is just as certain as that it teaches human depravity, the incarnation, the atonement, future punishment, or any other doctrine. I have yet to see the first attempt made to meet fairly the arguments by which this fact is proved. The gentleman has not done it on this occasion, and, therefore, we are at liberty to conclude *could not do it*. *He, like all anti-Calvinists, found it easier to make objections, than to*

*answer arguments.* That the Bible also teaches *free agency* is as plain as noonday. Either, then, these two doctrines, which are both taught in the Bible, are consistent, or the Bible is an imposition.

Man is conscious that he is free, and no power can convince him of the contrary. The Bible confirms this truth. Yet this volume abounds with instances in which man, *by his free acts, fulfilled the purposes of God.* Was not Pharaoh free in refusing to let the Jews go from Egypt? Yet God had predicted that he would not hearken to Moses, that he would glorify his own name, by the refusal of Pharaoh. Were not the Jews and Romans free in crucifying Christ? Yet he was "delivered by the determinate counsel, and Foreknowledge ('DECREE'—Bloomfield) of God, and with wicked hands crucified and slain." To assume that man cannot be free in doing what has been foreordained is to assume what no man can prove, to contradict the Bible on every page, and to limit the power of God as if he could not make a being who, while perfectly free, should act as he had predetermined.

But, the gentleman will say, "*Could* men do differently from what has been ordained?" This question is a poor, pitiful play upon the ambiguity of the word "*could.*" If it be said, they *could not* act differently, at once the idea of constraining force, or fatal necessity rises in the mind, associated with the words, "*could not.*" I answer, however, that men *could* act differently, *if they chose.* But they will not so choose. Their inclinations are all in the way in which they walk, and they will follow their inclinations.

And now I would be glad to ask a few questions, in my turn. Is God omniscient? "Oh yes, my God knows as much as yours." He has foreknown the actions of all his creatures, from eternity, has he? "My God has had his knowledge as long as yours." Very well; will every event that God foresees, certainly come to pass? The gentleman cannot deny it; for how could an event be certainly foreknown as about to happen, which might not happen? Every act, then, of every man, was fixed in the Divine Foreknowledge from eternity; and now, *I* ask, *could* man act differently from what God foreknows will be his action? Will any man show that the Foreknowledge of God is not as much opposed to free agency as the Divine decree?

Perhaps you are beginning to find that man is not *omniscient*, and that things may be true against which very fluent objections can be urged. But what shall we say of the candor of the gentleman in urging that as an insuperable objection to the doctrine of Predestination, which lies in all its force against doctrines which he himself professes to believe?

3. It is objected that the doctrine of Predestination is inconsistent with the universal offer of the Gospel, and with the declarations that God has no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but is willing that all should be saved.

In answering this objection I shall answer I know not how many of the exceedingly "independent arguments" of the gentleman. The objection is founded upon the idea that man's liberty is destroyed by God's decree. But, this is false, as I have just shown, therefore this objection is destitute of force. *Every man is just as free to embrace the Gospel as if there were no decree in existence. PREDESTINATION IS NOT THE CAUSE WHY ANY ARE LOST; it is the sole cause that any are saved*, God provided a ransom sufficient for all the race, and offers deliverance freely to every man through the atonement of Christ; but he saw that, if left to themselves, *all* would reject it and be lost, therefore, he determines to bestow grace upon some that will dispose them to embrace it. But this grace bestowed upon some, places no obstacle in the way of others. They have the offer of mercy, but they reject it. They *choose* death. God called, and they *refused*; he stretched out his hand, and *no man regarded*. In itself considered, God does not wish the destruction of any creature which he has made; not even of the devils in hell. For he has no delight in suffering for its own sake. But all things considered, God does not see fit to interpose, and save all from destruction. In itself considered, he did not wish the destruction of the antediluvian world, yet, all things considered, he determined to destroy it. In itself considered, he did not will the destruction of Pharaoh; but sent repeated messages to him, to let his people go, yet he had determined not to change Pharaoh's heart, to leave him to follow his own wicked plans, and finally to destroy him. And the purpose to destroy him, he announced before he sent commands to let the people go.

The objection which the gentleman urges is just the objection of the infidel to the Bible, "How," says the disciple of Paine, "can you vindicate the sincerity of God in sending commands, and threatenings, and judgements, to Pharaoh to induce him to let the people go, when before he sent to him, he had told Moses, "Behold I will harden Pharaoh's heart that he shall not let the people go!" How, says the anti-Calvinist, can you vindicate the sincerity of God in sending commands, threatenings, and promises, to induce men to believe the Gospel, when her has determined to leave some of them to their own evil dispositions, without disposing them to receive that Gospel? conceive that the answer is the same in both cases. God has a right to point out man's duty, though man has no disposition to perform it. And God is perfectly sincere in pointing out to men the way to obtain his favor, though he does not see fit, in all cases, to dispose them to compliance

But here, again I ask, by what right the gentleman, who. professes to believe in Foreknowledge, urges this objection against Predestination? Why does God offer the Gospel to those who he knows will reject it? Since God has no pleasure in the death of the sinner, why did he create him, knowing at the time, that he would transgress and die? Let the gentleman cast out first the beam out of his own eye, before he raises such an outcry about the mote in the eye of the Calvinist.

4. It is objected that if Predestination be true, God is unjust.

And how, I pray you? Can any injustice be done when no one is treated *worse* than he deserves? Those who are lost, are condemned solely *for their sins*. At least, this is the doctrine of the Confession of Faith:

"The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, thereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, *and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath* FOR THEIR SIN, to the praise of his glorious justice.". Chap." 3, sec. 7,

Those who are lost, are condemned for sin. They, suffer no more than they have deserved. Those who are saved, are treated better than they deserve, but justice



has been satisfied for them. There is, therefore, no ground for the objection.

But the objection really destroys all grace in man's salvation. It makes it a matter of debt. If God pass by any, the gentleman says, God is unjust. If he pass by all, of course, the injustice is still greater. Hence God was *bound in justice* to make provision for man's salvation! Indeed, the gentleman explicitly declares that "If Christ had not died for all men, they could not *in justice* be condemned." *Justice*, then, required that salvation be provided for all men. This destroys all idea of *grace*. Strange *grace*, indeed, the denial of which is *injustice!!* And so it turns out that the "*free grace*" which the gentleman has told so much about, is just NO GRACE AT ALL. And Paul was mistaken in attributing salvation to *grace*. God was bound *in justice* to provide it! Such are some of the beauties of the "free grace," no grace of Arminianism.

5. But Predestination makes God partial.

How? In bestowing favors to which no one has a claim, a man may discriminate without partiality. If there be claims, those claims must be regarded; but man has no claim on the mercy of God. "Many widows were in Israel, in the days of Elias, \* \* but unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. And many lepers were in Israel in the days of Eliseus the, prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman, the Syrian." Is it not lawful for God to do what he will with his own? Is the gentleman's eye evil because God is good? Neither in creation, in providence, nor in the dispensation of his grace, does he treat all alike; is he therefore partial?

6. "But Predestination makes God a respecter of persons."

By no means. The very essence of the doctrine is that in selecting some as the objects of his grace, *he has no respect to anything in, about, or belonging to, the persons selected.* The reason for his selection is not at all in the *persons* themselves, but solely in his own good pleasure. "He hath mercy on whom he will." If he favored one because he was a Jew, to the neglect of a Gentile, or one

who was rich, to the prejudice of the poor; or if, in his choice, anything in the person was the ground of that choice, there might be color for the charge. As it is, it is utterly unfounded. But the gentleman's system make? God a respecter 'of persons; for he has altered the Bible in order to make it read, "*Jacob have I RESPECTED, but Esau have I slighted.*"

7. "But Predestination renders useless the preaching of the Gospel, or the use of any of the means of grace." How? God hath from the beginning chosen men to salvation, through sanctification of the spirit *and belief of the truth*. Is the preaching of the truth, therefore useless? God had ordained that by the exertions of the sailors, the whole ship's company, with Paul the prisoner, should be saved. Was it therefore, of no importance whether the sailors abode in the ship? The means and the end are united in the decree, and they cannot be severed in the execution of the decree. Beside, God has not revealed to his ministers who are his chosen.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTH ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

*Beloved Audience*—IT is quite clear that Mr. M. is not unchangeable. When he entered upon the negative, he gave us a faithful promise that he would reply to my arguments; but in opening his speech this morning, he informed us that he should riot reply to my speech last evening. This latter promise he has *kept to the letter?* though he has *broken his former pledge*. He, however, has found it necessary to "add to his faith works," and has *worked* manfully to mend up some of the lame places pointed out in his system last week; but in this case, *all works are in vain*. It is impossible to bring something out of nothing. That my affirmative argument remains, not only unanswered, but without an attempt at answering, I need inform no one in this audience. I may, then, at my ease, and without molestation, proceed with my series of argument, or turn aside and follow the gentleman. To get any reply from him is out of the question. I am not complaining; he is doing the best the case admits of, to cover his failure and keep up appearances.

My worthy friend seems anxious to have us look at the *fruits* of Calvinism, which has so little affinity to "New Lightism." He certainly should not be debarred from the gratification. In the warmth of his love, he gave vent to his imagination, and at a glance, seemed to see that all that had ever been achieved through the mission of Jesus, and all the mighty men, both ancient and modern, was to be put down to the credit of a partial system, that declares that God passed by a portion of our race; never intended to have mercy upon them, or extend his grace to them. Such sweeping claims as these are easily asserted, but can never be proved. If the gentleman would like something to reason from on this subject, I would greatly prefer coming closer home, and see the fruits of his doctrine in the rich soil of his own State. About twenty-eight or thirty years ago, there were about 15,000 Presbyterians in this State. There were, probably, about the same number of Baptists. In our present organization we were scarcely known as a distinct organization. At present we number about 50,000, the Baptists about 60,000, and the Presbyterians about 15,000. Here is fruit for the gentleman, without going to the dark ages, or before the dark ages, to Augustine. Here is the fruit of Calvinism, in your midst, in its benevolent operations to save the world!! If as many as are ordained to eternal life believe in the doctrine, and are united with those who hold it, the elect is exceedingly small in this State; much less than *one-twentieth*.

This brings us to an important point. Mr. M. has admitted Mr. Wesley to be in heaven, though he thinks he would *shed tears* for opposing Calvinism, if there could be tears in heaven. Now if Mr. Wesley is in heaven, he must be one of the *elect*! Yet he never believed the doctrine!!! He was one of the *elect*; one of those enlightened, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, and a minister of Christ; yet he made the most formidable and determined opposition, through his entire life, against the very doctrine that saved him, teaching that it made God worse than the devil!! How is all this? If the Predestination of the Confession is the Gospel, or any part of it, then, Mr. Wesley did not believe that part of the Gospel; yet the gentleman admits the unbeliever and

opposer of his Gospel plan to be in heaven!! Then, poor Servetus may be in heaven, as I solemnly believe he was more deserving to be than his persecutors.

But who was ever convened to Jesus Christ by hearing Calvinism preached? Do Calvinists preach it in their revival efforts? By no means. Indeed, many of the members of the Presbyterian church do not believe the doctrine or know that it is in the creed. I was conversing with an intelligent Presbyterian gentleman, from Lebanon, Ohio, a few days since, when he remarked that it was an antiquated doctrine, and he thought very few remained who believed it. He is a worthy man, but evidently did not know that the doctrine was in his creed. Some four or five years ago, I published the article headed, "God's Eternal Decrees," in the Western Reformer, with some remarks. A large number of copies circulated in and about New Castle, Ind. The Presbyterians in that place saw the publication, and referred to a later edition of the Confession, the pages of which did not correspond with the copy quoted, and of course, did not find the quotation. They immediately concluded that I had slandered them in attributing to them the doctrine, and, if my memory serves me, the preacher passed through and did not correct them. I grant that Presbyterians do acts of benevolence; that they try to enlighten and convert the World; but all this is when they rise above their system, and are more benevolent. It has not one particle of benevolence in it.

The gentleman has had quite a struggle with "free agency" and the "author of sin." He insists that *man is free*. Free to do what? The elect to *be saved!* The non-elect to be *lost!* Can either do the contrary? *Can the elect be lost? Can the non-elect be saved?* He is bound to answer *no*. Can either of them by any possibility avoid these conditions? He is bound to declare that *they cannot*. The one is saved because God has *immutably decreed it*, and he *cannot avoid it*; and the other is damned because God "*ordained him to wrath*," and he *cannot avoid it*. This is the gentleman's "free agency," I suppose! But he says he has admitted that Adam could have avoided the fall. So far he has admitted the truth, for which he has my thanks. Does he admit that the non-elect can avoid the wrath to which God ordained them? If they cannot, then,

what becomes of their freedom? He insists that they will be *free*, because they will choose sin! Is that it? Let the gentleman take a lesson from Calvin: "I say, that by the ordination and will of God, Adam fell. God would have man to fall. Man is blinded by the will and commandment of God. We refer the causes of hardening us to God. The highest or remote cause of hardening, is the will of God." Beza, Calvin's successor, says, "God hath predestinated whomsoever he saw meet, not only *unto damnation*, but also *unto the causes of it*." Zanchius says, "It is certain that God is the first cause of obduration. Reprobates are held so fast under God's almighty decree, that they *cannot but sin and perish*." Martyr says, "God doth *incline and force* the wills of wicked men into great sins." Zuinglius says, "God moveth the robber to kill. He killeth, God moving him thereto." Christian Teacher, p. 131. Let us hear another Calvinist: "But to say, God can so order the world as a *sin may necessarily be caused thereby in man*, I do not see how it is any dishonor to him," Hobbes, on Liberty and Necessity. I quote from Life of Calvin, p. 222. Calvin says, "Whom God passes by, therefore, he reprobates, and from *no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestinates for his children*." Inst. Vol. 2, p. 163. Speaking of the "cause of condemnation," Calvin says, "But though I ever so often admit God to be the *author of it, which is perfectly correct*, yet this does not abolish the guilt impressed upon their consciences, and from time to time recurring to their view." Inst. Vol. 2, p. 166. Again, same page, he says, "I confess, indeed, that all the descendants of Adam fell by the Divine will into that miserable condition in which they are now involved; and this is what I asserted from the beginning, that we must always return at last to the *sovereign determination of God's will*, the cause of which is hidden in himself." As I am determined to instruct my friend well on this point, I call his attention to Calvin again. He says, "If God simply foresaw the fates of men, and did not also DISPOSE AND FIX THEM by his determination, there would be room to agitate the question, whether his providence or foresight rendered them at all necessary. But since he foresees future events in consequence of *Ms decree that they shall happen*, it is

useless to contend about Foreknowledge, while it is evident that all things come to pass rather *by ordination and decree.*" Inst, Vol. 2, p. 170, See again, the following, on the same page: "I inquire again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations, with their infant children, in eternal death, but *because such was the will of God.*"

Shall we now take the definition of Calvinism, on the freedom of the will, given by the gentleman, or that given above from great and learned men before he was born? These men were not "ignorant," but knew the doctrine, as taught by Augustine, from whom Calvin received it, and to whom he referred in his essays upon it, almost, if not quite, as often as to the Bible, Calvinism cannot be modernized; we must take it pure, as it came from the mint, or renounce it. All his hard labor in his last speech is a failure. Its deformity cannot be covered.

My worthy friend admits that God is not willing that any should perish, and that he offers salvation to all. This is a strange admission! Is there any provision, in *his* plan, for all? Has *he* any grace for all? Not one word of it! Could God have provided any? Certainly he could, just as easily for all, as for a part. Why has he not done it? So it seemed good in his sight!! If, then, it seemed *good in the sight of God* not to provide means for all, not effectually to call them, without which they could not come, how is it made to appear that he is *not willing that any should perish?* But we are informed that God was not willing that the Egyptians should perish, that the Jews should be destroyed, etc., but they freely and voluntarily ran into those sins for which they were destroyed! This is a little too fast. They were ordained to wrath, without any regard to character, and their sin was the *result of the decree*, and not the decree the *result of their sins*. He must not oppose this doctrine, for in doing so he will run against Calvin, and thus we should have the son at variance against the father. This much I have done as a work of supererogation, but shall now proceed with my series of argument. I must post up my argument and place it before the audience from the beginning.

1. My first argument was founded upon the original intention of God, which I have shown to be to grant all

men that dwell on all the face of the earth the privilege to "*seek the Lord and find him.*"

2. My second argument is founded upon the promise to Abraham, to bless all nations; all the families of the earth, which, according to Calvinism, never was and never will be fulfilled.

3. My third argument was founded upon the testimony of the prophets; that the salvation of God was to extend to the ends of the earth.

4. My fourth argument was founded upon the testimony of John the Baptist,—that Christ is the "light that lighteth *every man that cometh into the world,*" that "*all men through him might believe.*"

5. My fifth argument was founded upon the love of God; that God *loved the world;* that he *gave his Son for the world;* that the *world through him might be saved.*

6. My sixth argument was founded upon the death of Christ. If he died for *all,* then were *all dead.* He *tasted death for every man,*

7. My seventh argument was founded upon the propitiation. "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the *sins of the whole world.*"

8. My eighth argument is founded upon the object of Christ's mission. "He came into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the *world through him might be saved.*"

9. My ninth argument is founded upon the preaching of the Gospel to all. It was preached to *all,* that *all might believe,* and all are thus granted the privilege to *believe* "that *they might have life.*"

10. My tenth argument was founded upon the design of preaching; "to *make all men see;*" to give all the privilege to believe.

11. My eleventh argument was founded upon the fact that all are commanded to repent; "now he commandeth all men everywhere to repent;" is "not willing that any should perish, but that *all should come to repentance.*"

12. My twelfth argument is founded upon the will of God. He has no pleasure in the *death of the sinner;* is not willing that *any should perish;* "he will have all men to be saved."

13. My thirteenth argument is founded upon the grace

of God. "The grace of God which brings salvation *to all men*, hath appeared." Titus ii, 11. "Where sin abounded grace did much *more abound*." He by the *grace of God tasted death for every man*. Here, then, is grace for all.

14. My fourteenth argument is founded upon the mercy of God. Let us hear Paul: "He hath concluded them *all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all*." How many did God conclude in unbelief? Evidently the race.

Well, he has extended his mercy to the same number. Let us hear David: "The Lord is good to all; and his *tender mercies are over all his works*." I should, like to know how the gentleman looks upon these passages. He cannot believe them. He does not believe that God had mercy upon all that were in unbelief, or that his tender mercies are over all his works.

