

THE  
APOSTACY UNVEILED:

BEING

A DEBATE

BETWEEN

JOHN THOMAS, M.D.,

AND

A PRESBYTERIAN CLERGYMAN,

*THIRTY-FOUR YEARS AGO,*

ON

THE POPULAR DOCTRINES OF IMMORTALITY, HEAVEN, HELL, ELECTION, AND  
KINDRED TOPICS.

ARE THEY SCRIPTURAL?

---

“Now this is the testimony, that God hath given unto US (the true believers) eternal life ; and this life *is in His son* ; he as the Son has this life ; he who has not the Son of God, has not this life.”—(John v. 12.)

“There is *an animal body* ; for thus it is written, the first man Adam was made a *living soul*. And there is a *spiritual body* : for thus it is written, the last Adam was made a vivifying spirit.”—PAUL.

“This mortal body must put on immortality.”—PAUL.

---

1872.

LONDON: GEORGE JOHN STEVENSON, PATERNOSTER ROW.

NICHOLS, SON AND CO., LONG ACRE.

BIRMINGHAM: ISSUED BY THE CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW, WHERE IT MAY BE OBTAINED OF

ROBERT ROBERTS.

## P R E F A C E .

---

THE debate here reproduced was first published in America, in 1838. It was entitled, "A TESTIMONY AGAINST THE APOSTACY; being a report of certain matters set forth in a debate between John S. Watt, a Presbyterian clergyman, and John Thomas, M.D., Editor of the *Advocate*." It was both printed and published by the Dr. himself, at Liberty, Amelia Co., Va., as a stitched pamphlet of 175 pages, of which very few copies are now extant. Dr. Thomas is the reporter of the debate. He drew the report from notes made at the time, prefacing it with correspondence and explanations which, being of purely local interest, both as to time and place, would now be inappropriate. An exception is made in favour of the following sentences:—

"The importance of the subject-matter of this volume, it is thought, is second to no other hitherto presented to the consideration of the citizens of these United States. If to stir up the people to search the Scriptures for themselves; to excite them to a scrutiny of the pretensions of the multitudinous and contradictory gospels of an anti-christian world; if to arouse them to a sense of their own spiritual rights; if to stimulate them to examine, that they may ascertain what the true 'power of God' for remission and eternal life is; if to unfold to them the 'strong delusion' which darkens their understandings, causing them to 'believe a lie;' if to teach them the true doctrine of life, and the way by which they may attain to 'glory, honour, and immortality;' if these things, we say, be useful, important, and desirable—then will this volume meet with the approbation of all 'good and honest hearts' for the endeavour, at least of its Editor, both in debate and by the press to effectuate such inestimable results. Be his fate, however, prosperous or adverse, he will have the satisfaction of which neither man nor fiend can rob him; namely, that of having done his best in contending earnestly before God and men, in the face of friends and foes, for that 'One Faith,' which was delivered to the saints of the primitive Age by the veritable apostles of the Son of God; to whom be ascribed the language of the prophet—

Jehovah God be praised,  
The God of Isra-el,  
Who by His power only  
Doth wondrous things perform !  
His glorious name be praised  
For ever, evermore ;  
May the whole earth His glory  
Pervade from shore to shore !—Amen ! "  
*Psalm lxxii. 18, 19.*


Great changes have taken place since that time; and none greater, as to the matter in hand, than those affecting the Dr. himself. To the grief of a large circle of benefited readers, he has been compelled to lay down his pen at the summons of the common enemy, not, however, before he witnessed his work fruitful over a large field, and his prophetic-political anticipations signally confirmed.

---

The progress he made in divine knowledge during a career of nearly forty years, is illustrated in the works he had published since the debate with Mr. Watt. *Elpis Israel*, in 1849; *Eureka* (his master piece), Vol. I. (1861), Vol. II. (1865), Vol. III. (1866); *Anastasis* (1866), and many minor publications, show a steady advance in the path struck in his earlier investigations. This advance was misinterpreted by some as a change; a close examination shows there was no change, but an amplification of principles accepted, though not discerned in their detail in the beginning.