15. My fifteenth argument is founded upon the fact that God will judge all. Let us hear the Scripture: "The Lord shall *judge the ends of the earth*." 1 Sam. ii, 10. "And he shall judge *the world* in righteousness." Ps. ix, 8. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds." Rom. ii, 6. Acts xvii, 30, 31, we have the declaration that God will judge the world in righteousness, and this too, is asserted immediately after the declaration that he commands all men everywhere to repent, and is the reason given why all men should repent. Would the blessed God command all men to repent because he will judge them, if he had never put it in their power to repent? And can he damn them for not repenting, when he knew they could not repent?

16. My sixteenth argument is founded upon the cause of condemnation. Why do men perish? Let us hear the Scripture. "And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that *perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved*" Here we have the truth presented to these persons, that they *might be saved*, but on account of their rejecting that truth, by which they might be *saved*, they are condemned. "He that believeth not shall be damned." What is the ground of condemnation? It is refusing to believe the Gospel when preached. But had they no power to believe it? Then why condemn them for not believing it? "Even denying the



Lord that *bought them* and bring upon themselves swift destruction." Can the non-elect deny the Lord that bought them? Can they bring upon themselves swift destruction? Nay; can they *avoid* swift destruction? Calvinism consigns men to the eternal burnings for what they *could not avoid*; but the Bible condemns them for wrongs they could have avoided, but did not. Let us hear the Lord: "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." How would light coming into the world prove a ground of condemnation, if men *could not see*? They could have been condemned just as well without the light. But God sends them the light, and gives them the ability to see, and condemns them for not doing what they could have done. Listen to the merciful Lord once more: "And *ye will not come to me*, that ye might have life." Did he say this, knowing that *they could not come to him*? And that they were reprobates for whom there was no life, or rather, *who were ordained to wrath*? If such a doctrine as this, does not make our glorious Redeemer a hypocrite, I cannot understand language.

17. My seventeenth argument is founded upon the fact that God is no respecter of persons. Hear Peter: "Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons." Acts x, 34. Let us hear Paul: "For there is no respect of persons with God." Rom. ii, 11. These Scriptures, Calvinism, in the most round and unequivocal manner, denies, and declares virtually that God is a respecter of persons, or which is the same thing; that he passed by a part of mankind, simply ordaining them to wrath, without any possibility of their avoiding it; and predestinating others, no better in *any respect than the former*, to everlasting life, effectually calling and saving them. Thus the gentleman stands opposed to the Bible.

18. My eighteenth argument is founded upon the fact that the elect can be increased. 1 Pet. i, 2, we read of "elect according to the Foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." These were not elected before the world, for it was *through sanctification of the spirit*, unto obedience, which could not have been before

they existed. Were they sanctified by the Spirit *before they were born?*—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' FOURTH REPLY.

*Tuesday, 10 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

THE ingenious gentleman thinks he has detected me in an inconsistency, because I said at the start that I would reply to all his *arguments*, and this morning said that I would not enter into a particular reply to his last *speech*. With due deference, I can see no inconsistency at all. There is a very simple mode of harmonizing these statements. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon my pointing it out.

It is to me matter of profound regret, that I: cannot succeed in pleasing the gentleman or his brethren, by my mode of conducting this discussion. I fully appreciate the motives which actuate them in making suggestions to me. They know that it is my first debate, though the gentleman somewhat ostentatiously informed me that it is not his first, by a great many. They therefore pity my youth and inexperience, and kindly suggest the mode in which I could manage my part, so as to please *them*.

The gentleman complains that his arguments are not answered. He is sincerely to be pitied. When on the negative, he apologized for not answering my arguments, by throwing the blame upon his memory; he could not recollect them immediately. And now, when on the affirmative, he has no recollection that his arguments have been answered! What a wretched memory he has, to be sure!! He is about the only man in the house who has forgotten my replies.

I have answered some of the gentleman's arguments, by showing that they proved *too much*, leading directly to Universalism. His arguments going to prove the universality of the atonement, I have answered by showing that they had no bearing upon the point at issue; many strict Calvinists believing the atonement to be universal; *but the gentleman himself utterly denying it*, if he believe in the atonement at all. His arguments on the words "all," "all men,"

"every man," "the world," "the whole world," etc., I have answered by showing that these expressions, in the usage of the inspired writers, do not commonly denote the entire race, but some, of all ranks and classes, Jews and Gentiles. Some of his arguments I have answered by showing that they disproved some monstrous doctrine, which no man ever pretended to believe, but had no bearing upon the doctrine set forth in the chapter and sections of the Confession embraced in the proposition for Debate. Some of his arguments I have answered by showing that they were based on forged or mutilated texts of Scripture, but bare no support from the genuine words of inspiration. Every argument which the gentleman has advanced, I have really answered by showing that they all bear with as much force against the absolute Foreknowledge of God, a doctrine which he has been forced to avow, as against the doctrine of Predestination. All of the gentleman's arguments then, have been answered at least once, and some of them three, four, or five times, according as they fell into these various classes. For this lesson in Mnemonics, I charge the gentleman nothing.

The gentleman is an adept at management. It is the custom in provincial theaters, to make up for the smallness of the *corps dramatique*, by causing the same actors to pass and re-pass across the stage many times. In this way half a dozen men may present the appearance of an army. So it is with the gentleman's arguments. What they want in number, they make up for in frequency of appearance. He has got as far as "*eighteenthly*," yet a very moderate share of logical discrimination will enable any one to reduce them to a very few. Take a specimen. His 4th argument was founded on the testimony of John the Baptist to Christ. "That all men through him might believe;" his 9th upon the preaching of the Gospel to all, "that all might believe;" his 10th upon the design of preaching the Gospel, viz: "to give all the privilege of believing" his 2d upon the promise to Abraham, "that the Gospel should be offered to all;" his 3d upon the prediction of the same truth by the prophets; his 1st upon the design of God to fulfill this promise; his 5th, 12th, 13th, 14th, upon the love, grace, and mercy of God, which prompted him to make this promise; his 6th, 7th, and 8th,

upon the mission and death of Christ to carry out the promise made to the Fathers. These eleven then, all run into one; and very probably the same could be; shown of others. I have already answered this argument, and all the others that run into it, by showing that, in fact, the Gospel never has been preached to the race, since the dispersion at Babel. I allude to it now, merely to show that the gentleman is hard pressed for argument, since for the sake of show, he makes one idea appear and re-appear, and then appear again and again, with a slight variation of phraseology. The prince of dramatists has, however, furnished him a noble model, in the profound and philosophic *Dogberry*.

"Dogberry: Marry sir, they have committed false report, moreover, they have spoken untruths; secondarily, they are slanders; sixth and lastly, they have belied a lady; thirdly, they, have verified unjust things; and to conclude, they are lying knaves."

As a complete vindication of our doctrine from all the abuse and vilification it has suffered, at the hands of such heated partisans, as the gentleman, I appealed to its effects, and asked that the tree might be judged by its fruits. I showed that in all ages of the Church, those who were foremost in opposing corruption, and maintaining the cause of truth, held the doctrines now called Calvinistic. The Waldenses, and the other dwellers in the Alpine valleys—the very people to whom Mr. Campbell points as the true Church of Christ, before the Reformation—as well as the Reformers themselves, held these very doctrines. I showed the effect of the doctrine on practical piety, on sound morality, on benevolent effort, and on civil and religious liberty. The founders of our Republic, and those who were foremost in asserting and maintaining our independence, received their ideas of liberty from the Republic of Geneva. As the eloquent Choate has said: "There they found a Church without a Bishop, and a State without a King." And to all this, what is the gentleman's reply? Why that the Presbyterians in Kentucky now number no more than they did thirty years ago. Whereas their body, hardly out of the shell then, now number 50,000, and the Baptists 60,000, having increased fourfold! The statistics of the gentleman are far from correct, but if they were, what do they prove? Do you

test the *quality* of a tree by the *number* of apples which it bears? Can you argue the truth of a system from the facility with which it makes converts? The Mormons were not known until after the rise of the gentleman's party. In fact, some of the leaders were of that party before they started the Mormon delusion, Sidney Rigdon has seen the new sect which he started, far outstrip the one which he left. Their growth is unparalleled. Therefore, if the gentleman's logic be good for anything, it is a good tree, else its fruit would not be so numerous.

But if numbers are to be the test, why confine the matter to Kentucky? Does not the gentleman know that Presbyterians outnumber them a hundred to one? And if number is the test, and Kentucky the limit of its application, by what authority does he array the "60,000 Baptists" *against* Calvinism, when on these questions they are *against him*, and with me? It certainly is a new thing under the sun, to array a Church whose most honored names are those of a Boothe, a Gill, a Haldane, a Fuller, a Ryland, and a Judson, *against* the system of doctrines called Calvinistic; when amongst these are found as able, uninspired defenders of the system as it has ever had, excepting, perhaps, Calvin himself, and President Edwards. More than this; I can tell the gentleman, that if those in his own denomination, who in their hearts cherish the truths which I am defending, and whose character and conduct are the result of Calvinistic training, were taken but, the salt of the system would be gone, and it would reach a more speedy dissolution.

But the gentleman has found an "important point," on which he dilates with due admiration. I have admitted Mr. Wesley to be in heaven, and he did not believe in Predestination! Several times the gentleman has, with his *usual candor*, insinuated that we regard none as the elect except Calvinists, and believe that the grace of God is confined to ourselves. Have I not told the gentleman that men's hearts are often better than their heads? that men may experimentally and practically embrace a doctrine, which, theoretically, they reject? There is enough of "Calvinism" contained in the Methodist Articles of Faith, to save any man who sincerely embraces them. And I fondly hope that the sound "Calvinism" of the gentle-

man's hymn-book, and of his prayers, may yet obtain such root in his heart, and bring forth such "fruit" in his life, as to save even him.

But where did the gentleman obtain the idea that a man must embrace the peculiarities of a particular party, in order to be saved? This notion he owes to his own most exclusive and uncharitable system. It is the fundamental doctrine in Mr. Campbell's creed, that *in the act of immersion alone can any one receive the remission of sins*. Now multitudes of the most pious men that ever lived, were not immersed. The overwhelming majority of immersionists, themselves, have no faith in immersion as the sole means of pardon; they therefore, though immersed, are not pardoned in the act. "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." Immersion is denied to infants and idiots. The Pagan world is unimmersed, and of course unpardoned. This gentleman's own doctrine, therefore, leads to the conclusion that, with the exception of their own sect, and the Mormons, who also immerse for the remission of sins, there are none of the human family in a pardoned state, and of course, if unpardoned, they cannot be saved. Says Mr. Campbell: "On this side, and on that (of immersion) mankind are in quite different states. On the one side they are pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, saved; *on the other side they are in a state of CONDEMNATION.*" Christian. Restored, p. 197. Again, "INFANTS, IDIOTS; *deaf and dumb persons, innocent Pagans*, wherever they can be found, WITH ALL THE PIOUS PAIDOBAPTISTS, we commend to the mercy of God." P. 240. When the judge sentences the criminal to the gallows, he says, "May God have mercy upon you;" implying that there is no mercy for him with man. So Mr. Campbell commands *infants, idiots, all the pious Paidobaptists, etc.*, to *God's* mercy, since his system has no mercy for them. As the High Church Puseyite would say, he delivers them over to "the uncovenanted mercy of God," which is simply to deny them any share in God's mercy. That Mr. Campbell so understands it, appears from the following remark, on the same page as last quoted. "One thing we do know, that none can rationally, and with certainty, enjoy the grace of God, and the hope of heaven, but they who intelligently, and in full faith, are born of water, or immersed for the

remission of their sins." Oh, ye infants, idiots, deaf and dumb persons, innocent Pagans, pious Paidobaptists, and all ye Baptists, who have not, "*in full faith*," been immersed for the remission of sins, may God have mercy upon you! But this system has mercy only for the followers of Joe Smith, Alexander Campbell, and Sidney Rigdon!! Now is it not the very sublime of impudence for men, holding such views, to talk of the exclusiveness and uncharitableness of others? Is not this, beyond all comparison, the most exclusive system on the face of the earth? And yet, in the face of all this, the gentleman has the assurance to quote Scriptures which declare that God is no respecter of persons, and that he will judge all men according to their character; when his system teaches that it matters not how pious a man may be, or how holy his life, unless in full faith he is immersed for the remission of sins, he cannot rationally enjoy the hope of heaven!!

Talk of a Pharisaical spirit, and of men thinking *themselves* the exclusive favorites of heaven! Why here is the very leaven of Phariseeism. What think ye of such a precious morsel as the following, from Mr. Campbell's own version of his debate with McCalla?

"When the baptized believer rises out of the water, is born of water, enters the world a second time, he enters it as innocent, as clean, as unspotted as an angel." P. 137.

Who is the Pharisee? Who is obnoxious to the charge of saying to his fellow, "I am holier than thou?"

The gentleman asserts that men are not converted by hearing Calvinistic doctrine, and that Calvinists do not preach it in their revivals. The gentleman does not know this to be true; and in fact, it is *not* true. Possibly he meant that Calvinists do not preach *his* Calvinism, and this is very true. They do not now, and they never have preached such doctrines as he attributes to them. But that they refuse to preach the entire depravity of human nature, the utter indisposition of man to obey the Gospel without Divine grace, the sovereignty of God in the bestowal of that grace, and the certainty of the final salvation of all who receive it, is an entire mistake. The truth is, the most glorious revivals, of ancient or modern days, were produced, under God, by the instrumentality of just such truths as these. They have ever proved the power of God

unto salvation. They humble the pride of the human heart. They prostrate the sinner at once before the throne of God. They completely cut off all hope based upon his own merits or efforts, and thus prepare him to look away from himself to HIM, from whom alone comes his help. The history of Revivals bears me out in this statement. At the great revival on Pentecost, Peter preached the doctrine of "God's determinate counsel and Foreknowledge." Whenever, during the ages that intervened between the Apostles and the Reformation, truth and righteousness prevailed over superstition and error, it was by means, of "the doctrines of grace," ever held by a few of God's own people. These were the doctrines preached in the valleys of Piedmont, at the great revival of true religion among the Waldenses. They were preached in thunder tones at the Reformation, shaking the Vatican to its foundation, and rousing the human intellect from the sleep of ages. The most precious revivals of religion have been enjoyed in Calvinistic Scotland, and as the result of Calvinistic preaching. President Edwards, one of the ablest defenders of the Calvinistic system, was one of God's honored instruments, in the great revivals of the eighteenth century. His preaching was pre-eminently doctrinal. *Whitefield* was a Calvinist; so were the Tennents; and in later days, Dr. Nettleton. "They shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God. The gentleman's assertion has not a shadow of foundation.

But what was the doctrine by the preaching of which the 50,000 of whom he boasts, were gathered?: "All sorts of doctrine preached by all sorts of men," says Mr. Campbell. And the same high authority speaks but despondingly of its permanent results. Speaking of his own denomination, he says, "I have seen all over the land, more zeal to augment congregations, than to promote their intelligence and sanctification. The zealot for his party goes for its increase; and therefore, the sanctification of the converts is always subordinate to the increase of the body. \* \* Many of our fellow-laborers are more attached to big meetings, and big conversions, than to the beauty, holiness, and happiness of those already joined to the Lord." Mill. Har., Vol. 5, p. 237-8. Again, "If there be not more teaching and less preaching; more building



up of the converts in the faith and manners of Christ's Gospel, and less efforts to increase their numbers by the mere force of preaching, and protracted meetings, the cause of reformation will rather be injured than benefitted by a continued augmentation of members in the *present mode of induction* into the Christian profession." P. 409. These are some of the "fruits" of the doctrines preached by the gentleman and his coadjutors, in their revival efforts. He will excuse us if we decline exchanging "Calvinism," for the system producing them,

The gentleman objects to my definition of Free Agency. I hold that a man is free when he can do as he chooses, without external restraint. I have shown that both the elect and non-elect, act from choice, and are, therefore, free. But he makes freedom consist in the power of acting *contrary* to choice. For a man to have the power of doing as he chooses, pleases, or wills, is not freedom enough for him. He must have the power of doing what he does not wish to do; what he is utterly averse to doing, then he is free! Grand freedom this!! Now I read of some who could no more do good than the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots." Jer. xiii, 20. Of others, "having eyes full of adultery, and that CANNOT cease from sin." 2 Pet. ii, 14. Of a "carnal mind which is not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed CAN BE.*" So then, "they that are in the flesh CANNOT please God." Rom. viii, 7, 8. Now I wish the gentleman to inform us distinctly if all these persons were free agents. I insist upon his answering. Let him not plead that his memory is bad, and he forgot the question.

Just in this connection, I will notice a matter that the gentleman has been harping upon since this discussion began. He asks me if the non-elect can come to Christ, believe and be saved? I answer, *if they were willing to come, there is nothing in the decree of God to hinder them.* PREDESTINATION NEVER PREVENTED the SALVATION OF ANY; BUT IT IS THE SOLE CAUSE WHY ANY ARE SAVED. "But the Lord never spoke of any that could not come to him," says Benj. Franklin. "No man CAN come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him," says our Lord Jesus Christ. Comment is needless.

He has treated us again, to some pretended quotations

from Calvin, Zanchius, Martyr, etc. I have already denounced these as contemptible scraps; either out and out forgeries, such as our "free grace" gentry alone would have the face to perpetrate; or sentences, and parts of sentences,

taken out of their connection, and made to teach a doctrine utterly repugnant to the views of these slandered men of God. I demand volume and page; that we may see for ourselves, whether they held such sentiments, But *I know they did not*; and, therefore, the gentleman will not, because he cannot, produce the passages. I put him upon the proof. He has *a second* time, introduced these scraps. I denied their authenticity at the first. He persists in quoting them. I put him upon the proof. If he fail, or refuse, he must bear the brand of a convicted slanderer.

But he gives us these dainty bits upon the authority of the "*Christian Teacher*." And pray who is this Christian Teacher? Aylett Raines; one of Mr. Campbell's "ingenious cohorts;" a fellow-proclaimer with the gentleman; a man just as embittered and prejudiced, and to the full as unscrupulous as the gentleman himself.: Mr. Raines came into the Reformation and was admitted to minister at its altars with all his Universalist opinions clinging to him. He brought with him, too, all that peculiar hatred of Calvinism which the Universalist priesthood ever cherish. Hence his effort to malign and blacken the character of some of God's most eminent servants. If the quotations were honestly made, why is there no reference to the volume and page of the works where they are to be found!