This debate is 34 years old. It cannot, therefore, be expected that the Dr. here will compare with the Dr. in later productions; yet there is less disparity than might be expected. There is herein more than the promise of the bud; it even reaches past the stage of the blossom and shows the fruit already ripening, and this in a form more suited to the necessities of the class for whose benefit it is now published by his sorrowing executors. The greater simplicity of the language adapts it for the purpose of enlightening the ignorant, even better perhaps than more advanced productions. The enquirer after truth will be aided in his search; yet those who have attained the happy prize will not be uninterested in the glimpse herein afforded of the time when the truth was just beginning to struggle out of the darkness, and matters shaping for their present happy issue. God bless and prosper His word to the further enlargement of the number of such as are waiting for the kingdom of God.

ROBERT ROBERTS.



# THE APOSTACY UNVEILED.

---

THE volume of controversy now submitted to the public proposes to record substantially certain important matters set forth, and defended in a debate between a Mr. John S. Watt and Dr. Thomas, who, at that time, was editor of a periodical called *The Advocate*. The discussion was held in Lunenburg County, Virginia. It commenced on the first day of August, 1837, and continued during five days. It originated in a discourse delivered by Dr. Thomas, at the Tussekiah Meeting House, in that county, upon the subject of this passage of Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews: "If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the polluted, sanctified to the cleansing of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without fault to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"—(ch. ix. 13, 14.) Among the audience, which was large, there was a Presbyterian clergyman, whose name is John S. Watt. This gentleman, after Dr. Thomas had left the county, diligently published his exceptions to the address; which elicited from certain individuals the inquiry—"Why do not some of you learned men answer him?" This provoked a declaration on his part of a willingness to debate. This avowal was communicated to a Mr. Albert Anderson, who immediately sought and effected an interview with Mr. Watt upon the subject.

After somewhat lengthened preliminaries, arrangements were made for the discussion, which duly commenced on August 1, 1837, at "The Fork" Meeting House, Lunenburg, Va.

The Meeting House, though of good dimensions, having been judged too confined for the accommodation of the public, the brethren erected an arbour and stage. The audience was large, and, from the equipages and other concurrent circumstances, quite respectable. The weather during the first three days was favourable; but on the fourth and fifth, rainy. Considerable interest seemed to be excited; and the attention was unexceptionable; the rain, however, cooled the enterprise of many, and correspondingly diminished the bulk of the assembly on the two last days. Yet the house was well filled; and on the Lord's day, being the day after the debate, it was crowded with a most exemplary, patient, and listening multitude.

Arrived on the ground, Dr. Thomas was introduced to "the Reverend" John S. Watt. Having exchanged civilities, they walked aside; when Dr. Thomas observed to Mr. W., that he had come there by invitation to discuss all topics appertaining to the Christian religion as opposed to popular views; that in doing so, he should, no doubt be in his (Mr. Watt's) estimation, severe; but, that he begged him to bear in mind, that his remarks would be against sectarianism, and not personal; that it was impossible that they could be personal, because, until that day, he (Mr. Watt) and Dr. Thomas were perfectly unacquainted; or words to that effect. Mr. Watt acknowledged the distinction, and considered himself equally at liberty to exercise the same freedom with Dr. Thomas' views, without incurring the charge of personality. This was according to the reporter's understanding of the conversation; though Mr. Watt, in the debate, said, that he told Dr. Thomas, that he should consider himself free to impugn his conduct in coming over from England to attack the religion of his (Mr. Watt's) country, or words to that effect. This explanation he gave in consequence of Dr. Thomas objecting to his personalities, as contrary to the agreement made between them in the conversation, the particulars of which he (Dr. T.) stated to the audience.

The moderators having been appointed and the rules read, Mr. Watt stood forward and proposed that the congregation should join with him in prayer upon the occasion. He was preparing to carry into effect the suggestion, when Dr. Thomas arose and said that, of course Mr. Watt was at liberty to do as he pleased as to that matter, and his brethren and friends in the assembly could join him as they judged fit; but that for himself and some others, he would say that they took no part in the act at all.\*

Mr. Watt then offered a short 'prayer.' Having finished, he gave out the following text.—"But though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other doctrine unto you than that which we have preached