But I shall prove the scraps dishonest, by showing what were the real sentiments of these eminent men. "ADAM,

THEREFORE, COULD HAVE STOOD IF HE WOULD, SINCE HE FELL MERELY BY HIS OWN WILL." Calvin's Inst. Vol. 1, p. 181. "HIS CHOICE OF GOOD AND EVIL, WAS FREE." Ib. "He enjoyed soundness of mind, and a *will free to the choice of good*" Pp. 181, 2, "He was *involuntary* procurer of his own destruction." P. 102. "Such was the primitive condition of man during his state of integrity, that he could incline to the one side or the other." P. 273.

The gentleman tries to make the impression that the cause of condemnation, according to Calvin, is God's decree. He has quoted the passage on page 163 of 2d Vol.,

eight or ten times, commencing on the very first day while his Sermon was on the rack, hoping to make this impression. What does Calvin mean by "reprobate" in that passage? He defines it: Whom he reprobates he passes by. Does he mean punishment inflicted? No; except so far as leaving some in the condition into which their own sin had brought them, be a punishment, while he selects others as vessels of mercy. But when Calvin treats of the *cause* of the sinner's condemnation, he always refers to his own crimes. I challenge the gentleman to quote the connection on page 166, from which he has called out two scraps, severed from their context. *He dare not*. For on the very page to which he refers, Calvin vindicates the character of God from the charge of injustice, by showing that, "as we all are corrupted by sin, we must necessarily be odious to God, and that not from tyrannical cruelty, but in the most equitable estimation of justice." "If they have all been taken from a corrupt mass, it is no wonder that they are subject to condemnation." "Hence, appears the perverseness of their disposition to murmur, because they intentionally suppress the CAUSE OF CONDEMNATION which they are constrained to acknowledge in THEMSELVES, hoping to excuse themselves by charging it upon God." This unequivocal declaration of Calvin, that the *caused* condemnation is in *the sinner himself*, stands just before the sentence quoted by the gentleman, with a view of convicting Calvin of holding that the cause of condemnation is God's decree!! But hear Calvin again, "OUR PERDITION PROCEEDS FROM THE SINFULNESS OF OUR FLESH, NOT FROM GOD." Vol. 1, p. 231. "In conformity, therefore, to the clear doctrine of the Scripture, we assert that by an eternal and immutable counsel. God has once for all determined both whom he would admit to salvation, and whom he would condemn to destruction. We affirm that this counsel, as far as concerns the elect, is founded on his gratuitous mercy, totally irrespective of human merit; but that to those whom he devotes to condemnation, the gate of life is closed by a *just* and *irreprehensible*, but incomprehensible judgment." Vol. 2, p. 149. "For if Predestination be no other than a dispensation of Divine *justice*,—mysterious indeed, *but liable to no blame*,—since it is certain they were *not unworthy* of being predestinated to that

fate, it is equally certain that the destruction they incur by Predestination, is CONSISTENT WITH THE STRICTEST JUSTICE. *Beside their perdition depends upon the Divine Predestination in such a manner, that the CAUSE AND MATTER of it are found IN THEMSELVES.*" P. 171. "Let us rather contemplate the evident cause of condemnation, which is nearer to us, in the corrupt nature of mankind, than search after a hidden and altogether incomprehensible one, in the Predestination of God." P. 171, 2. "We maintain that they act preposterously, who, in seeking for the origin of their condemnation, direct their views to the secret recesses of the Divine counsel, and overlook the corruption of nature, which is its *real source.*" "He is ruined *solely in* consequence of his having degenerated from the pure creation of God, to vicious and impure depravity." P, 172. "The reprobate suffer nothing but what is consistent with the most righteous judgment of God." P. 194. The title of Book 3, chap. 24, is, "THE DESTRUCTION OF THE REPROBATE PROCURED BY THEMSELVES."

The gentleman repeats for the fourth or fifth time, the quotation from p. 170, that "the fall of Adam INDEPENDENT OF ANY REMEDY, involved so many nations, with their infant children, in eternal death." But God has provided a remedy; a remedy, in the opinion of Calvin, "sufficient for the whole world." Com. on 1 John ii.,2. He also says in answer to Servetus, "*Quos parvulos Dominus ex hac vita recolligit, non dubito regenerari arcana spiritus operatione.*" i. e.: "I DO NOT DOUBT THAT WHEN GOD, REMOVES INFANTS FROM THE WORLD, THEY ARE REGENERATED BY THE SECRET INFLUENCES OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. 3, p. 59. Such are the real sentiments of Calvin. What shall we think of the strength of a cause which requires such glaring perversion and misrepresentation to sustain it? And what can we think of the character of a system which produces such "*fruits*" as these? The sentiments of the other authors quoted, are equally misrepresented. Says Zanchius, directly in the teeth of the pretended quotation from him, "God does not (as we, are slanderously reported to affirm) compel the wicked to sin as the rider spurs on an unwilling horse. God only says in effect, that tremendous word, *let them alone.*" Annan's Difficulties of Arminian Methodism, p. 336.

So with Peter Martyr, "God doth not, properly stir up men to sin; but yet he useth the sins of wicked men, and also guideth them, lest they should pass beyond their bounds." lb. p. 337.

But the richest and rarest of the gentleman's freaks remains yet to be told. He gives us a quotation from Hobbes, whom he calls "another Calvinist." He does not inform us of what *Church, Hobbes* was pastor; or in what Theological School he was professor! Of one thing, however, we are certified, he was a Calvinist! Now I have read of a certain Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury, who was a rank Infidel. He is the author of several works, the most celebrated of which is his "Leviathan," upon, the publication of which a bill was introduced into Parliament to punish the publication of ATHEISM. Whether technically an Atheist or not, certain it is, Hobbes was a disbeliever in any *incorporeal* being; he denied the immateriality and immortality of the soul; and if not an Atheist, came as nigh it, perhaps, as it is possible for man to do. Such is the man whose sayings the very candid and upright gentleman, out of the "vasty deep" of his erudition, quotes as a specimen of CALVINISM!!

But, the gentleman may say, he quoted from Dyer's Life of Calvin. Yes; that filthy pool, the reservoir of all the vile slanders that Popish, Anabaptist, and Infidel opponents could invent, to destroy the fair fame of that eminent man of God, is well adapted to furnish the gentleman such aid as he needs in the work he has on his hands. But does Dyer have the brazen audacity to call Hobbes a "Calvinist?" No; he dare not do it. But he set a trap to catch gulls, and sure enough, the gentleman, in his blind zeal to excite odium against Calvinistic doctrine, rushed headlong into it! There I leave him to the admiration of his brethren, and the just judgment of all candid men.

It is needless, after this exposure, to notice the morality of charging us with holding that any men "were ordained to wrath without any regard to character." The Confession says of those who are lost, that they are "ordained to dishonor and wrath FOR THEIR SIN, to the praise of his glorious *justice*."—[*Time expired.*]

**MR. FRANKLIN'S FIFTH ADDRESS.**

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I SHOULD like to know what the gentleman means by his constant reference to the Pagans and those who lived before Christ. Does he intend to say, that all such are non-elect? Does he intend to put infants with these, because infants have not the Gospel preached to them? If he does, his elect will be less than we have represented. But infants are in no danger of the punishment of hell. The only condemnation ever brought upon them, was what they inherited, without their volition or action, the Adamic sin. The penalty for that sin, was not punishment in the fire that shall never be quenched. It is set forth in God's own words, as follows: "From dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Here is the penalty for the Adamic sin, death. "As in Adam all die, even so *in* Christ all shall be made alive." Here is a redemption of all from the Adamic condemnation, the ransom of their bodies from their graves. This is all infants need. They have no *actual sin*, no impurity of spirit, and need no regeneration, for of "such is the kingdom of heaven," Infant regeneration is not a Bible doctrine, but belongs to the same house with infant damnation.

Christ has come, and, in his resurrection, has given assurance that the race will be redeemed or raised from the grave, and thus delivered from the Adamic sin. For this sin, God never threatened nor intended eternal damnation, but from it, he, from the beginning, designed to raise men up. Through Christ, he will raise them tip from the dead, whether good or bad, and those condemned to eternal punishment, will be thus condemned *for their own sins*, and not for Adam's. Gospel salvation, as set forth in preaching repentance and remission of sins among all nations, is a salvation from *our own sins*, and not from Adam's sin, which we must obtain, or be lost forever. For *our own sins*, if not pardoned, we shall be punished in another world.

Now the question between the gentleman and myself, is not concerning infants nor idiots; nor concerning those who lived before Christ, or who have not at the present time, heard the Gospel, or who never will hear it, but

concerning those who do, and will, or might, if the proper effort was made, hear the Gospel. Can every one of *this class* believe it, repent of their sins and be saved? I believe they can. He denies it. I believe that every one in this house can believe, repent, and be saved. He denies it. He preaches the Gospel to *all*, and admits that God commanded it to be preached to *all*, but that only a *part* can believe, repent, and be saved. The cause of this he finds in the *intention of God*. God loved *him* and a *few more* in this place, though they were *no better than others*, and *passed by all the rest*, leaving them in their sins, without any power of escape, "all to the praise of his glorious grace." How comforting to *him*! How complaisant to those about him!

If I show that *all*, where the Gospel is preached, *can* believe it, repent and be saved, Calvinism, not *imaginary*, but "genuine Calvinism," is disproved in defiance of all efforts to defend it. This I have already done, but must extend my "independent" argument—*independent* indeed, of all refutation from my opponent—and, as I solemnly believe, from any man.

18. My eighteenth argument, founded on the fact that the elect can be increased, was stated in my last; but my arguments only partially stated when my time expired. I shall proceed further to show that the elect can be increased. I call attention to Rom. xi, 17-20. The Apostle, in speaking to the Gentiles, says: "Thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them." In among whom? Among the elect. The Gentiles, who were not of the elect, are grafted in among the elect, and are now the elect people of God. These were added to God's elect, and consequently increased the elect. To these persons, now added to the elect, the Apostle says: "*For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed, lest he also spare not thee.*" So I would say to my worthy friend, if he had ever been grafted in, as they were, "take heed lest he spare not thee."

Rom. xvi, 7, we read of some who were in Christ before Paul. There had been a time when they were not in Christ, and yet they were in Christ before Paul. When these persons came into Christ, they became a part of the elect, and the elect was thus increased. This shows that

the number can be *added to*, contrary to the doctrine of the Confession.

Let us hear Paul once more, as he seems to argue for us. Rom. ix, 25: "As he saith also in Hosea, I will call them my people, who were not my people; find, her beloved, who was not beloved." Here we have a people who formerly were not the people of God, but afterward were the people of God. But we must hear the prophet a little further. He says, "And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God." When these not the people of God, were constituted the children of the living God, the elect was *increased*. This, in the clearest terms, refutes the doctrine of the creed.

19. My nineteenth argument is founded upon the fact that the elect can be diminished. Rom. xi, 7; Paul admits that branches were broken off of the good olive tree. Were any but the elect ever in the good olive tree? Surely not; but some that were branches, were broken off. Thus the elect were diminished. Esau had a birthright, which none but elect persons have, and lost it so effectually that it could not be regained. In this, the elect was *diminished*. Judas Iscariot was lost; he by transgression fell. He was among those given to Christ, or one of the elect, and his loss made the number less. Jude's "trees twice dead, and plucked up by the roots," were elect persons, spiritually dead, or *lost*. "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." Those for whom *Christ died* were elect persons, and you can be *destroyed*. This shows that the elect is not so definite and certain that it cannot be diminished, as stated in the Confession. We have seen that heretics can "deny the *Lord that bought them*, and bring *upon themselves swift destruction*." When this is done, the elect is diminished, and the doctrine of the Confession refuted beyond redemption. Paul labored to keep his body in subjection lest he should be a *castaway*, and the elect be diminished. No doctrine, that we have ever seen in print, is more untrue and in more direct opposition to almost every page of the Bible, than the doctrine that the elect cannot be diminished. How could the Apostle speak of the elect *failing* of making their calling and



*election sure; of their failing of the grace of God; of their having their names blotted out of the book of life; of losing their part out of the holy city, if the number of the elect could not be diminished?*

20. My twentieth argument is founded upon the fact that men may fall from grace. This point I have argued, in my defense of my Sermon, as I think to the satisfaction of all who hear me. But I wish my argument to appear in as unbroken a form as possible; and shall, therefore, briefly introduce it in the order of my arrangement. The first passage I shall invite your attention to, is Rom, viii, 17. The "Apostle remarks, verse 16, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." He then proceeds: "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; *if so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together.*" Now the Apostle includes himself with the Disciples at Rome; Christians or *the elect*, as the gentleman would call them, and says that "the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." These are, beyond all doubt, elect persons. What does Paul say to them? He says, "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ, *if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.*" "What if we *suffer not* with him? Will we nevertheless be joint-heirs and glorified with him?"

Let me call your attention to the language of the beloved John: "If that which ye have heard from the beginning, shall remain in you, ye shall continue in the Son, and in the Father." 1 John, ii, 24. Does not this imply, that if what, they had heard from the beginning, *remained not* in them, they *shall not continue in the Son and in the Father*? If this does not show that there is danger of those *in the Son and in the Father*, and certainly elect persons, failing to continue in the Son and in the Father, I know not how any language could show it. But we must hear Paul once more, talking to the elect. Heb. iv, 1: "Let us therefore, fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." To whom did God promise an entrance into his rest? To none but the elect, the worthy gentleman would say. What does he say to these? He solemnly

exhorts them to "*fear*, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of them should seem to *come short of it*." The elect may, then, come short of an entrance into rest. Heb. xii, 15, the Apostle admonishes saints to look diligently lest any man *fail of the grace of God*, and as an example, he admonishes them of Esau, who sold his birth-right, and could not obtain it again, though besought it with tears. On this point, there is no lack of evident as you have abundantly seen in the forepart of this Debate. I have now presented twenty arguments, against Calvinism, or in proof of my affirmative proposition, that Predestination, as taught in the Confession, is unscriptural, unreasonable, and in opposition to the spread of the Gospel of Christ. These arguments mainly have been aimed at the unscriptural character of the doctrine, yet it has abundantly appeared, that it is unreasonable and opposed to the spread of the Gospel. But that *my twenty arguments*, from the infallible oracles of God, remain unanswered, and not only *unanswered*, but many of them *unnoticed*, I need inform no one here. Yet every one of them stands in direct opposition to his theory. Thus far he has been trying to draw me off from the straight forward course of argument, he saw I was determined before you. But in this attempt he has failed as badly as he has in his argument. I suppose the gentleman learned his catechism when quite young, I therefore, invite his attention to the following:

1. Can a man "fail of the grace of God" unless he was *once in grace*? See Heb. xii, 15.

2. Can a man be "renewed to repentance *again*," unless he had once repented? Heb. vi, 6,

3. Can a man "destroy a brother for whom Christ died," without destroying one of the elect? Rom. xiv, 15.

4. Are not those whom the "Lord bought" elect persons, and if they bring upon themselves swift destruction, is it not bringing swift destruction upon the elect? 2 Pet. ii, 1.

5. Can a man have his part taken out of the book of life, unless he had a part in it? Rev. xxii, 19.

6. Can a man have his name *blotted out of the book of life*, if it was never *in it*? Rev. iii, 6.

7. Can a man "count the blood of the covenant where-

with he was sanctified an unholy thing," and as "despite against the spirit of grace," and not fall from grace? Heb. x, 29.

8. Could Esau have a birth-right unless he was one of the elect, and if he was one of the elect could he have lost his birth-right? Heb. xii, 16.

9. Could Judas, one of the elect, *fall by transgression*, and be *lost*, without diminishing the elect? Jno. xvii, 12.

10. Could Paul have "become a castaway" without diminishing the elect? 1 Cor. ix, 27.

11. If Christ came into the world, that "the world through him *might be saved*," can it be true that he passed by any portion of the world, without giving the least opportunity to be saved? Jno. Hi, 17.

12. Can it be true, that "God concluded *all* in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon *all*," and that God passed by a *part of mankind*, without having any mercy upon them? Rom. xi, 32.

13. Can it be true, as the Scriptures say, that "Christ died for all;" that "in Christ all shall be made alive," and yet that Christ only died for a part? 2 Cor. v, 14,15; 1 Cor. xv, 21.

14. Did the grace of God appear to *all men*, and yet did God pass by a part of mankind? Tit. ii, 11.

15. Is it the will of God that all men should be saved, but did he nevertheless, ordain some to wrath? 1 Tim. ii, 4.

16. Did "God command all men everywhere to repent," when he knew many could not repent? Acts xvii, 30.

17. Did the benevolent Jesus say, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," knowing that many could not repent? Luke xiii, 3.

18. Did the holy Jesus say, "he that believeth not shall be damned," knowing that one part of mankind could not believe? Mark xvi, 15.

19. Did Paul tell the Hebrew Christians to "fear, lest a promise being left them, of entering into his rest, any of them should seem to come short, of it," knowing all the time that they could not come short of it?

20. Is it true, as Peter says, that "God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repent-

ance," and that God never granted the honor of repentance only to a part of mankind? 2 Pet. iii, 9.

21. Is it true, that God has no pleasure in the death of the sinner, and yet that he unchangeably ordained a portion of mankind to wrath? Ez. xviii, 23.

22. How can the Gospel be good news of great joy to all people, when it contains not one particle of love, mercy or salvation only for a part of the race? Luke ii, 10.

23. How can it be that "God is no respecter of persons," as Peter says, and yet that he passed by a part of mankind, without offering to save them? Acts x, 34.

24. How are the holy attributes of Jesus to be sustained, when he says, "How often *would I have gathered your children, but ye would not,*" when he knew they were ordained to wrath all the time? Mat. xxiii, 37.

25. How can God judge the world according to the Gospel, when the Gospel never offered one blessing only to a part of the world? Rom. ii, 16.

26. How can the wicked "despise the riches of the goodness of God," unless God has been good to them? Rom. ii, 4.

If my worthy friend will make himself well acquainted with these questions, and the Scriptures, they are founded upon, he will find his "*iron Jacket*" unbuttoning and slipping off pretty rapidly. But if he passes them unnoticed, he may wear the *iron Jacket* with as much comfort and gracefulness, in time to come, as heretofore. —

[*Time expired.*]

---

**MR. MATTHEWS' FIFTH REPLY.**

*Tuesday, 11 ½ o'clock, A. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

THE gentleman has attributed to me a piece of defensive armor, such as Homer has not described. He sees his darts, many of which, contrary to the laws of civilized warfare, he had poisoned with the venom of misrepresentation, and calumny, fall harmless at my feet; hence he fancies I wear an "iron jacket." The gentleman is slightly mistaken as to the nature of my armor. That I am well armed, I do not deny. For,

"Thrice is he armed, who hath his quarrel just."

But the true Calvinistic panoply he will find described by one of the best soldiers in our whole army, in the following terms: "Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with *truth*, and having on the *breast plate of righteousness*, and your feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace; above all, taking the *shield of faith*, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the *helmet of salvation*, and the *sword of the spirit, which is the WORD OF GOD*." Such is the true Calvinistic armor, offensive and defensive. And clad in this, the most inexperienced youth, is more than a match for the veteran of many battles.

The gentleman has set forth his arguments dogmatically, and now he presents us with them catechetically. He has found, by sad experience, that it is hazardous to make assertions, but any one can ask questions with impunity. Let us attend to his catechism.

1. Cruden, who according to high authority in the gentleman's denomination, is "the best of verbal interpreters," gives, as one definition of "the grace of God,"

"the doctrine of the Gospel." The Apostle, Heb. xii, 15, is not speaking of the grace of God in the heart of Christians, but is warning them to whom he wrote, against apostatizing from "the doctrine of the Gospel." But if God has begun a good work in Christians, will he not perform it until the day of Jesus Christ? Phil. i, 6.

2. The Apostle does not say "renew them unto repentance again," as the gentleman loosely quotes; but "*renew them again (eis metanoian)*," in order that they might repent. Is genuine repentance a sorrow that needs to be repented of? Does not godly sorrow work repentance to *salvation*? 2 Cor. vii, 10. Is not the repentance which God grants, a repentance *unto life*? Acts xi, 18.

3. Bloomfield, an Arminian, says of the passage, "destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." Rom. xiv, 15. "*Apollue*, (destroy) DOES NOT IMPLY FINAL PERDITION." If any who have been redeemed by the blood of Christ go to perdition, will Christ see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied? Is. liii, 11. If any of his sheep for whom he died perish eternally, will it be true that he gives to them eternal life, AND THEY SHALL NEVER

PERISH, neither shall any pluck them out of his hand? John x, 15-28.

4. Even Adam Clarke and Bloomfield admit that it is not certain that, "the Lord that bought them," 2 Pet. ii, 1, is Christ, or that the buying is redemption by his blood. Says Clarke, "It is not certain whether God the Father be intended here, or our Lord Jesus Christ. For God is said to *have purchased* the Israelites, Ex. xv, 16, and to be the *Father that had bought them*. Deut. xxxii, 6.; and the words *may* refer to these and such like passages." This perhaps is as much as could be expected from so decided an Arminian. Others, however, have shown that the words not only "*may*" but *must* refer to the Father. To him alone of the persons of the godhead, is the word *despotes* ever applied. When Christ is called Lord the word is not *despotes*, but *Kurios*. The passage, then, has nothing to do with Christ, redemption, or, perseverance. The persons spoken of were never of the spiritual elect. Shall not all that the Father hath given to Christ come to him; and he that cometh to him, will he in anywise cast out? John vi, 37.

5 and 6. God is sometimes, in Scripture, represented as taking away from men, that which in reality they never had; but which they appeared to others to have, or themselves thought they had. "From him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath." Mat. xxv, 29; i. e. as Luke explains, "that which he *seemeth* to have," viii, 18. But one thing is needful; now if a man choose that good part shall it ever be taken from him? Luke x, 42.

7. A man may count the blood of the covenant wherewith he—i. e, Christ—was sanctified, or set apart; John xvii, 19; an unholy thing; and may do despite to the Spirit of grace; i. e. reject him as a lying spirit, and his gifts and miracles as illusions, according to Whitby; or resist and strive against his common influences; and, yet never be a child of God; and of course, without losing his adoption. But if God enters into an EVERLASTING *covenant* with his people, by which he binds himself not to turn away from *them*, and engages to put his fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from *him*. Can they so depart from him as to cause him to turn a way from them?

Jer. xxxii, 40. If God give his elect one heart, and one way, *that they may fear him forever*, will they *ever* cease to fear him? Ver. 39.

8. No sane man ever thought that the elect are confined to the first-born; and the first-born alone have the birthright. Esau was never one of the elect, but a "profane person;" rejected of God, before the children were born, or had done good or evil. If Esau had ever been a child of God, would he ever have sinned unto death? Would not his seed have remained in him, *so that he could not sin*, because born of God? 1 John iii, 9.

9. The gentleman says Judas was "one of the elect." Jesus Christ says he was not. "I speak *not* of you *all*; I know whom I have chosen." John xiii, 18. If Judas had been given to Christ in the covenant of redemption, would it be true that he gives eternal life to as many as are given him? John xvii, 2. If Judas was ever given to Christ as one of the elect, has Christ done the will of the Father, that of all given to him *he should lose nothing?* vi, 39.

10. Paul is warning against self-indulgence. 1 Cor. ix, 27. If a man desires the prize, he must run the race. If a man hope for the crown, he must fight the good fight. So if a man hope for salvation, he must *use the means*. He must not sit down in sloth. He must not abandon himself to self-indulgence. The man who acts thus is deceived. Paul always connected the means with the end. He knew that no man's life on board the ship would be lost, yet he said that if the sailors did not stay in the ship, the company could not be saved. Acts xxvii, 22-31. He knew in whom he had believed, and had no doubt that he would keep that safe which he had committed to him; yet he knew also that watchfulness and self-denial must be exercised by the Christian. Without these the elect cannot be saved, any more than the ship's company without the seamen. But if Paul had believed in falling away, totally and finally, from the favor of God, could he have said to the jailer, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved? Acts xvi, 31. If the gentleman's doctrine be true, might not a man believe on Christ, and yet *not* be saved? Shall not all who are justified by his blood, be saved from wrath through him? Rom. v, 9. Shall not

all who are reconciled to God be saved by his life? Ver. 10. Shall not they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness reign in life by Jesus Christ? Ver. 17. If we be dead with Christ shall we not also live with him? Rom. vi, 8, Is there any; condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus? viii, 1. Can those who are free from the law of sin and death, be condemned by it? 2. Shall those who have been adopted into God's family, never enter their Father's house? 14. If we are children, shall we not be heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ? If we suffer with Christ, *as all true Christians do*, shall we not be glorified together? 17. Whom God foreknows, does he not predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son? And whom he predestinates does he not call? And whom he calls does he not justify? And whom he justifies does he not glorify? Are not all then, glorified who are predestinated? 29, 30. If God be for us who can be against us? 31. He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give as all things? 32. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? 33. It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemns? 33, 34, Shall Christ fail in the object of his death and intercession? 34. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? 35. Was Paul deceived when he said that he was persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord? 38, 39, Has God ever cast away one of his people? xi, 1. Are not the gifts and calling of God without repentance? 29. Does not Christ *confirm his people to the end*, that they may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ? 1 Cor. i, 8. Does the gentleman sing the *truth* when he sings the following, found in the Hymn Book of his denomination?

"The soul that on Jesus has leaned for repose, I will not, I cannot desert to his foes; That soul, though all hell should endeavor to shake, *I'll never, no NEVER; no NEVER forsake.*"

11. If by the term "world," in John iii, 17, the gentleman understands all human beings who have ever lived,



who now live, or who shall live hereafter, he does not believe the passage. Does he believe that those who never heard of Christ, could be saved by him? Rom. x, 13-15. Bid Christ come into the world that those already in hell might be saved? Did Christ come to seek and save infants? Has the Gospel anything to do with infants? Monthly Chris. Age, March 1852. If Christ had not made an offering for men, could God, according to the gentleman's principles, justly condemn any one? Now that Christ has died, is there any *assurance* that any will be saved by him? May not all reject him, since there is no efficacious grace? Or if any receive him, may they not "fall from grace" and perish? The coming of Christ then, on the gentleman's principles, renders the salvation of no one certain, but brings the whole race under condemnation, to which previously they were not justly liable. Is not this doctrine very honoring to God who sends, and to the Son, who is sent? Won't you all embrace it?

12. In this question the gentleman repeats the effort to pass a forged text, slightly improved from his original issue, upon this audience. When I first charged this forgery upon him, he offered three or four grounds of defense: 1. Bad memory. His standing excuse. 2. The example of Calvin. 3. The quotations were correct. The kettle was cracked when he borrowed it; whole when he returned it; and beside, he never had it. I must then, give him another lesson in Mnemotechny, it seems. His spurious text reads, "God concluded all in unbelief that he might have mercy upon all." Rom. xi, 32. The genuine reads, "God hath concluded THEM all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." The gentleman gave us, some days ago, a dissertation on the importance of verbal exactness in quoting the Scriptures. It was very good, as what he borrows from Mr. Campbell, generally is, but I could not see the application. Now if it was wrong in the devil to *add* a word of three letters in quoting a divine precept, is it right for the gentleman to omit a word of four? More especially when the word omitted limits the term "*all*" on which his argument is based, to the persons spoken of in the context. But where is the *mercy* on the gentleman's hypothesis, when without

a

Savior none could justly be condemned; but the coming of a Savior rendered all liable to 'condemnation?

13. "Can it be true, as the Scripture says, that Christ died for all," if "the Gospel has nothing to do with infants?" if to seek and save them was not a part of Christ's mission?

14. Did the grace of God appear to all men, in an unlimited sense, when "the doctrine of the Gospel," which is here called the grace of God, was not preached to every human being in the days of Paul, nor in any subsequent age? "All men" in this passage evidently signifies all ranks and conditions of men. Paul exhorts *servants* to fidelity, "that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things, for the grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men." Since the Gospel is adapted to servants as well as others, let them adorn its doctrines. It brings salvation to men of every rank and condition in life.

15. "All men," 1 Tim. ii, 4, cannot mean the entire race, for some are already in hell, and it is the will of God that they should be punished there to all eternity. If God willed the race to be saved, would they not be saved? Who hath resisted his will? Does he not work all things after the counsel of his own will? Eph. i, 11. The same "all" that he "wills to be saved," he also wills "to come to the knowledge of the truth;" but some of the race, by the will of God, are born in circumstance where they cannot have the knowledge of the truth. The truth is, as the best interpreters are agreed, it means men of all ranks, conditions, and capacities. The context proves this to be the meaning. He exhorts that prayers be made, for "*all men*;" not the entire race; for some are in heaven where they need not our prayers; some in hell where our prayers will not benefit them; some have sinned the sin unto death, and for them we are not to pray. By "all men," the Apostle explains that he means all ranks and conditions; "kings, and all that are in authority," even though wicked men, and heathen; for God intends to show mercy to some in every rank, in every station, in every country, The redeemed will be of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation? Rev. v, 9.

16. God has not lost his right to command, though men have, by their sins, lost the ability to obey. The command is one of the means by which God brings men to repentance. Did the Savior say, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden," when he knew that "no man can come unto him except the Father draw him?" Matt. xi, 28; John vi, 44. In point of fact, has the command to repent ever been addressed to the entire race!

17. The benevolent Jesus knew that the reason why all to whom he spoke, Luke xiii, 3, could not repent was, that they loved their sins too well to be willing to turn from them. He knew, too, that an inability arising from depravity of heart, so far from palliating, aggravated their crime. Is not evangelical repentance the gift of God? Acts v, 31—xi, 18. 2 Tim. ii, 25. If this mean simply that God has given us the natural faculties with which to repent; or the truth in view of which we repent, is not *impenitence* in the same sense the gift of God?

18. Jesus did say, he that believeth not shall be damned. He also said to the Jews, "How *can* ye believe?" John vi, 44. "YE BELIEVE NOT, BECAUSE YE ARE NOT OF MY SHEEP." x, 26. How can multitudes of men believe in him of whom they have not heard? Rom. x, 14, Is not faith the gift of God? Eph. i, 19—ii, 8, etc., etc. Can any one believe, to whom it is not given? If the gentleman's gloss be correct, that it means that God gave all the *opportunity* of believing, is not *unbelief* equally the gift of God? Have they even an opportunity of believing in Christ, who have never heard of him?

19. To come short of the promised rest, and to seem to come short of it, are two very distinct things. Christians may *seem* to come short, and therefore, for the glory of God, the honor of religion, and the good of others, they are to take heed, and let their light shine. If the "Holy Spirit seal the saints," will they not be kept securely? 2 Cor. i, 22. Eph. i, 13. If God has given us an earnest or pledge of the heavenly inheritance, is not that inheritance sure? 2 Cor. 5, 22. Eph. i, 14.

20. "God is long-suffering to USWARD, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 2 Pet. iii, 9. The "*usward*" would seem to limit the whole passage to those "elect strangers," to whom

Peter wrote, and the Apostle himself. God was patient with them before their conversion, not willing that any of them should perish. And yet, it is true, that God takes no pleasure in the perdition of any of his creatures; not even the devils. But it is also trite, that he does not give repentance to devils. Neither does he "afford even the *opportunity*" to repent to those who never heard the Gospel.

21. Is it true that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, and yet he swept myriads of them by the deluge, the burning of Sodom, the destruction of Korah, and his company, earthquakes, pestilences, etc., by a miserable death to a miserable eternity? Many things which, in themselves considered, God has no pleasure in, he nevertheless does; and what he does, he may resolve to do. If it is not wrong to punish the wicked for their sins, can it be wrong to determine beforehand to do it?

22. How can the Gospel be glad tidings of great joy to all people, when, according to the gentleman, it has Nothing to do with infants? When it never has been preached to all people? When it would be unjust in God to condemn men, if it were not that the Gospel is offered to them? When in fact, then, it is the cause of the damnation of all that God can justly condemn?

23. How can it be that God is no respecter of persons, when some of the gentleman's *nameless* "best authorities" say, "Jacob have *I respected?*" When he chose the Jews as his people, and "passed by" all the rest of the world? When he cured Naaman, and not the lepers of Israel? When he causes one to be born in a Christian land, and others in heathenism. Is God a Sovereign? May he do what he pleases with his own? In the bestowment of his favors must he make all equal? Does he make all equal? Is he therefore, a respecter of persons?

24. How is the sincerity of Jesus to be defended in expressing an anxiety for the fate of Jerusalem, when he knew from eternity that the fate impending, would certainly visit them?

25. God judges the world according to the Gospel, because the Gospel teaches that he will judge the world. The Gospel offers blessings to all to whom it comes. All men have not heard the Gospel. But as many as have

sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law.

20. It does not detract from the goodness of God, that he is determined to punish the wicked; but every respite from punishment enjoyed by them, is a proof of his goodness.

I have now "said *my* catechism," of twenty-six questions. I have also taken the Yankee privilege of asking a few questions in turn. Paul has also propounded a few to the gentleman, that I apprehend he will find posers. Between us we have more than doubled his list. I hope his *memory* will not fail him here; I want very much to put him through, as I fear *he* never was taught the catechism in his youth.

The gentleman says the elect can be increased and diminished. His *memory* failed him, when I was on this part of my argument, but now some days having elapsed, it comes up. Now he *professes* to believe that God's knowledge embraces all things past, present and future. He knows then, who will be saved, and who lost. He knows the whole number of mankind; and who of that number belong to the one class, and who to the other. Can a man that God knows will be saved, be lost? Can a man be saved whose perdition God foreknows? Can the number of those whose salvation God foreknows, be added to, or diminished? Let the gentleman not forget these questions. And let him remember also, that all who shall be saved are the elect, and all who shall be lost the non-elect; and, by his own admission, their number is "certain and definite," as embraced in the Divine foreknowledge.

The Scriptures which he quotes are grossly perverted. For example, to prove that the elect can be increased and diminished, he refers to the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles, Rom. xi, as if the whole body of the Jews of that time were of God's spiritual elect, and the Gentiles not. Now the whole object of the Apostle is to show that God had not cast away his people totally, for at that very time there was a remnant according to the election of grace. The body of the Israelites had not obtained what they sought for; but the election, or elect

portion, had obtained it, and the rest were blinded. And of the Gentiles God had chosen some to be the trophies of his grace. In fact the gifts and calling of God are without repentance. So far from the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles being contrary to God's purpose of election, it is the most illustrious exhibition of the stability of that purpose.

Some were in Christ before Paul! Profound discovery! Paul and all other elect persons were "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world," but they actually became members of Christ's mystical body, when they believed upon him.

His twentieth argument against Predestination, is that men may fall from grace! His proposition needs just such support. The argument and the proposition are perfectly homogeneous. When he says *his* catechism, when he answers the questions which Paul and myself have propounded to him, if his memory does not fail him just here, I have a few more items on "failing from grace."

Having now disposed of the last speech of the gentleman, I will refer to a few items formerly omitted for lack of time.

It cannot have escaped any one's attention, that the argument of the gentleman turns mainly on the atonement of Christ, and its alleged universality. He has never told us, though I urged the question, whether he believes in the vicarious atonement of Christ, or whether he agrees with "*Father Stone*" in rejecting it? Sometimes, when it suits his argument, he seems to admit it; at other times he appears just as ready to deny. But one thing is certain, he does not himself believe in the hypothesis on which his entire argument rests. He has committed himself on this point, beyond even his powers of evasion. There is a large portion of the human family with whom he declares emphatically, "*the Gospel has nothing to do!*" He has, then, completely destroyed the basis of his whole argument. Neither has he ever explained how the Gospel benefitted those who never heard of it, and who were in the world of woe before the offering was made. But he volunteers the information that all who have ever been saved have been saved through" the sacrifice of Christ. *Presbyterians* need no instruction from the gentleman, on that

point. But still, he may enlighten some minds. A man of some note among the brethren of the gentleman, was wont to teach as follows. *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. 5, p. 163:

"I know that my brother or wishes from this text to establish his opinion, *that all the saints who died before the death of Christ, were pardoned by his blood, to be shed in future.* To DISPROVE *this opinion I have said enough in a former letter.*" B. W. STONE.