\* My reasons for this refusal were, that "the Reverend" gentleman was a man of unhallowed lips. Believing from my heart that the Presbyterians are not Christians, it was impossible that I could regard one of their "Divines" as a hallowed or sanctified person. No act of worship, then, offered through him, could, as I conceive, be agreeable to God: and therefore, to me, it would have been not only useless but impious. Again, I believe, that acceptable worship can emanate only from Christians in their individual and collective capacity; I could not therefore, have conscientiously prayed, or worshipped, which is the same thing, in concert with a congregation so constituted as was that assembly. There were a few Christians present it is true; but they were but as drops in the bucket as compared with the whole; the congregation in the mass was anti-christian. It was made up of religionists of almost every shade, irreligionists of divers classes, some friendly aliens, and so forth. When I viewed this audience, headed by "a clergyman," by the light of the New Testament as in the presence of God, my soul revolted at the invitation to bow before Him, in communion with such an unhallowed crowd. Oh ye patriarchs and prophets—ye holy apostles and saints of the primitive age, were ye to come forth from *sheol*, would ye have fraternized with the corruptors of the truth as with them who worship the Father in spirit and in truth? I believe not, and therefore, I refused. J. T.

unto you, let him be accursed! As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed!—(Gal. i. 8.)

“The Reverend” gentleman commenced by giving his hearers a short sketch of the history of the Baptists in Virginia, and, in effect, divided his exordium into *three* parts; the *first* related to the times before the revolt of the American Colonies from the Mother Country; the *second*, to the times of that political earthquake; and the *third*, to the times since that event. Under the first head he spoke concerning the labours of the Baptists in Virginia. Their success, which was great, excited the ineffectual opposition of their enemies. Thus they became the subjects of persecution, for the purpose of putting an end to what were regarded as their fanatical labours. They were excluded from houses, and proscribed by law from exercising ~~their~~ ministerial functions. At that time, the yoke of Englishmen was upon our necks; they required all to submit to them, but British intolerance failed to put down the despised and persecuted Baptists. The whole power of the government was combined in vain to divert them from their purpose. They were threatened and imprisoned for preaching the gospel; but all was useless. So mightily grew the word, that their enemies soon found it politic to take Gamaliel’s advice—“take heed to yourselves what ye intend to do as touching these men. Refrain, and let them alone; for if this counsel, or this work, be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.” Persecution is the best way to give the persecuted importance in the opinion of the public. Persecute a people if it is desired to give them consequence. This he considered as illustrated in the case of the Baptists. But they did not owe their success simply to persecution. It was to be ascribed chiefly to the power of God working with them. They were a plain people. They read the Bible, and were not too proud to recognize the work of the Holy Spirit. There were no *Millennial Harbinger* and *Advocate*<sup>o</sup> then to disturb their peace. Their success was owing to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, to the oppressiveness of the established order of things, and to the favour they received from the influential of their day. Regeneration by baptism had always been the doctrine of Roman Catholics, and of those who have “a form of godliness, but not the power.” The Baptists had the truth on their side: they honoured the Holy Spirit, and therefore, the Holy Spirit honoured them.

Having concluded his remarks under the first head, he proceeded under the second, to speak of the politics of the Baptists. They were republicans from interest and principle; and their influence was great among the people, from that time till now. *Thirdly*, they had been a

\* The periodicals at that time conducted by Mr. Alexander Campbell and Dr. Thomas.—R.R.

powerful and influential people. There was no reviling of the old Baptist Ministers then ; but it can be done here between the Forks of Meherrin ; yes, and it has been done. But there are few now entitled to the character of a genuine old Baptist. He illustrated this by an anecdote of an "old Baptist woman," and then spoke of the pollution of the beautiful House of the Forks (an old frame building, neither lathed, plastered nor glazed) which in these days had not been polluted by the feet of strangers.

The occasion of Dr. Thomas' visit to these parts will be found in the following extract from the *Apostolic Advocate*, page 41, vol. 3.— "The occasion of my journey will be found in the falling to pieces of the Baptist denomination in Lunenburg, Mecklenburg, Nottoway, Prince Edward and Amelia. Several churches in these counties have renounced the traditions of men, and desire to constitute themselves on the basis of the New Testament. I go to afford them my humble but determined assistance. Hannibal swore eternal enmity to the Romans ; but I, better disposed to my fellow-men, vow no hatred to their persons, though I have declared a mortal, uncompromising strife against their traditions and tottering institutions." Mr. Watt then descanted on the relationship between himself and Dr. Thomas. Dr. Thomas was a foreigner. He had no objection to a good and virtuous man, but no sooner did he put his foot upon the shores of America than he began to revile our religions. He (Mr. W.) was a Presbyterian and could not bear his religion reviled, a system which he had always recognized as a part of the church of Jesus Christ. James Shelburn<sup>9</sup> has ascended up on high. He did not believe that his spirit rests in the cold sepulchre ; and were he here, he would address his flock in the language of the text,— "*though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed !*"— "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed : for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds."—(2 John i. 10, 11). Will it be denied that another gospel has been preached in the Forks of Meherrin ? According to Dr. Thomas, nine hundred and ninety-nine out

---

\* The distant reader may wish to know who this gentleman is. James Shelburn was for many years a preacher of exemplary moral character among the Baptists in Lunenburg and the region round about. There was considerable policy in bringing him up from the 'cold sepulchre' before the audience on that warm day ; for the district of our battlefield has been a Baptist one for many years ; and the particular seat of Mr. James Shelburn's influence. He had been known and esteemed by many present ; to bring him, therefore, up from the dead, or rather down from heaven, against us, it would seem to some, was calculated to excite the prejudice of his friends against the things we held, and to enlist them in behalf of his chivalrous Presbyterian patron. We have since learned that the old gentleman's belief concerning 'the immortality of the soul' and 'the intermediate state' is nearer to our own than our opponents were aware. But James Shelburn answered the occasion and purpose of quoting the text for the first and last time in the sermon.

of one thousand must be re-immersed to be properly baptised. On page 201, vol. 3, he says, "if ours be the genuine labours of preparation, then is the Baptist Denomination part and parcel of the symbolic Babylonish Empire."—Hence the Baptists must preach a gospel different to Dr. Thomas', and therefore, James Shelburn would condemn it as accursed.

Hear his opinion of the religious meetings of our country. "When I first landed in America, and attended their camp meetings and revivals, I thought I had landed on a New World indeed, whose inhabitants professed a religion entirely different from anything with which I was acquainted. At some of their nocturnal orgies in the woods, I could only figure to myself Bedlam broke loose; so frantic were the cries and agonizings of the poor deluded creatures. 'And, mark Sir, for every effect there must be an adequate cause; but, on these occasions there was none. The 'sermons' preached were of the most childish and pettifogging description—*jejeune* in the extreme. No testimony from the word of God submitted; but in lieu thereof the merest old wives' fables. I refer you to an 'elder' James Fife, now in this city, I believe, for a specimen of this preaching. He will wile away an hour in reciting the most lugubrious death-bed tales his imagination can conjure up; and this he calls preaching the gospel. The tone of his voice, his infernal phraseology, his sobbing enunciations, touch, harrow up, and excite the feelings of the unthinking girls, who begin to manifest an ebullition of feeling corresponding to his cadences. The poor blacks, too, begin to sob and wave to and fro, like the billows of the ocean—till at length a hubbub bursts forth to the tune of 'I'm passing over Jordan, will you come along with me,' which, when well sung, is certainly very exciting. All this is called '*preaching with the Spirit*.' This is the crisis: a form is cleared for 'penitents,' who are urged to come forward and kneel down, that 'God's ministers may bear them up in their arms to a throne of grace!' From fifteen to twenty or thirty, may be seen kneeling, sobbing and agonizing. This form is called the 'anxious bench.' I have seen in the West a 'penfold' crowded with men and women promiscuously collected together 'praying,' beating their breasts, shouting and jumping, till at length they have sunk down exhausted, and some fall into convulsions. When they are all tranquillized, which they soon can be by the word of the preacher, some of them profess to have got 'religion' and to have been converted.'" vol. ii. p. 34.—Dr. Thomas can tell us of all the immersed fanatics; and that all will be damned unless immersed into the true faith! In writing of the Baptist preachers, he calls them 'accursed preachers of another, and therefore diabolical gospel.' (*Adv.* p. 197. vol. 2.) The alternative, therefore is between James Shelburn and Dr. Thomas.

Having advanced thus far, Mr. Watt came to the Tussckiah address.