The following is Mr. Campbell's statement of Mr. Stone's belief on these points, p. 254:

"*The death of Christ as a sin-offering had no virtue, any more than the blood of bulls and of goats, to take away sin from any one who died before him.* Faith and repentance, "WITHOUT THE BLOOD OF CHRIST, availed to the remission of Abraham, and to the remission *of all who died from Adam to Moses, and from Moses to Christ,* who have obtained pardon. As for INFANTS, they were saved, IF SAVED AT ALL, without faith, repentance, circumcision, sacrifice, or anything else but naked justice."

I wish also at this point, to show the gentleman and his brethren, the conclusion of a truly logical mind on the extent of the atonement.

"As to its value it is unspeakable. \* \* *Reconciliation and redemption have however, a certain LIMITED EXTENT.* Reconciliation is *not universal,* but PARTIAL. \* \* *Redemption,* or deliverance from the guilt, pollution, power and punishment of sin, *is only commensurate with* THE ELECT OF GOD; i. e., with those who believe in Jesus and obey him. \* \* \* It is indeed, infinite in value, as respects the expiation of sin, or its propitiatory power; but as respects the actual reconciliation and redemption of sinners, *it is limited* to those only who believe on and obey the Savior. While also it is as universal as the sin of the world, the peculiar sins only of the obedient, are expiated by it." "Its *design,* then, is NECESSARILY LIMITED!!" does the gentleman hear? I am afraid he does not catch the idea! "Its *design is* NECESSARILY LIMITED, to all who come to God by it; while its value and efficacy are equal to the salvation of the whole world, provided only they will put themselves under the covering of its propitiatory power." So says A. CAMPBELL, *Christian System*, pp. 39, 40. And so say I. It is in substance the doctrine of the Confession of Faith.—[*Time expired.*]

**MR. FRANKLIN'S SIXTH ADDRESS.**

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

THE worthy gentleman has repeated, I am unable to say how often, the stereotyped phrase of Mr. Rice, in his debate with Mr. Campbell, "I cannot please the gentleman." In this, he is mistaken. He cannot displease me. This, however, he has tried to do, as all in this house know, but has failed. I have not for him an unkind, word or feeling, and hope I shall not have to the close. As it respects the argument; it is *out of all danger*, entirely *beyond his reach*. This is all I could ask on this point. Respecting the unkind and ill-tempered remarks of the gentleman, I am beyond their reach. Christianity may suffer, when its professed friends dishonor it by unkind, unChristian and unfeeling remarks, but I am not responsible for them unless they escape my own lips; and, I thank Heaven, that the spirit that animates my heart, does not incline me in the least, to return railing for railing or evil for evil.

Respecting my brethren not being, pleased, and making suggestions to Mr. M., I suppose the whole of it grows out of his own unkind feelings, and not out of anything he has seen or heard. Of course, they should not be displeased nor insulted at all the unkind insinuations of the gentleman, for he is but exhibiting not so much his own spirit, as the spirit of his doctrine. His sneering allusions to that great and holy man of God, B. W. STONE, now in Abraham's bosom, and to that other tallest and mightiest of the human spirits of this age, A. CAMPBELL, endeared. to so many thousands of our cotemporaries, he will find but a death-blow to his own name and to his own influence, while they will fall harmless at the feet of the great cause I have the honor to advocate. But the remarks of the gentleman are in good keeping with the spirit of the older and profounder advocates of his doctrine, and in good keeping with the doctrine itself. I beg leave of the audience to hear a few of the advocates of Predestination, speak of their opposers only a few words. In a letter of Calvin to Fabri, Dec. 1551, he says, "It is of the greatest importance that that knave should not be harbored in the Burmese territories. I am so ashamed of De Fallais, that I cannot bear the



sight of those who reproach me with his levity." Again he remarks of the same person, [Bolsec], "Let De Fallais write what he will about his not being a bad man, and prostitute his good name to ridicule in favor of an obscure scoundrel, it will soon appear, and with more detriment to the church than I could wish, how pernicious a pest he has been."—Life of Calvin, p. 236. Ruchart says, that Calvin treated those who rejected Predestination, "without ceremony, as scoundrels, rogues and worthless fellows."—Life of Calvin, p. 230. Bullinger, a warm friend of Calvin, in a letter to Beza, uses the following language: "But what is your most venerable Senate of Geneva, going to do with that blasphemous wretch, Servetus? If they are wise, and do their duty, they will put him to death, that all the world may perceive that Geneva desires the glory of Christ to be maintained inviolate."—Life of Calvin, p. 283. Such are the spirit and temper Calvinism inspires. I offer this as an apology for the gentleman, to show that he is not so much to blame as *his system*.

My apology that I *forgot* the gentleman's argument, was only my reason for not answering *immediately*, and not for failing to answer at all, as *he has done*. I have answered everything in his affirmative arguments that could possibly demand any answer, and some things two or three times over.

I deny in the roundest terms the correctness of the gentleman's historical accounts of the great prevalence of Calvinism. Nothing of the kind can be shown from any authentic source, and what is worse, it was not known at all to the first Christians.

It was amusing to hear the gentleman trying to show how Mr. Wesley could be saved, after declaring that Calvinism makes God worse than the devil! Is Calvinism Bible doctrine? To hear the gentleman talk, you would suppose it was the *marrow* of the Gospel. Can a man be saved without believing it? Surely, for Mr. Wesley not only did not believe it, but called it a *blasphemous doctrine*, and said that it made the blessed God *worse than the devil*; and my friend believes and has stated it before this dense congregation that he believes he has gone to heaven! He calls it a system of Grace, yet Mr. Wesley did not believe in it, but was saved by it! He was saved in unbelief then. But

the gentleman forgot the main point. If Mr, Wesley is saved, he is one of the elect, yet he opposed the doctrine with every power he could command. Do the elect themselves disbelieve and oppose the doctrine? And does it save them in their opposition and unbelief? If this is the case, I can see how their election is "without any foresight of faith;" for there could not be any foresight of faith, in these *unbelieving, opposing elect children!* This precious doctrine, was not only hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed to babes, but hid from many of the *babes themselves*. Or if not hid from *them*, they are opposed to *it*, and do not believe one word in it; yet it is so efficacious that it will save them whether they believe it or not. We have now followed Calvinism till we have found from the gentleman's own admissions, that there is no Gospel in it; for men can be saved who do not believe it; but men cannot be saved without believing the Gospel; and that it is of no consequence, for Mr. Wesley was a great, good and useful man, and is gone to Heaven, though he opposed and disbelieved the doctrine all his life. What is the gentleman contending for Calvinism for? To save anybody? No; for men can be saved without as well as with it. What then? Because they must believe it? No; for they can be saved without believing it. What a singular doctrine! It is not one particle of difference; whether you believe it or not, if true; for if the elect disbelieve and oppose it all their lives, they cannot be lost; and if the non-elect believe it with all their hearts, they cannot be saved! It is like Universalism; if you disbelieve and oppose it all your life, if true; you will be just as certain of heaven as the greatest friend and advocate the doctrine ever had! In the same way, *believing* and not *believing*, in Calvinism, can make no difference with one soul of Adam's race, if the doctrine is true, for the elect will all be saved, and the non-elect all lost, whether they believe it or not. The same is true of every commandment of God, and every doctrine laid down in the Bible. If Calvinism is true, no one need be at any further trouble on the subject. Faith, repentance, a Divine change of heart, are all matters about which a man need give himself no trouble. If he is one of the elect, in his own good time, God will *effectually call him*, without which he can no

more come to God than he can make a world! Of course, he is not to blame for not coming before God calls him, for he *could not come*. He is not to blame for all *his unbelief*, for he could not believe, till God gave him faith. He is not to blame, for not repenting, for he cannot repent. If there is anything wrong in sinners continuing so long in sin, according to the doctrine of my friend, it is all on the part of God, who has not effectually called them, without which they could not come,

I beg of the gentleman to cease preaching the doctrine, for every time he does it, he puts an excuse, an unanswerable one, too, if his doctrine is true, into the mouth of every sinner in the land. The eternal call of the Gospel, he admits to be to *all*, but that is not the *effectual call*. It is irresistible, and none can come without it. Those to whom God sends it, all come, and the balance never can come. If this is the true doctrine, preaching the Gospel to the non-elect, is a solemn mockery; nay more, it is the same to the elect, for they cannot come without the other; the *effectual call*. But he will say, we cannot tell who the elect are. God can tell who they are, and this horrible doctrine represents *him* as sending the preacher to *invite all*, when *God and the preacher both know that all cannot come!* God sends the preacher to invite those whom he *knows never can come*. Nay, worse; he tells him to say to them, that it is his "will that all men should be saved;" that he "is not willing that any should perish;" "that he is no respecter of persons;" that "he has no pleasure in the death of the sinner," knowing all the time, that it is impossible for the sinner to come, to believe, repent and turn to God, for the want of that effectual call which he *will not grant*. The preacher may excuse himself, by saying that *he* does not know who the elect are, and therefore, he preaches to all, that all the elect may hear. This may excuse *him*, but not his God, who sent him to mock those with an invitation whom he knows never can come. But did our Savior say, that no man cometh to me except the Father draw him? He did, and the very next words show how he *draws*, and who he draws. "It is written in the prophets, and they shall *all be taught of God*. Every man therefore, that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me." This shows how the gentleman per-

verts this passage. The Lord sent the Apostles to "preach to every creature;" to "teach all nations," that all might hear and learn of the Father, and come to him. Had he not drawn all, they could not have come. This accords with God's method of justification as set forth by Paul, Rom. x. My worthy friend has been instructing us that sinners should *pray for faith*; but Paul asks, "How then, shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" How does God draw men? How does he enable men to call on the name of the Lord? According to Paul, he sends men to preach. Preaching enables them to hear. Hearing gives them power to believe. Believing gives them power to call on the Lord, or come to him. This accords with that statement of John: "These things are written that *ye might believe*," or to give them powers to believe. Such is God's order or plan.

How different all this from the antiquated and contradictory system of the gentleman, born in the dark ages! It can never be represented in a much shorter or more correct manner, than in the words of the eccentric Lorenzo Dow:.

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

I am not sure that I have the exact words, as I have not seen them for years; but I have the substance. Nor is the representation anything more than just. In one breath, this system calls upon men to believe, for "without faith it is impossible to please God;" in the next breath it tells men that they cannot believe, till God is pleased to give them faith, and that they must pray for faith. Then the question comes up, how can a man with out faith pray? Can he pray to God before he believes in God? Can he pray for faith before he believes the existence of the very thing he prays for? If he should, it would be in the style of the Infidel, I have in some place heard of, who became alarmed, and having heard pious persons say, it is *good to pray*, he concluded to resort to this

method of relief. He accordingly prayed as follows: "O God, if there be a God, save my soul, if I have a soul, from hell, if there be any hell."

In this way thousands are kept under the delusion that they cannot believe, when they have just as much and as good faith as the preacher himself. It is quoted to the sinner, that "he that believeth not shall be damned," but that he *cannot believe* till God gives him faith. He is told that except he repents, he will perish, and yet that he *cannot repent!* That he must turn to God, or be lost forever, but that he *cannot turn to God!* This is the system, the gentleman says, that prostrates the sinner before the throne of God. Yes, exactly so, that he may effectually call and save one, and send another to perdition, without any regard to the *goodness* of the one. or the *wickedness* of the other; Thus it is too, that Calvinism fritters down faith, repentance; a Divine change of heart, the new birth, making nothing depend upon them, but making them and everything else depend upon an immutable decree of God before the world. If men do not believe, repent, turn to God, and be born again, it is no fault of theirs; for they could not. And it is not Adam's sin that men will be punished for in the world to come, but for *their own sins*; the sins they could not save themselves from, and from which God had made no provision to save them. In thus prostrating the sinner "before the throne of God," the gentleman prostrates every particle of *sincerity* in the commandment of the everlasting God, to "all men everywhere to repent," and nullifies it, by declaring that they cannot repent; that they cannot turn to God, and yet that they will be lost if they do not repent! No wonder the gentleman does not love to look at the working of this "system in his own State. It is known by *its fruits here*, and estimated according to its worth. He must excuse me for desiring him to look at it in his adopted State. I do not wish to mar the good feeling that has prevailed from the beginning, by going back to the days of Calvin and Servetus, to find the fruits of his doctrine.

He has become so accustomed to contradiction, that he seems to involve the utmost absurdities without the least consciousness. In one part of a speech, he is making the most sweeping statements about the prevalence of his

doctrine, the myriads who have believed it, etc., etc., and then anon, he is telling us that great numbers are no evidence, for the Mormonites have spread marvelously! The amount is, that when Calvinism spreads, it is an evidence in its favor, but when Baptists and Disciples multiply, it is no argument in their favor. But he informs us that the Baptists are Calvinists, especially several distinguished men who have gone from among them. There were more Calvinists among the Baptists thirty years ago than now. The truth of the matter is, they never prospered to any considerable extent in this State; till they abandoned Calvinism; and that party who still maintain it, like the Presbyterians in Kentucky, has not anything more than kept up its numbers, these many years. This is a sad comment upon the doctrine!

The attack the gentleman made upon Brother Raines, must fall upon his own head. That distinguished gentleman has been in your State much longer than Mr. M., and is known transcendently better. His word will stand for its face any place. But unfortunately for my friend, Mr. Raines made the quotations from Mr. Wesley, and so acknowledged in his remarks below, which I did not observe at the time. If he will look into the Doctrinal Tracts of Mr. Wesley, lying upon my table, he can see them. Will he accuse that great man of false quotations? But that is not the worst. There were but two or three quotations from this source, in the remarks he was speaking of. They were from the Life of Calvin and from Calvin's Institutes. How does he dispose of these? He sets himself up as judge, and pompously pronounces a sentence of condemnation on the Life of Calvin. This is an easy method of setting aside books. But I put my opinion against his, that Dyer's Life of Calvin, is the most faithful Life of Calvin that can be found! That is the reason it is dreaded; it is too faithful! How does he dispose of the quotations from Calvin's Institutes? He quotes other passages that *contradict them*, I was aware that such passages could be found; but which are the real sentiments of the man; those quoted by me, or those that contradict them? The truth is, you can find Calvinists teaching "all sorts of doctrine!"

But I must record one more word here, if I have time.

touching the Baptists. In our correspondence the gentleman included all the immersionists in the short phrase, "a mere fraction of *nominal* Christendom." Such words are cheap, and easily uttered. But is he aware that the best Pedobaptist authorities in the world state it, as an undeniable fact, that *the first thirteen hundred years of the Christian era, immersion was invariably practiced by all Christians*, except in cases of extreme weakness or sickness, called cleric baptism, and that there is no account of even these exceptions till the third century. Of course, I cannot argue a question of this kind here, but I risk my reputation, upon the assertion, against any man who dare assert the contrary. In addition to this, there have been large numbers of Baptists all the time, and at the present moment they nearly equal all the religious opponents, with the most rapid increase of any body in Protestant Christendom. It is easy to sneer at them, and say, as was said in this stand by Mr. Jennings, that Calvinism *is proved*. But the gentleman will soon find that he is not to decide this question for the people of this country. They have not given up the right of private judgment yet. It is easy to treat with contempt the Bible Union, New Translation, and the men engaged in it, as in the case of Mr. Waller. But he, and others like him, show fifty men that he is right, where those who treat him with disrespect will gain the attention of one. A short time more will show how the land lies.—[*Time expired.*]

---

### MR. MATTHEWS' SIXTH REPLY.

*Tuesday, 3 o'clock, P. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I WILL reserve my remarks upon some points in the gentleman's last speech; I desire now to offer some arguments against the system which he advocates. I have already presented the first, but the gentleman has not attempted any reply. I shall repeat it, and add a few others, hoping that they may be more fortunate in attracting his attention.

*I. According to the Arminian system, the gift of Christ was the greatest curse ever inflicted upon the world.*

It is a fundamental maxim in that system, that it would

be unjust in God to punish those for whom no Savior was provided. If then no Savior had been provided for any one, no one could justly have been punished. The coming of Christ, then, saved no one from condemnation; for had he never come, they could not justly have been condemned. But on the contrary, his coming was the cause why millions and millions of our race are sent hell. There was then no mercy, no love, no compassion in the mission of Christ. God sent not his Son into the world to save men, but that through him men might justly be damned! His mission was not to save, but to destroy! How could he save men if they were not justly liable to condemnation? The conclusion the gentleman cannot on his hypothesis, escape.

II. *The Arminian scheme supposes that God has placed all men in such a position that they may attain eternal life, or, as some have it, "that all men have an equal chance to be saved;" which supposition is false.*

No one can be saved except through Christ, Acts, iv, 12. Faith in Christ is, in the case, of adults, essential to salvation through him. Acts, xvi, 31; Mark, xvi, 16, No one can have faith in Christ who has no knowledge of him. Rom. x, 14, 15. But before his incarnations the true religion was confined to the Jewish nation. Since his incarnation, the knowledge of him has never penetrated all parts of the habitable globe. More than one half the race are at this moment involved in pagan darkness, having never heard of Christ. More than one half the remainder are followers of the false prophet. How is it possible that all have an equal chance of salvation, when so large a proportion of our race never heard of the only Savior? The gentleman, it is true, has so far outstripped all preceding inquiries into Christian Antiquity, as to have discovered that Scythia, India, Burmah, China, Japan, Africa, North, South, and Central America, as well as all the isles of the ocean, were completely supplied with a preached Gospel, in less than thirty years after Christ's ascension!! He has proved this point, too, by Paul! who had never dreamed even of the existence of countries which the gentleman's interpretation makes him say, were thoroughly evangelized!! And even conceding this very feasible interpretation, what has that to do with the millions



who, before and since, have lived and died, never having heard of Jesus? Moreover the condition of the people in some nominally Christian countries, is little better than that of Pagans. And even in the most enlightened parts of the earth, many are providentially so situated that they are constantly exposed to most deleterious moral influences. The gentleman may cry out "partiality, injustice, respect of persons," etc., etc., as loudly as he pleases, *There are facts*, known and read of all men; and they totally overturn the Arminian theory of an equal or sufficient dispensation of grace to all.

III. *It is an objection filled to the Arminian theory, that it denies the scriptural doctrine that salvation is of grace.*

Grace is opposed to desert. What a man deserves, he may justly claim; and what a man may justly claim, there is no grace in bestowing. Now the system which I oppose, proudly lifts its head, and in the face of Heaven's Majesty gives utterance to such lofty claims as the following:

"If there be any for whom no offering has been made, that fact would forever stand as an unanswerable argument against the justice of their punishment." "Had not an offering been made for all, every lost spirit that shall stand before the throne in judgment, could forever have used the righteous plea that they never had it in their power to be saved." "If Christ had not died for all men, they could not in justice be condemned."