He observed that he should, perhaps, frequently refer to this. His (Dr. Thomas') object was to prove, that, as under the Jewish Dispensation, the blood of animals was necessary to cleanse the polluted from the filth of the flesh, so under the Christian, the blood of Jesus was necessary to cleanse the conscience from dead works. He took two hours to prove what none would deny. The first out-of-the-way thing was that of people not going to heaven before they are raised from the dead; another, that baptism is one of the "things in heaven;" another, that the prayers of the unimmersed were of no more value than those of Mahommedans. Our fathers prayed to be delivered out of the hands of their oppressors; he heard them, and did deliver! He also told us that justification by faith alone was an absurdity.

He began by telling us that man was depraved. He gave an orthodox account of Adam and Eve, and of their primitive holiness, but overlooked the whole part the serpent acted in that transaction. What, Dr. Thomas, is your opinion of his Satanic Majesty? Receiving no reply, Mr. Watt continued, that the first objectionable thing was as to the consequence of the Fall. Dr. Thomas believes that Adam had no soul that could die—that he had no immortal soul! But that the sentence referred to his body.

The thing that originated this debate was Dr. Thomas' idea that man had no soul. He discovered that he was a Materialist, which some denied. He might have been mistaken; he had read an article in the *Advocate* entitled 'no-soul system,' which rendered him yet more doubtful. Dr. Thomas had heard a report that it was believed, that he denied the existence of the soul, and on page 253, vol. III, he says that the report is slanderous and untrue, and that he believes in 'body, soul, and spirit, the whole person.' He had been taunted by his (Dr. Thomas') friends with the question why he did not state his objections to Dr. Thomas' discourse to his face while he was in these parts: this he would now do. He did not know then how willing Dr. Thomas was to admit that he was a Materialist.

Dr. Thomas says, page 219, vol. II: "Man cannot exist without breath or spirit, soul or blood, and body, or an assemblage of organs for the development of functions manifested by the action of air and blood upon them. The *how* these functions are evolved, especially those of the brain, being inscrutable to the ancients, as to a certain extent it is to us, they infused a ghost into the cavernous sinuses of the body, where they kept it a prisoner until liberated by that veritable kidnapper, death! This is truly Pagan, Papistical, and Protestant; a real tradition of the devil. Having thus tenanted the body with a ghost or spirit, they made him president of the corporeal republic: the immortal shade of a mortal substance! Thus enthroned, all mental, moral, spiritual, or intellectual operations were attributed to him;

all other functions to the body." Did you ever think you would hear such language in this enlightened age? Again, on page 246, vol. II, he says 'the brutes have 'souls' as well as men.' You start at this; but reflect. The word soul in Greek is *psychee*, and signifies the animal life. Now, is not animal life common to men and brutes? Certainly; well then, the soul or animal life, which Moses calls the blood, does not 'distinguish man from the brute creation.' Dr. Thomas continues: "you have heard talk of *religion in the soul*? Well, the true meaning is *fanaticism in the blood*. This puts you in possession of the philosophy of the wildfire fanaticism of the day. Do you not know that a man is the most 'religious' when he is most drunk? This is owing to the rapidity of the circulation of the blood. The religion of the blood frenzies the brain and enables the subject to see sights and hear voices, and feel feelings of the most remarkable kind! Reason and Scripture have nothing to do with such religion. To fever the blood is the true secret of getting up a revival!" In a certain Dialogue, he makes Tomaso say: 'As to the immortality of the soul, in the popular sense of that phrase, it is nowhere taught in the Bible.' Mr. Watt did not think it necessary to prove this to his audience who had read the Bible. The immortality of the soul is taught there; and Dr. Thomas knows that he has no right to use this language. The definition of the words of Scripture must be derived from lexicographers. Wherever 'soul' is used, it signifies something separate from the body. This appears from Johnson and Webster. Dr. Thomas says the soul signifies the blood. This is not true: it signifies *the separate and independent spirit*.

He came next to the *reasons* he could adduce to sustain the immortality of the soul. 1.—*Materialism is repugnant to common sense*, in proof of which, he appealed to the acceptance of the word soul among the illiterate, by whom the doctrine of Materialism was rejected. Hear what Mary says: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my *spirit* hath rejoiced in God my saviour." Didn't she believe in the soul? David believed in the soul; for he says: "Why art thou cast down, O, my soul!" Psalm xlii. 5; and Job says "that there is a *spirit* in man." He could prove that Dr. Thomas believes in a soul. He writes concerning the incorruptible seed in the heart; and what can he mean by *heart* but the soul or moral sentiments through the intellect; and what is most astonishing, he says that the *brain* thinks; not the soul, but the brain! 2.—*Materialism is contrary to all true philosophy*. Lord Brougham has proved this; but Dr. Thomas sneers at Lord Brougham. Is it proper that he should do so? How could the preacher answer a sneer? 3.—*Materialism amounts to Atheism*. If Dr. Thomas believes there is a God, he believes in Him, as he says the Old Baptists believe in their gospel, without evidence, if he denies