This then, is the Arminian theory of the origin of the Gospel. God was *obliged* to provide redemption for fallen man, or disregard the claims of justice. Had not God given his Son to die, men would have had "an unanswerable argument," "a righteous plea," against the "*justice*" of their condemnation. JUSTICE, *then, required God to give his Son*. And since it is of *justice*, it is no more of *grace*. There is, then, on the gentleman's principles, no grace in the bestowal of a Savior, and the provisions of the Gospel. And as this theory thus denies all grace in the origin of Redemption, so it virtually denies it in its application. In terms, indeed, the Arminian admits that we are saved by grace, but in fact he denies it. His system teaches that all men have grace given them. But all are not saved. The grace given then is not the real cause why any are saved; for those who are lost had it equally with those

who are saved. Why then are some saved, and some lost, when all had "sufficient grace?" All, says the Arminian, some improved the grace given. But why did not all improve it? Whence came the disposition to improve it on the part of some? Is this disposition itself the effect of grace? It cannot be on Arminian principles; for that would be admitting the hateful idea of *discrimination*; God giving to some grace to dispose them to improve grace, and not to others. Beside it is really putting the effect before the cause. If grace has no effect unless there be a previous disposition to improve it, this disposition cannot itself be the effect of grace. Whence comes it then? It is of the man himself. It exists entirely independent of the grace given, and is what gives to grace its efficacy. This disposition to improve grace is the real cause why some are saved and not others. Therefore, salvation is not of grace; for all have grace, and all are not saved. But salvation is obtained by man's own act of choice, *which act he makes entirely independent of the grace of God!!*

Every argument then, which the gentleman has used in this discussion, based upon the love, mercy, compassion, and grace of God, he has directed point-blank *against his own system*. We can now place the proper estimate on all his loud professions respecting "free grace." It is *grace* which God could not refuse without *injustice*; and grace by which no soul is saved!

We can also estimate the sufficiency of that "sufficient grace" which, according to the Arminian theory, is given to all men. Are all men saved? "Oh no," Have all men "sufficient grace" to save them? "Yes; else God is partial, unjust, a respecter of persons, a tyrant, a hypocrite, worse than the devil," etc., etc. If all have "sufficient grace" to save them, why are not all saved? "All do not improve the grace given." But is not grace the cause why any have the disposition to avail themselves of proffered mercy? "No, verily! for that would necessarily lead to the doctrine of efficacious, distinguishing, and sovereign grace, which we deny." Then a good disposition, which is not of grace, must be superadded to the "sufficient grace" which all men have, before any will be saved? "Exactly." Why then, call the grace "*sufficient*" when something must be added before it will

*suffice?* "Why—really—yes—ahem. Proceed if *you* can find anything to say." Well, I will proceed and say that this "sufficient grace" which is yet *insufficient*, this "universal grace of salvation" which yet saves nobody, is the merest figment that ever the brain of man created. It had its birth among the Jesuits, and Dominican Monks, was lashed by the caustic wit of Pascal, and exploded amid the laughter of all Europe. I recommend to the careful perusal of my friend, Pascal's 2d Provincial Letter.

IV. *According to the Arminian hypothesis, there is no assurance that any will be saved.*

"Sufficient grace," they say, is given to all; but that this grace, of, itself, does not suffice to determine the will of any. And, in fact, God cannot determine the mind of any, so that they will infallibly choose Christ, without destroying their freedom, and changing them into "mill-wheels." All men then, are really left to themselves; and it depends on human caprice, whether any shall be saved. Some, we see, do refuse salvation; and, if there be no efficacious grace determining the minds of any, all may refuse it. Christ then, will be dead in vain. All the preparations of the Gospel will be wasted. All the sufferings and agonies of the Son of God will be fruitless. He may never "see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied."

V. *If the Arminian theory be true, no man will be saved.* Most of them seek to escape the odium of Pelagianism,

by asserting the innate and entire depravity of human nature. The gentleman is a little obscure, it is true, upon this point; at one time maintaining that infants are so pure that they were not included in the number of those whom Christ came to save; at another time charging upon them the "Adamic sin," from the consequences of which Christ saves them, by permitting them to suffer them themselves! Great men, however, will contradict themselves sometimes! The Bible is very explicit upon this point: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." And therefore, must be born again. "By nature children of wrath even as others." The better portion of the Arminians admit these doctrines so clearly set forth in Scripture, and embody them in their formularies of faith. Now if, as these admit, the native

bent of the human mind is only evil continually, man, if left to his own unbiased choice, will infallibly and invariably, choose evil. We are told, it is true, that grace is given to all. But this grace, as already shown, is not that which determines the will of any to good. All are left, ultimately, to the promptings of their own nature. And since their natures are corrupt, their promptings are only evil. No man, then, would choose good, and of course, no man could be saved.

Before leaving this point I will, for the edification of the gentleman and his brethren, treat them to an extract from *Mr. A. Campbell's PRINTED CREED!!* Millennial Har., 1840, p. 385. He explicitly avows his "heartly assent to what is intended by" the expressions, "total depravity." etc. He then adds, "I believe that every human being participates in *all* the consequences of the fall of Adam, *and is born into the world frail and depraved in ALL his moral powers and capacities.*"

Of course, if it be left to beings "frail and depraved in all their moral powers and capacities," whether they will choose sin or holiness, they will follow the bent of their nature, and no man can be saved.

I cannot resist the temptation to give, just in this connection, the following *gem*, from B. W. Stone: "Calvinism is among the heaviest clogs of Christianity in the world. *Its first link is total depravity.*"

We now have a fair specimen of modern "Christian union," as well as of "all sorts of doctrine!"

VI. *According to the Arminian system, God treats the devils better than he treats men.*

We have already seen that if God had not provided a Savior for men, he could not justly, according to the Arminian, condemn any. The same principle applies to *all* God's moral creatures. Indeed the gentleman told us last evening that, if an offering were not made for all, "EVERY LOST SPIRIT that shall stand before the throne," will have a righteous plea to offer. The devil and his angels are "lost spirits," They shall "stand before the throne" to be judged. The gentleman volunteers as their advocate. He files in their behalf "a righteous plea." Of course, they will be discharged from custody. And of course, the gentleman, having due regard to the interests of his *clients!!* will

advise them to bring an action for false imprisonment. See 2 Pet. ii, 4, and Jude 6.

Now the reason why the devils, through the gentleman's able advocacy, will all be freed, is that no Savior was provided for them! While the reason why millions of the human race will be banished to hell, is that Christ shed his blood in their behalf!! The devils then, ought to rejoice that Christ "took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham;" and men have great reason to complain of the same. They ought to join in the devils' prayer, "let us alone." I understand that one of the gentleman's brethren in Nashville, is projecting a mission to the "spirits in prison." I hope the gentleman will join Mr: Ferguson on this errand of mercy. He certainly can preach "Glad tidings of great joy to all" devils; peace in hell, and good-will to the dragon and his crew.

VII. It is an overwhelming argument against Arminianism, that if that system, be true, *there is no efficacy in prayer.*

We are told that God has done all that he can do for man's conversion. And they quote, "what more could have been done to my vineyard that I have not done in it." Is. v, 4. A passage having respect solely to the peculiar civil and national advantages conferred upon his *elect* people of old; and of course, totally perverted when used to prove "sufficient grace" to all. We are also told that God has done his part, and now men must do theirs. This is the very marrow and fatness of Arminian preaching. If "sufficient grace" has already been conferred on all, why pray for more? If God has already done all he can do for the conversion of sinners, why pray to him to do more? Why ask God, whose part is already done, to do anything toward a sinner's salvation? Moreover, what can God do for the conversion of a sinner on Arminian principles? Repentance is not the gift of God, but the sinner's own work. Faith is not a gift of grace, but the act of a man's own mind. We cannot pray, then, that God would impart either to the sinner. God cannot in any way influence the mind to a certain course without interfering with its freedom, and making it "a mill-wheel." There is no possible way in which, on Arminian principles, God can answer prayer. There is no room for prayer in

the system. Every prayer to God for the bestowment of his grace that sinners may be converted, is a Calvinistic prayer, and implies the truth of Calvinistic doctrine. If Arminianism be true, prayer should be addressed only to the sinner himself. He exercises a sovereign self-determining power.

VIII. *The Arminian system tends to flourish pride and self-sufficiency. .*

It answers the question, "Who hath made thee to differ?" by saying, myself of myself, without .the intervention of "invincible grace," which is an absurdity. I determined my own will to a holy choice. God has done for me no more than for others, and if I am converted and they not, it is because, of myself, I turned my heart to God.

IX. A serious objection against the Arminian system is, that *it is derogatory to the Divine character.*

This system represents the Divine Being as undertaking the work of creation without any purpose respecting it; or else that having a purpose he fails to carry it into execution. That everything which God does, or permits to be done, he from eternity purposed to do or permit, is the essence of Calvinism. The denial of this is Arminianism, And this denial implies, either that God had no purposes with respect to creation, or that trying to execute them he failed; or that for sufficient cause, he changed them. But if he have no purpose with respect to his works, he is not wise. If he fail to execute them, he is not Almighty. If he change them, it implies an original defect in forming purposes that afterward must be changed, and is an impeachment of the Divine immutability. This system represents God as failing in matters on which his heart was set, and being defeated in his most cherished plans, by the opposition of the creatures which he has made. One defender of it is driven, by a regard to consistency, to deny God's omniscience; another, his Almighty power. No defense of it can be made without infringing upon the Divine attributes, and dishonoring the Divine character.

X. Another argument against the Arminian system is, that *it lies exposed to every objection which it urges against Calvinism; but has, in addition, inextricable difficulties peculiar to itself.*

That no finite mind can fully comprehend, and clearly explain the harmonious connection of the Divine purposes with human freedom and accountability, none are more ready to admit than enlightened Calvinists. They know the fact that they are perfectly harmonious. Each can be proved by its own appropriate evidence; and being both true, they must be consistent. The alleged inconsistency between them is the one great argument against Calvinism. This inconsistency has never been proved to exist. And the difficulty is just as great in reconciling man's freedom and God's Foreknowledge. Even Wesley, in answer to the question, "How is God's Foreknowledge consistent with our freedom?" candidly says, "I CANNOT TELL." Watson likewise makes important concessions upon this point. The difficulty then is common to both systems, and resists from man's finite capacity. But the honesty of urging that as an overwhelming argument against Calvinism, which bears just as strongly against the opposing system, is what I do not just see as clearly as some other things. So with the objection from the warnings, entreaties, and expostulations of Scripture. So with every objection made to Calvinism. We can turn our opponents' weapons against themselves, and by their own reasoning prove their system untrue.

In this connection I will notice the gentleman's theory of free agency. He objects to my statement that freedom consists in the power of acting according to choice; and insists that unless one have the power of willing directly the opposite of what he does will, he cannot be free. The gentleman then, is not free in loving his children, for he cannot will to hate them, let him try ever so much. The Devils and damned spirits in the world of woe are not free, for they will only sin, and have no power to choose good. They are not then, blameworthy, and ought to be released. The gentleman is determined to give aid and comfort to these clients of his at every turn! The Scriptures tell us of some that cannot do good—that cannot come to Christ—that cannot cease from sin. These are not free, not accountable, and of course, not sinners 1 God himself, according to the gentleman's theory, is not free. He acts, (I shudder to repeat it) like a mere "mill-wheel!" For certain it is, that he chooses good, and good only. He

*cannot* choose evil. Therefore, he is not free, and there is no reason why he should be praised for his acts. There is no merit in them! The angels in heaven are not free, for they are established in their state of rectitude, and can choose only good. There is then, no moral excellence belonging to angels more than to a mill-wheel. The spirits of the just made perfect, are confirmed in holiness; they cannot choose sin. Therefore, they are not free; they are mere machines! Let the gentleman look the consequences of his system directly in the face, and either avow boldly these consequences, or renounce his theory.;

XI. Another argument against Arminianism, is *its contradiction of many explicit declarations of the word of God.*

I have already had an opportunity of laying some of these Scriptures before you, when proving the doctrine of our Confession. Have they been met by the gentleman, and the argument drawn from them briefly answered? This audience knows that he made no attempt to reply to a tithe of them. He preferred making quotations from Dyer's attack on the memory of Calvin; from the *Christian Teacher*, *alias* Aylett Raines; and from the semi-Atheist, Hobbes, together with detached sentences and parts of sentences from Calvin and the Confession of Faith, with the purpose of vilifying the system, the scriptural argument in support of which he found it impossible to refute. The course of the gentleman in this matter is precisely the course pursued by his clan always. Where in all the ranks of Arminian authors, can we find a candid statement of Calvinistic doctrine, and a thorough discussion of the arguments and Scripture proofs adduced in its support? They all find it easier to misrepresent than to refute. But these proof-texts are in the Bible; they agree with the whole tenor of Revelation; they must have a meaning. What is that meaning? Talk of the difficulties of the Calvinistic system! To evade the force of these declarations of the word of God, is a difficulty paramount to them all. And in doing this, you involve yourself, as perhaps my friend begins to find, in an endless maze of absurdities.

"If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?"

XII. *The same objections made by Arminians against the*



*Calvinistic system, lie with equal pertinency against the Scriptures themselves.*

"God meant that Joseph should be sold Into Egypt." Gen. 1, 20. That event was an essential link in the chain of providences, by which he fulfilled his promises to Abraham, Gen. 15 chapter. He had determined to fulfill those promises, and to fulfill them by the very means which were used, of which the chief was the selling of Joseph into slavery by his brethren. Was God, then, the author of the sin of these unnatural brethren? Did they act under constraint? Were they mere "mill-wheels?" or were they free from guilt, because they performed God's secret purpose? If Arminian reasoning be true, these questions must receive affirmative answers.

That Judas would betray Christ, that Peter would deny him, that the Jews and Romans would put him to death, were events determined beforehand, for they were predicted. Indeed the death of Christ entered essentially into the whole frame-work of the universe. Had it not taken place, the entire plans and arrangements of God would have been nullified. He is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. His enemies acted in accordance with the "determinate counsel and Foreknowledge of God." Acts ii, 23. Was God then, the author of the sin of crucifying Christ? Did his decree exert any compulsory force on the enemies of Christ, impelling them to the course which they pursued? How could he say to them, "Thou shalt do no murder," when it was his "determinate counsel and *decree*," as Bloomfield interprets it, that Christ should by them be crucified and slain? How can he punish them for doing "*what his hand and his counsel DETERMINED BEFORE TO BE DONE?*" Acts iv, 28. Were they not mere "mill-wheels," acting as they did because it was impossible that they could act otherwise? Are they, then, responsible?

Let these two instances, out of hundreds, serve as specimens of Arminian reasoning applied to scriptural facts. If it prove anything against Calvinism, it is equally powerful against the Scripture.—[*Time expired.*]

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

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

I NOW rise to close my part of this Debate. I trust, you will bear me witness, that I have sought no advantage only what truth always has over error. I did not desire any undue advantage of the worthy gentleman, My entire object, if I know my own motives, was to hold a fair and honorable discussion, that the real merits of the question might appear to this community, and to as many as may read this debate. As I think I remarked at the commencement, I desire no victory but that of truth over error. Truth is great; I am comparatively nothing; therefore, if need be, I should humble myself into the dust, rather than that truth should be exposed. Let me be defamed; let my brethren be defamed, but never let holy, pure, heaven-born truth be defamed. We have nothing to fear; the truth, as it is in Jesus, is all we want for our selves, and for all mankind.

My worthy friend has shown a suspiciousness from the beginning of our correspondence, as if he feared that, by some undue advantage, he would be captured, made a prisoner of war, or slain. In the same spirit, he has received a letter, he says, from some friend, whose name he persists, in withholding from this community, informing him of the advantages I was heard to declare it to be my intention to take in the controversy. As this story goes, I was to make a splash at the outset, to terrify and disconcert my antagonist, and at the close seek to overwhelm him. But this is a mere fabrication, first and last, as I had no such conversation with any one, on the way here, or at any other time. This audience will also bear me witness that I have pursued no such course. Nor is there anything more dishonorable and injurious to the holy religion of our most adorable and gracious Lord, than low cunning and trickery among men claiming to be ministers of Christ. The religion of which I have the honor to be a humble advocate, inspires in the soul more noble sentiments—more noble heavenly and God-like deportment and feelings. It does not inflate us with the self-conceit, that we are the peculiar favorites of heaven, and that all the world beside should be treated as dishonest pretenders. But it teaches

that God loved all mankind; that we therefore, should love all; that God is good to all and his tender mercies are over all, therefore, he requires us "to *do good to all.*"

I came not into your midst to stir up the coals of strife, to sow the seeds of discord and hatred. But I came with the best and most kind feelings toward all. I have had no other feelings since, and none other now. I would not wound the feelings of the gentleman or one of his brethren, but hope to leave them without the least hardness. I believe that they are in error on the point under investigation; error of a very injurious nature to them and to all under its influence; error that manacles the gentleman himself, and ties his hands, so that he never does and never can do one particle of good, only as he rises above his system and acts in direct opposition to it, which is the case every time he calls upon a sinner to believe, repent or turn to God. He might, in harmony with his doctrine, plead with God to give the sinner faith, effectually to call him and save him, thus lessening the amount of sin in the world. But in vain is it, upon his theory, to call upon sinners to turn to God, for they *cannot turn.*

My worthy friend will have it that the sinner cannot *turn to God*, and a saint cannot *turn from God*. This is the free agency he believes in. He has admitted that Adam could have avoided the fall. In this, he admits that he was a free agent, but the descendants are free to do what they were ordained to do, but not to do anything else. The angels that sinned, must have had the power of doing good or evil, for they must have done *good* before the fall, and *evil* when they fell. All the angels may have the same power, but forever refuse to fall. The sin is not in *having the power to do evil*, but in *exercising it*. I do not know that man will ever cease to be a free agent or that he will ever get where it 'will be impossible for him to disobey God, though he will evidently get where he will never desire to disobey. But one thing I do know, he now has the power to obey and disobey; to yield himself up to be the servant of the most high God, or the servant of sin. For the exercise of this power; God holds him *accountable*, and upon this power to do good and evil, is based every *command*, every *invitation*, and every *promise* of the word of God.