the 'immortality of the soul.' There cannot be a God if there be not an 'immortal soul.' What have Materialists been through all ages? Look at Dr. Priestley. To be consistent, if Dr. Thomas worshipped a God at all, it ought to be a wooden god—a god that he can see with his eyes, that he can hear with his ears, and handle with his hands; for he recognises nothing which is not material. What Dr. Thomas has asserted in his phrenological sayings, everybody knows to be false. Materialism robs man of his dignity and destroys all moral obligation. And here is Dr. Thomas, come all the way from England to teach us illiterate Americans, and he tells us that some are immortal, some mortal, and some neither one nor the other! He addressed himself to the mothers of his audience; spoke of their beautiful infants, their tender offspring, whom Dr. Thomas had consigned to the damnation of annihilation. They would never see them after they had been laid in the grave, for they were all doomed to that damnation! The heathen, too, have been turned over by this new teacher, not to the damnation of hell, but to the damnation of annihilation! And we poor Episcopalians and Presbyterians and Baptists are all to be damned with this damnation, while he and his followers alone will ascend to that heaven which has been purchased by Jesus Christ!"

DR. THOMAS then came forward and *in effect* said—"Gentlemen and Ladies,—when I was invited to take part in this discussion, it was under the impression that I was to encounter a clergyman of the Presbyterian denomination. I listened very attentively for about two-thirds of my friend's speech, or rather 'sermon,' as he prefers to call it, before I could assure myself that he intended to assume the character which I had been led to suppose he ordinarily sustained—that, I mean, of a Presbyterian 'divine.' Judge of what must have been my surprise when I heard him belaud the Baptists! The panegyric which he has pronounced upon them led me, during its utterance, to conclude that certainly I had been deceived, and that Mr. Watt, instead of being a Presbyterian, must be a Baptist preacher; for thought I to myself, a consistent Presbyterian, and a 'divine' too, could never admit that the Baptists had the truth on their side; for assuredly, if Baptistism be true, Presbyterianism must be false!

But discovering at length that Mr. Watt was indeed a clergyman of the Presbyterian order, and not a Baptist, I began to philosophize upon the probable motive inciting him to such a singular course as he was adopting. I reflected upon the character of the neighbourhood: it is more Baptist in its predilections than otherwise; upon the constitution of the audience, we have the privilege of addressing; it is probably composed of many of the members of Baptist churches, and of the friends of Mr. Shelburn:—it was such ideas as these, that led me to

conclude that Mr. Watt, by panegyrising the Baptists, was striving to throw them off their guard, and to enlist their prejudices against his opponent; so that 'seeing they might not perceive, and hearing they might not understand.'

It would have been a great point gained in his favour, could Mr. W. have succeeded in blinding your eyes against any thing we might have to offer to your inspection in reference to the defect or perversions embraced in the popular versions of the Christian religion. Hence we have been favoured this morning with appeals to prejudice both national, religious, and maternal. But such appeals are beneath the dignity of an intelligent mind, and quite extraneous to the attributes of a defender or an inquirer after the truth. It is only the multitude or the unthinking mass, who would condescend to lend an ear to such an insult upon their understandings. The speaker who now addresses you, my friends, has been opprobriously introduced to your notice on account of the land of his nativity. It is true I am an Englishman; a name, which, when compared with those of the rest of nations, certainly suffers no disparagement by the comparison. I am not ashamed of the name, neither do I glory in it. I claim no merit in being an Englishman, for the simple reason that *I could not help it*. I say that it is a name in which I make no boast; though it is quite possible to do so, without vanity or presumption;—the name in which I glory is the name of Christian. And to sustain this with credit and honour, is the chief object of my aspirations. If merit be due to men because of the national names they bear, certainly those citizens are the most noble and meritorious, who, whether they have been born in Britain, France, or Spain, do voluntarily of their own mind and choice, expatriate themselves from their native homes constitutionally to assume the name and rights of an American citizen. I consider, therefore, if any praise be due to a name, I am entitled to a greater share than my opponent; for I, though born an Englishman, am an American by choice; whereas he is one, because he could not help it! But for myself, I regard not the spot of earth on which a mortal first inhales the vital air; my mind is a foreigner to the national prejudices of the multitude: I regard all men as brethren according to the flesh; but more especially as my fraternal relatives *if they be the exemplary members of the body of Christ*. Other feelings than these cannot be harboured in the Christian's breast; for the kingdom of heaven is a nation of individuals, chosen by a belief of the truth from all the nations of the world. In my estimation there would be no sight more admirable than to see an assembly of French, British, Spanish, and others, all sitting down at one table to show forth the death of Christ, whose name they should have lawfully assumed on the American soil.