One more point, and I proceed to close the argument.

My friend has found an infallible argument to justify the exclusive character of a system that leaves a large portion of the human race to, perish forever in their sins, without any offer of grace. It is this: Mr. Campbell holds exclusive views on baptism! Does my friend believe them? No; yet his own standard authorities justify every position maintained by Mr. Campbell, as any one can see, who will read his new book on baptism. But it must be obvious to all here that my friend has no desire to discuss the subject of baptism, for I challenged him to mate me a fair proposition on that point, and could not prevail upon; him to do it. I shall not now be diverted from the subject to reply to matter of this kind, but shall proceed to sum up the argument in a brief manner, and leave this intelligent audience and those who may read the printed discussion to decide for themselves the merits of the whole argument.

1. My first argument was drawn from the *intention of God in creating man*. I showed from the Confession, that "man's chief and highest end is to glorify God, and fully to enjoy him forever." This passage I have shown to be in direct contradiction to the chapter of the Confession under discussion, for God could not have ordained a portion of mankind to wrath, before the world, if his designs was, that man should "fully enjoy him forever." If he shall plead that this passage is Universalism, that is his construction, not mine. I take it as the writer evidently intended, that the chief and highest end in man's creation, is that he might glorify and enjoy God forever. But I have shown that Paul, Acts xvii, 26, 27, sets forth as the design of God in creating man, that he *might seek the Lord and find him*.

This I have also sustained from several other Scriptures, beyond the power of refutation.

2. My second argument is founded on the promise, "*all the families of the earth should be blessed*." On this promise we have the following comment from Paul: "The Scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying. In thee shall the families of the earth be blessed." Gal. iii, 8. This promise, thus defined by Paul, to be the Gospel, containing a blessing for all the families of the earth, I maintain, God has fulfilled. Calvinism virtually

denies it. I defy any Calvinist to show any blessing for all the families of the earth.

3. My third argument is founded upon the testimonies of the prophets, such as Isa. xlv, 22: "Look unto me all the ends of the earth," etc.; Christ is set for salvation to the ends of the earth. All the prophets bear witness of him, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sin. The Lord is good to all and his tender mercies are over all. Such we will find to be the spirit and substance of all the prophesies, showing the extensive share of benevolence, designed for the race. These testimonies subvert the entire fabric of Calvinism. It can never be true that God is *good to all*, and yet that he *passed by a part*, leaving them not only to *perish in their sins*, but "*ordaining them to wrath*."

4. My fourth argument is founded on the testimony of John the Baptist, that "*all men through him might believe*." It cannot be true, that "all men through him might believe," as John testifies, and yet true, that *some men are ordained to wrath*; passed by without ever having power to believe.

5. My fifth argument is founded upon the law of God. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." Calvinism virtually denies that God ever did love the world, so that here it stands in direct opposition to the love that brought to the world a Savior.

6. My sixth argument is founded upon the death of Christ. 1 Cor. xv, 21, 22. It is seen that the same "all" that die in Adam, shall be made alive in Christ: and it is evident that none that Christ did not die for, could be made alive by him. 2 Cor. v, 14, 15, we find Paul using the admitted truth, that "Christ died for all," to prove that all were dead. In this, we have Paul's testimony, that Christ died for the same "all" that were dead. The gentleman dare not deny that the race were dead, for he is *universal* with his sentence of condemnation, but *partial* in his proffers of justification. Heb. ii, 9, we are assured that Christ "tasted death for *every man*." All this, Calvinism contradicts.

7. My seventh argument is founded upon the propitiation,

1 John ii, 2, we are assured that "Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the *whole world*." This the worthy gentleman expounds, that he is the propitiation not only for the Jews but for the Gentiles. But John is not making distinctions between Jews and Gentiles, but between Christians and the whole world; 1 Tim. ii, 6, he is declared to be a ransom for all; 1 John iv, 14, he is called the "Savior of the world." Are these passages true? Then Calvinism is not.

8. My eighth argument is founded on the object of Christ's mission. What did Christ come into the world for? Mat. xviii, 11, we are informed that the "Son of man is come to save that which was lost." Will the gentleman tell who were lost? He dare not deny that all were lost. Then Christ came that *all might be saved*. But if he doubts this, let him hear the Lord: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; But that the *world through him might be saved*." John iii, 17. We have our choice to believe this or Calvinism; to believe both, and be consistent, is impossible; for Jesus asserts that "*the world through him might be saved*," and Calvinism declares that God ordained a part of the world to wrath before the world.

9. My ninth argument is founded upon the fact that the Gospel was commanded to be preached to all. This I knew Calvinists admitted, but brought it in here to show the perfect harmony of the whole revelation of God. But Calvinism only admits this in form, for the word Gospel, means *good news*, and Calvinism has no *good news* to *every creature*, unless it be good news to hear that God passed by some of them to perish in their sins forever.

10. My tenth argument is founded upon the design of preaching the Gospel. Paul says, Eph. iii, 9, "to *make all men see*." John gives as his reason for publishing the Gospel, "that ye *might believe*." Joh xx, 31. Paul says, "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." The word of God is then, preached to all, that all may hear, believe, and, as John says, "obtain life." The gentleman would preach to all, if he could, but not as Paul did, "to *make all men see*" but to convince them that some men *could not see*.

11. My eleventh argument is founded upon the fact,

that "God now commandeth all men everywhere to *repent*;" Acts xvii, 30, 31, which the holy and blessed God would not tantalize his creatures to do, if he knew they *could not repent*. I vindicate his holy name and attributes against such an imputation. He would not, because he is *holy, just and good*, "command all men everywhere to repent," knowing that they *could not do it*; and he would not say, "he is *not willing that any should perish*, but that *all should come to repentance*," knowing that he had ordained a part of them to wrath, because so it seemed good in his sight. It is an impeachment upon his holy name and cause to allege it.

12. My twelfth argument is founded upon the will of God. He says, "He will have all men to be saved." 1 Tim, ii, 4. "He is not willing that any should perish." 2 Pet. iii, 9. "He takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked." Ez. xviii, 23. Mat. xxiii, 37: "*How oft* would I have gathered your children, \* \* but *ye would not*." Can these Scriptures be true, and it still be true, that God passed by a portion of the human race, making no provision for them?

13. My thirteenth argument is founded upon the grace of God. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared." Tit. ii, 11. "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Rom. v, 20. "He by the grace of God tasted death for every man." Heb. ii, 9. Such is an expression of the word of God on the grace of God. Can it be true, that the grace of God which brings salvation to all men, hath appeared, and that "where *sin abounded, grace* did much more abound," and yet be true that Christ only died for a part of mankind, leaving the balance to perish forever in their sins?

14. My fourteenth argument is founded upon the mercy of God. "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." Rom. xi, 32. This passage is conclusive. Who are concluded in unbelief? "All." Upon whom did God have mercy? "All." The "all" in one case is precisely the same as the "all" in the other. We may believe this passage, or Calvinism; we cannot believe both.

15. My fifteenth argument is founded upon the fact that God will judge all. Acts xvii, 30, 31: "All men every-

where" are commanded to *repent*, because God will *judge the world*. The same number that are commanded to repent, will be judged. Could God judge "*all men everywhere*," in righteousness, which in this passage, is the same as "*the world*," having commanded them to *repent*, because he would judge them, if he had passed by a part of them, without giving them the power to repent?

16. My sixteenth argument is founded upon the cause of condemnation. Mark xvi, 15: "He that believeth not shall be damned." 2 Pet. ii, 1: "Even *denying the Lord that bought them*, and *bring upon themselves swift destruction*." The cause of condemnation is not found in some unchangeable decree, but in "DENYING THE LORD THAT BOUGHT THEM." There is justice in punishing men for such a sin as this, but none in punishing a man for not coming to a Savior that *never died for him*, and to whom he *could not come*.

17. My seventeenth argument is founded upon the explicit statement of the Apostle, that "God is no respecter of persons." Acts X, 34, and that statement of Paul, "There is no respect of persons with God." Rom. ii, 11. Now no man living can show how God can pass by some, making no provision for them, and leaving them in eternal ruin, and effectually call and save others, *no better*, and yet be "no respecter of persons." No two sentiments can stand in more direct contradiction.

18. My eighteenth argument is founded on the fact that the elect can be increased. This is sustained by 1 Pet, I, 2, by the fact that certain persons were "elected through sanctification of the spirit." which was evidently at their conversion, and they were not elect before. Also from Rom. xvi, 7, where it is stated that others were in Christ before Paul; and from Rom. xi, 17-21, where the wild-olive is said to be grafted into the good olive-tree, and, of course, become elect.

19. My nineteenth argument is founded upon the fact that the elect can be diminished. This I have shown from Rom. xi, 19-21, where the natural branches were broken off; John xvii, 12: "None of them are lost but the son of perdition," and many other passages.

20. My twentieth argument is founded upon the fact that men may fall from grace. This I have shown at full



length; from the fall of Judas; Esau selling his birthright; trees twice dead and plucked up by the roots; exhortation not to fail of the grace of God; for him that standeth to take heed lest he fall, etc., etc.

In addition to this, I have presented the gentleman a new catechism, containing twenty-five questions to answer, You have heard, and will hear in his closing speech, the reply he has to make to all these matters. It has been my part to argue these matters, but it is your part to judge of the Force of the argument, not to please or displease the worthy gentleman or myself, but that you may please. God.

My dear hearers, this system that I have been laying before you, is a great system, displaying from the beginning to the end the love, mercy and grace of God. He calls upon you to love him, because he first loved you. He requires you to believe, because he has given you Divine facts, upon Divine testimonies. He demands of you that you repent, because, he will judge the world in righteousness. He says, his goodness leads you to repentant, and exclaims, "Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die." Fear his glorious name then, come to him and find pardon, the Holy Spirit, the hope of heaven and eternal life. Hold sweet communion with the children of God on earth, and, by faith, rise up, and hold communion with the spirits of the blessed and redeemed from every nation and kindred, and tongue, and tribes, and people before the throne, with the mighty angels, with our most gracious and all-glorious Redeemer, and God the Father of all, who is over all, in all, and through all, blessed forever and ever.

Dear hearers, you have my most sincere thanks for your kind attention, during this protracted discussion, and your very orderly deportment.

Gentlemen Moderators, you are entitled to our most kind regard and gratitude, for the patient, faithful and dignified manner in which you have presided in our discussion.

The worthy gentleman on my right is also entitled to my thanks for affording me this opportunity of discussing this important subject before his neighbors and brethren.

*[Time expired,]*

**MR. MATTHEWS' CLOSING REPLY.**

*Tuesday, June 1st, 3 o'clock, P. M.*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:

IF I can do it, without a violation of our rules, I wish to introduce a few testimonies respecting a matter alluded to in a preceding speech of the gentleman. I will introduce no *new* subject; but simply reply to the gentleman's remarks upon a subject which we have already had before us.

*Mod.*—We have no right to grant that privilege, but Mr. F. can if he wishes.

*Mr. M.*—I ask Mr. F. then, if I may be allowed to introduce any new testimonies?

*Mr. F.*—Certainly; introduce what you please.

*Mr. Matthews.*—The subject is the distinction I made between efficacious and permissive decrees. The gentleman and his brethren seem to think that this is a modern invention to escape difficulties, dating no farther back than Dr. Rice, or Dr. Green. I wish to show that it is a distinction which Calvinists have *always* made. Calvin held it, though he insisted that by "*permission*," more was meant than merely allowing that to come to pass which could not be avoided; showing that in permitting evil there was, on the part of God, a *will* to permit, or suffer it to be done. He quotes Augustine as teaching the same. The Confession of Faith explicitly teaches that God's decrees respecting sinful acts, are permissive; though it denies that it is a *bare* permission, without a bounding and overruling of them to his own holy end. Chap. 5, sec. 4: chap, 6, sec. 1. I will quote a few passages from standard Calvinistic works, to the same point. Some of them are in the Latin language, and to this hour, the gentleman has left me in. ignorance whether he is acquainted with it. However, his brother, elder Young, is here, and to him I appeal to witness that I translate literally. I shall make no pretensions to elegance. Let us hear Turretine, born 1623, an eminent teacher of theology, at Geneva: "*Conditio et conditionatnm pendent immutabiliter a Deo, vel quoad permissionem, ut in malis, vel quoad effectonem, ut in bonis.*" I. e.:  
" Both

the condition, and those things regarded as conditional, depend immutably upon God, either as respects his *permission*, as in evil acts, or as respects his effective operation, as in those that are good." Inst. Theol. Vol. 1, p. 286. Again: "Deus non propterea potest censeri autor peccati, \* \* quia decretum non influit in rem, nec est effectivum mali, *sed tantum permissivum*, et directivum." P. 288. I. e.: "God cannot, therefore, be regarded as the author of sin, because the decree does not influence the act, nor is it effective of the evil, but only *permissive*, and directive." Again: "Deus nihil praevidere potest futurum, nisi consequenter ad suum decretura, aut effectivum, *aut permissivum*, de illius futuratione." P. 290: "God can foresee no future event unless in consequence of his own decree respecting its futuration, either efficacious, or *permissive*." Again: "Decrevit illa [scelera] *permittere*, decrevit etiam illa \* punire." P. 293. I. e.: "He decreed to permit those (crimes), he decreed also to punish them."

*Mr. Young*,— I think the passages have been correctly translated.

*Mr. Matthews*.—Let us next hear Pictet, another *Genevan* divine, of the age immediately succeeding the Reformation: "By the term *decree*, we understand a fixed and unchangeable purpose in the mind of God, concerning that which he will do, *of permit to be done*." Pictet's Theology, p. 113. "Nothing takes place in the world which God hath not decreed should take place; still it is certain that God is differently concerned in these events, according as they are either good or evil; the good he hath decreed to do, *the evil only to PERMIT*." P. 115. "As God decreed to create angels and men, so he decreed to *permit* their fall." P. 167. See also p. 174, and an important passage on pp. 154-5, which I regret that I have not time to read.

Let us hear the great American Theologian, Edwards, whose works, and especially his Treatise on the Will, I would earnestly recommend my friend to read, before entering upon another discussion of these topics. It will do him good: "What God permits, he decrees to permit. If it is no blemish to God to permit sin, then it is no blemish to him to purpose or intend to permit it. And if he be omni-

scient, and does designedly permit that sin which actually comes to pass, then he designedly permits that sin, knowing, if he permits it, it will actually come to pass." Works, Vol. 2, p. 533.

Other authorities I have marked, but these must suffice to show that when modern Calvinists are charged with having changed their ground, the charge originates with those who have never read the early expounders of the system.

I must now attend to some matters in the gentleman's speech preceding the one just delivered; this I omitted to notice at the time, that I might present, in unbroken connection, some arguments against the motley system which he advocates.

He complains that I quote a remark of Mr. Rice. It is very possible that Mr. Rice may have used language similar to mine. One thing is certain; *he* could not please Mr. Campbell in his style of debating, at Lexington. And *I* am equally unfortunate; I can please neither the gentleman nor his brethren here. If I fail to notice everything, he says, he complains; if I notice him, he complains still more piteously. He thinks I have a very bad temper, else I would not distress him so much as I do. Now I can say, in all good conscience, and I appeal to all who know my usual manner of address, to confirm my word, that not for a single moment since this discussion began, have I felt, or manifested, the slightest angry emotion, nor do I now. My feelings toward the gentleman and his course, are very different from anger; they are more nearly allied to pity. But it is easy to account for the insinuation which he has several times thrown out. Those who are not here, and who may read the book, may possibly be induced to believe him; this is one hope he has. Moreover, such is the disturbed state of his own feelings, that he thinks I must be angry with him, or I would not corner him as I do. I venture the assertion, that nowhere, in all the annals of theological controversy, can a parallel be found to the bold and unblushing recklessness which the gentleman displayed, in handling the facts of history, the characters of his opponents, and in his citation of pretended authorities. I have been absolutely amazed by his course. I warned him after his very first speech, in which he began

to manifest his tendency to misquote, that he must be careful in citing pretended authorities; but no! on he went in his premeditated course, piling Pelion upon Ossa, until he capped the climax by citing Hobbes as a "*Calvinist!*" His misrepresentations, perversions, forgeries, and calumnies, I have been compelled to expose. It was no pleasant task; but I would have proved recreant to my duty had I failed. This exposure I knew would not be pleasant to the gentleman. Hence I warned him of what was coming, if he persisted in his course, that we might all be spared the pain of witnessing it. But he would take no warning, and now he is suffering from mingled feelings of disappointment at his failure, and mortification at the exposure to which he has been subjected. He therefore, thinks that I must be a very cruel and ill-natured person, thus to thwart his plans, and expose his obliquities. If I had only stood silently by, and heard all that is sacred in the faith which I hold, all that is venerable in the church which I love, and all that is pure and noble in the character of men whom I revere, made the subject of perversion, and gratuitous abuse, without attempting a reply, I might possibly have obtained the gentleman's commendation, as a very easy, innocent, and good-natured kind of soul. I must try and survive his censure. But this I will say; I had rather, in temper, be the veriest cynic that ever snarled and growled, than stand in some men's shoes, and answer for their conduct, at the judgment of the great day.

Let me tell my kind and amiable friend a story, which I hope will assist in calming down his disturbed feelings. Agricola going out into his fields one morning, detected his neighbor Lanius, in the very act of carrying off one of his finest sheep. Agricola was an honest farmer, who generally called things by their right names; so he exclaims: "You thieving 'scoundrel,' what 'knavery' is this? You are the 'pest' of the neighborhood. No man's flock is safe." Upon which Lanius, with a meek and simple air, replies: "My worthy friend, I am sorry to see you so 'excited.' You display a very 'ill-temper;' there is great 'want of loveliness' in the spirit which you manifest. Your 'unkind, unfeeling, and unchristian remarks,' all fall on your own head. Christianity suffers' by them. 'I thank heaven that the spirit which animates my heart, does

not incline me in the least to return railing for railing, or evil for evil." So saying, Lanius turns from the astounded Agricola, with the air of a deeply wounded and injured man, bearing the sheep to the shambles, and leaving his neighbor revolving in his mind how it came that Christianity suffered more by charging theft upon one caught in the act, than by the act of thieving itself!

The gentleman makes a great outcry respecting my treatment of B. W. Stone and A. Campbell. The head and front of my offending in this matter, is that I have quoted the doctrines of these "tallest spirits" in the gentleman's denomination, in their own language; giving in every instance, volume and page, that all might have an opportunity of verifying the quotations, and seeing that they were fairly made. He has not ventured, reckless as he is, to call in question the correctness of a single citation. Now I will leave it even to the gentleman's own brethren to say, Whether either of these their leaders have been injured, when they are allowed to set forth doctrines of which they are proud to have been the discovered, in their own language. But with how good a grace a reproof touching a matter of this kind, comes from the gentleman! To defame, misrepresent, calumniate Calvin, Zuingle, Beza, etc., is all right! The end sanctifies the means. But to let Stone and Campbell set forth their own views in their own language, manifests an "unkind spirit" and "want of loveliness!"

The gentleman treats us to some more "elegant extracts" from Dyer's Life of Calvin, a work so much after his own heart, that he pronounces it "the most faithful Life of Calvin that can be found!" Alas, for the distinguished Dr. Henry, whose impartial and elaborate work, the fruit of twenty years' research, has lately been given to the English reader! How can he survive this implied condemnation, from such a high literary tribunal, of a work which even Dyer admits, "presents materials abundantly sufficient to satisfy the most minute inquirer into the actions and opinions of the Genevese Reformer," P. .6. Of Dyer's book, critical authorities, not altogether unknown to fame, say: "Mr. Dyer has attempted a work for which he does not possess a single qualification." "To expect a truly candid account either of Calvin's personal

history, or of his religious faith, from such a writer, is manifestly preposterous." *Biblical Repertory*, July, 1850. "The most prominent idea in the work, is antagonism to that Reformer as a predestinarian; and from some of the positions, argued or advanced by the author, we may, perhaps, rank him side by side with those of whom it has been said that they 'write against Calvinism with the virulence of men who did not understand it.'" "This work loses no opportunity of saying or insinuating what may on the whole be disparaging to the French Reformer." "Its tone and tendency are adverse to Calvin, and not calculated to convey a fair representation of the man." *North British Review*, May, 1860.

The gentleman explains to us more minutely that remarkable peculiarity in his *memory*, which enabled him still to *forget* my arguments on any topic, until I had passed to another; and then to *recall* a few of them, and such as he thought he could pervert. It is a great loss to future inquirers in psychology that he did not also explain that still more remarkable trait by which he is enabled to *remember* things that never occurred at all! As, for instance, that he had fully answered my arguments!

He "denies in the roundest terms," he informs us, my references to the history of Calvinism. Of course, he does. To affirm or deny, "in the roundest terms," whatever may suit his present purpose, is the gentleman's *fort*. Nevertheless the facts, which he so roundly denies, are all historic verities, as any one may see for himself who will look into Milner's *Church History*, from which I obtained the most of them. The gentleman says that the doctrine was not known to the first Christians. If, by the first Christians, he means those in New Testament times, it has been already shown that it was Calvinistic doctrine, which our Savior preached at Nazareth, Peter on Pentecost, and Paul everywhere and always. If he means those immediately following the Apostles, he must have found in the writings of the first century, with which he is so familiar, an epistle written to the Corinthians by Clement, of Rome, whom Paul mentions, Philip iv, 3: of which epistle Milner says, "The doctrine of election runs remarkably through it." Vol. 1, p. 133. He cites a passage, in which Clement, in the true spirit of his "fellow-laborer,"

Paul, speaks of "the love of our gracious and compassionate Father who hath made us, by his election, his peculiar people." If the gentleman is curious in this matter, and desires to correct his impression that this doctrine originated "in the dark ages," I refer him to that eminent *Baptist* author, Dr. Gill, who, in his "Cause of God and Truth," has given other citations from Clement, A. D. 69, to the same purport. He also shows that Ignatius, A. D. 110, Justin Martyr, A. D. 150; Minutius Felix, A. D. 170; Irenaeus, A. D. 180; Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 190; Tertullian, A. D. 200; and many others, the earliest and ablest of the Christian writers, taught the doctrine of Predestination.

The gentleman insists that if Predestination be a doctrine of the Gospel, and Mr. Wesley did not believe it, he cannot be saved. This is precisely the idea that they all have borrowed from Mr. Campbell, and which compels him to deliver over infants, idiots, deaf and dumb persons, innocent Pagans, all pious Paidobaptists, and all Baptists, who have not, "in full faith," been baptized for the remission of sins, to the uncovenanted mercies of God. Here is his argument, in effect.

No one who refuses to receive the Gospel, or any doctrine thereof, can be saved.

But immersion for the remission of sins, is a doctrine of the Gospel.

Therefore, no one who refuses to receive immersion for the remission of sins, can be saved.

It is the gentleman's logic, not mine, which consigns not only Wesley, for whom he has conceived so sudden and so violent an affection, but every other human being, Mormons and Reformers excepted, to the fires of perdition! In his study, Wesley was an Arminian. In his closet, and on his knees, he, like all other good men, was a Calvinist.

The gentleman urges sundry objections to the doctrine, that man, without the grace of God, can neither believe, repent, nor turn to God; just such objections as Infidels urge every day against the Bible.

1. It renders preaching useless. I think not. If a man be laboring under a deadly disease, and has *no power* to heal himself, it is very important to convince him of the fact, that he may be induced to apply to the physician.



2. It discourages effort. Paul did not think so. "Work out," says he, "your *own* salvation with fear and trembling." Why? Because you have all needful power within yourself, independent of the grace of God! Nor that; but because "it is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Phil. ii, 12, 13.

3. The sinner is not to blame if he cannot, of himself, believe, repent, and turn to God. That is, if a man hate the holy God so much that, until his heart is changed, he *cannot* love him, he is excusable! The more vile a man becomes, then, the more excusable he is for not being virtuous! Joseph's brethren were excusable, for they hated him so much that they *could not* speak peaceably to him. Gen. xxxvii, 4. Those who *cannot* believe, are excusable for not believing. John v, 44. Those who are in the flesh *cannot* please God. Rom. viii, 8. Therefore, they are excusable for not pleasing him. The carnal mind *cannot* be subject to the law of God; ver. 7. Therefore it is under no obligation to be subject to it! The truth is, man's inability to obey God is the result of his depravity, and instead of excusing, aggravates his sin.

4. Furnishes the sinner with an excuse for not obeying the Gospel. Already answered.

But the gentleman's arguments on this occasion, have furnished men with an unanswerable excuse. They are already beginning to say, in this town, that the reason why they are not Christians, is that they are made of "*bad clay!*" A decidedly inferior article!!

5. Of no use preaching to the elect. The elect are "chosen to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth," "How can they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how can they hear without a preacher?" The preaching of "Christ crucified, is unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them that are CALLED (here is a call different from, the preaching of the Gospel) both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the wisdom of God, and the power of God."

6. Preaching the Gospel to the non-elect, is a solemn mockery. No; it shows them their duty; and that the only reason why they are not saved, is that they *will not* come to Christ that they might have life; so that they are

without excuse. Was Noah's preaching to the antediluvians "solemn mockery," when God knew that they would not hearken? Was it "solemn mockery" in God to send Moses and Aaron to Pharaoh to command him to let the people go, when at the very time they were sent he had purposed to harden Pharaoh's heart so that he would not hearken to them? Is it "solemn mockery" for God to send men to preach to those who, as he knows, and has known from eternity, will never repent and believe? The gentleman forgets that he is a convert to the doctrine of God's absolute and eternal Foreknowledge; and that these objections have equal force against that doctrine as against Predestination. Let him cast the beam out of his own, eye and then attend to Calvinistic notes.

The gentleman has, at last, timidly ventured to notice the passage in John, vi, 44. He quotes it thus: "No man cometh to me except," etc. It is astonishing how the gentleman's *memory* fails him, when quoting a strong Calvinistic passage; and it is equally surprising that he should always contrive to forget the very words that render them most pointed against his system. The Savior says not merely, "No man cometh," but "No man CAN COME to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him."

But, says the gentleman, the very next words show how he draws, and whom he draws. "They shall all be taught of God; every man then that hath heard and learned of the Father cometh unto me." We are agreed that these words show how the Father draws men to Christ, But what kind of teaching is meant? He understands it to be the external preaching of the Gospel. And, accordingly, all who hear the Gospel are, in his sense of the passage, taught of God. But does not the gentleman perceive the fatal objection to this interpretation? "EVERY MAN that hath heard and learned of the Father cometh to me." *Does EVERY MAN who hears the Gospel come to Christ?* Then all who hear the Gospel are saved! For he that cometh to him he will in no-wise cast out. Into this probable absurdity does his interpretation lead.

The teaching here meant is an "effectual" teaching. "*Every man*" who is taught comes. It is not then the external teaching of the word merely, which many neglect;

but superadded to this the internal teaching of God's Spirit, convincing the man of sin, enlightening the eyes of his understanding and taking the things of Christ and showing them unto him. In a word, it "is the work of God's Spirit, whereby, convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of the truth, and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to us in the Gospel." And this, says the Catechism, is "effectual calling."

Speaking of Catechisms, reminds me that the gentleman said before he sat down, that you would hear what answer I would make to his twenty-six questions! Oh! that treacherous *memory!* Why, I answered all his questions this forenoon, and propounded some fifty or sixty to him, all of which he seems to have totally *forgotten!* The audience will bear witness that I have "said *my* catechism." Paul and myself are now the catechists, and the gentleman the catechumen. But he has *forgotten* his lesson.

The gentleman quotes some blasphemous doggerel, and equally blasphemous prayers, in order to show the absurdity of Paul's doctrine, that Faith is the gift of God, and that it is a proper subject of prayer. How woefully blinded our Savior was who prayed that Peter's faith might not fail; and the apostles who prayed, "Lord increase our faith." How greatly mistaken Luke was in mentioning some "who had believed through grace."

We are told that the Baptists of Kentucky have long since abandoned Calvinism. This is news! The great mass of them are called "Fullerites," because they regard Andrew Fuller as an able expounder of the true Bible doctrine. *And so he is.* Between Calvinism as taught by him, and the system of the Confession of Faith, there is, so far as I have examined, an exact agreement. The small segment of Baptists sometimes *called* Calvinistic, just so far as they differ from Andrew Fuller, differ in like manner from Calvin and the Confession of Faith.

You all remember that the gentleman quoted certain scraps, which *he said* were from the works of eminent Calvinists. I denounced them as forgeries, and he then gave Mr. Raines as authority. I showed that Mr. Raines is no better authority upon a point of this sort than the gentleman himself, and called for volume and page of the works

pretended to be quoted. This he has not pretended to give, but he now discovers that Mr. Raines did not commit the forgery himself, but only borrowed it from the Doctrinal Tracts, and tried to give it currency. I leave it to more profound casuists than I am to determine the relative guilt of him who actually perpetrates a forgery, and him who endeavors to palm, it upon the public. This has been made perfectly manifest, that *a forgery has been committed*, though it seems as difficult to get those concerned to confess the author, as it was to find out who was to blame for eating the forbidden fruit. Adam threw the blame on the woman, the woman on the serpent, and as there were but three engaged in it, the devil, as usual, had to bear the blame of others' sins as well as his own. So the gentleman says it was Mr. Raines, and Mr. Raines says it was the Doctrinal Tracts, and the Doctrinal Tracts has no voice to speak. But the gentleman has *indorsed* the forgeries by quoting them, and thus has rendered himself responsible. Yet when called on, though he has Calvin's Institutes before him, he makes no effort to extricate himself, but, as misery loves company, he drags his brother Raines in with him. Then finding the indignation of the community roused against both, he tries to screen both Raines and himself behind the Doctrinal Tracts. Now, I knew all the while that the citations were there, and I have works in my library which exposed the fraud twenty years ago. The gentleman and his brother Raines then, according to his own confession, fished up a stale calumny, and served it up as a fresh dish, and they now have the satisfaction of being compelled to swallow their own dainty preparation. The way of transgressors is hard.

Verily there is a force and point in the gentleman's remarks in the introduction of his closing speech, reaching much further than he thought when uttering them. "Truth," he says, "is great, and I am nothing." Quite an antagonism exists between himself and truth then! "I should humble myself into the dust rather than that truth should be exposed." That he has got low enough into the dust is true; but even then, with all his efforts against it, the truth has been exposed. The God of truth will not permit it to be obscured. He will assist every faithful effort to "expose" and defend it, that his name may be

glorified therein. Again the gentleman exclaims, "let me be defamed, let my brethren be defamed, but never let holy, pure and heaven-born truth be defamed." So say I. Whenever the gentleman and his brethren place themselves in such an attitude toward the truth, that they or it must suffer, we cannot hesitate a moment. Truth shall arise and shine; they must remain "in the dust." "The truth," says the gentleman, "is all we want for ourselves." I am truly glad to find that they form so correct an estimate of their wants. May they soon be supplied.

It will be time enough for me to give the author of the letter I received on Saturday, when his name is called for. And whenever the gentleman shall tell me who that Calvinistic author is who makes the elect only 1/20th of the human family; who his "best authorities" are for the translation, "Jacob have I respected, but Esau have I slighted;" who the Presbyterian was who told him that the doctrine of the Confession on the subject of Predestination was not believed now; who the Presbyterian minister in Indiana is, who did not know that certain sections were in the Confession; who told him that Hobbes was a Calvinist; and who informed him that Dyer was a trustworthy author, then most cheerfully shall I give him the author of the letter. One thing I will say now however; the character of the writer, for truth and veracity, is not at all endangered in this community by the solemn asseverations of the gentleman, that he held no such conversation.

The gentleman draws a very engaging picture of a minister of Christ; a man who despises low cunning and trickery; whose soul is inspired with noble sentiments; whose deportment and feelings are God-like and heavenly; who is not inflated with self-conceit; who cherishes the kindest feelings toward all; and who would not wound the feelings even of his opponents. I admire the picture. But when the gentleman writes *his own name* beneath it, he must pardon me if I am unable to trace the resemblance. I do not wish unnecessarily to pain or mortify the gentleman. I shall not, then, in this our parting hour, take up his picture critically, feature by feature, and *contrast* it with the intended original. I will simply remind him of his mode of quoting the Bible, the Confession of Faith and

Calvinistic authorities; the attributing to us the sentiments of the infidel Hobbes, called by him "another Calvinist;" his attempts, at second or third hand, to palm off forged quotations to blacken the character of his opponents, and his steady refusal either to produce those quotations in the works referred to, or to retract his charge. These matters, together with his whole style and manner of conducting this controversy, I would remind him of, that I may offer an excuse for not being able to recognize the picture with such an original before me, even when he labeled it with his own name. In any school of art, the artist would be pronounced a mere dauber. As a fancy sketch, it is very fine; but as an intended portrait, it is execrable. He says that our standard authorities justify Mr. Campbell's position, that baptism is the only means of procuring the pardon of sins! May the God of outraged truth forgive him! He surely knows nob what he says.

He has at length, timidly, and with evident misgivings, and a desire to leave room for escape or qualification, ventured to respond to one of my questions respecting free agency. My idea of free agency is the same as that of A. Fuller. "A free agent," says he, "*is an intelligent being, who is at liberty to act according to his choice, without compulsion or restraint,*" The gentleman holds that it is essential to free agency to have full power to do precisely the contrary of what one does in any given case. A being who has not this power is "a mill-wheel." I then asked him, if God was a free agent? for he does good and *cannot* do evil. He answers *nothing*. I have inquired if the devils who are confirmed in sin, and cannot choose holiness, are free agents, or whether their want of power to choose good frees them from guilt? and he responds *nothing*. I inquired if the holy angels, and the spirits of the just made perfect, are not free agents, though confirmed in holiness, with no power to fall? And he answers, that with respect to the righteous in heaven, there will be no desire to disobey. Exactly. *But that is Calvinism*. They have no *desire* to sin; they act according to their desires, and are therefore free. *So with the non-elect on earth*. They "*desire* not the knowledge of God's ways;" they are constantly "*fulfilling the desires* of the flesh and of the mind;" *they are therefore free*. If the non-elect are "mill-wheels,"

because they choose only sin; the saints in glory are "mill-wheels" also, since they choose or "desire" only holiness. I thank the gentleman for this unintentional concession of the truth of Calvinism in this essential feature. The opposite system leads to the conclusion, that unless they have in heaven the power of exciting a desire to disobey, they are not free; and unless they have the power of disobeying, though their desire may be to obey, they are not free. For it teaches that the power of self-determination, without any motives, and the power of contrary choice, in opposition to all motives, are essential to freedom.

The gentleman came much nigher an exhibition of the legitimate results of his doctrine, when he expressed his doubts that "*man would ever get where it will be impossible for him to disobey God.*" Here is the development of the true genius of his system. Men may fall from grace *and glory too. Sin may enter heaven.* Those who have once tasted its pure joys may, for aught the gentleman knows, or for aught that his system teaches, disobey God and perish. The gates of hell may not only prevail against the Church on earth, and Satan pluck the sheep, for whom the good Shepherd laid down his life, out of his and his Father's hand, but *they are not secure even in heaven itself!* Such is the system.

It is my fervent wish and prayer that the gentleman and myself, all our errors abandoned, and all our sins repented of, may be so happy as to meet in heaven above. But I desire not to go to *such* a heaven as *this*. The heaven in which, it is my heart's desire and prayer to God, that we may meet, is an "everlasting habitation," where "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain. And there shall be no more curse; and they shall reign *forever and ever.*" The crowning glory of the whole is that they shall go no more out forever.

I shall not detain, to tell you what I have proved, and what the gentleman has failed to prove; I shall not again recapitulate my answers to the gentleman's twenty arguments, which, simply or collectively, he has kept marching and counter-marching over the stage since the first day of this discussion, galvanizing them into a kind of

ghastly life, as often as slain, which most of them have been thrice and yet again. I shall not rehearse my unanswered arguments against his system, as presented in my last address. The whole subject is before you. It is for you to say where the marks of truth are found. Decide in the fear of God.

Fellow-citizens:—I am proud to say that a more orderly and decorous assembly than you have been during the entire six days of this discussion, never convened on earth. May you all find the truth, and cherish it as a jewel of inestimable price.

Gentlemen Moderators:—Your patient attention, through so lengthy a discussion, deserves my thanks; your ability and impartiality, my admiration.

And now to God, only wise, be glory, through Jesus Christ, forever. Amen.

**THE END.**