The momentous and stirring principles of the Christian's hope bury

all national feuds and prejudices in the oblivion they deserve; and I cannot but conclude, that the man in whose breast such sentiments hold a place, is a stranger both to the spirit of Christ, and to the generous sympathies of an enlightened mind.

Suppose such appeals as you have heard this morning had been responded to by the Jews and Gentiles of the apostolic age, where now would have been the Christian religion? It would have been confined to the few who first professed it, with but a singularly small addition to their sect; or, at most, to the land of Palestine. It is probable, that we should *all* be sitting now in a valley of the shadow of death, our hopes being bounded by the chambers of the dead. The apostles were all Jews; and Paul, the author of our friend's text, a Hebrew of the Hebrews. His Master appointed him to the high office of ambassador from heaven to the nations. He proclaimed to them the manifesto of a Jewish king. Now, my friends, if all our race had been like our opponent, there would have been a universal clamour against 'this new teacher,' who had come all the way from Judea to teach us illiterate Gentiles; and who was reviling our religion, saying that our gods were no gods, and consigning us all, not to the damnation of Tartarus, but to the damnation of an everlasting destruction from the presence of his king! But, my friends, I cannot believe that you will respond to so insensate a cry.

As to his appeal to the Baptist portion of your assembly, what does it amount to? If he is honestly convinced of what he avers, he is certainly egregiously inconsistent, and truant to his own weal, in not becoming a Baptist;—but if he is merely complimenting your prejudices, then indeed he is playing the courtier to your self-esteem; which I should suppose, as intelligent people, would be judged an artifice calculated only to defeat itself.

We come now to our friend's text. It is true, he has taken a text, and a very important one too;—a text, indeed, to which you would do well all to take heed: but, orthodox-like, he has failed to expound it! He has preached *from* his text, truly; but it must be obvious to you all that he has not stuck *to* it. As far as his labours are concerned, we are all as uninformed concerning its import as though the apostle had never penned it! We have heard the text once only in the whole course of the 'sermon;' and that, not by way of exposition, but for the purpose of applying it to a case, which, according to our conception of the matter, was most extraneous; unless it can be shown by our friend that the Apostle had James Shelburn and John Thomas in his eye when he wrote it!

It is to be regretted that Mr. Watt should have preached a whole hour from a text, and yet have left his hearers as much in the dark as to its signification, as if he had never condescended to name or allude

to it. I cannot, therefore, my friends, permit so important an omission to pass unrepaired. Mr. Watt, having failed to preach his sermon from his text, I will endeavour to do it for him. I will then briefly illustrate it, by way of showing how completely it anathematizes the order to which my opponent belongs; and not only so, but by way of introduction to the examination of those things which will probably be brought forward in this debate.

In studying the epistolary writings of the New Testament, there are a few considerations which should never be lost sight of. Among these are the following: Who is the writer? and what facts are there in his history calculated to throw light upon what he has written? To whom does he write, and what circumstances are of note in relation to them? What are the things, or the subject-matter of his epistles? and so forth. The Epistle before us was written by one named Paul to certain persons in Galatia; a province of Roman Asia. Who was this Paul? He says that he was 'an apostle,' or a messenger: From whom? 'Not from men,' he continues, 'neither (constituted such) by man; but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.' How do we in this remote age, know that he avers the truth? Some of us believe that whatever the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain, is faithfully and truly recorded; upon the testimony of these, then we believe he writes the truth. We depend not upon that portion of the word which Paul himself wrote, but on the collateral testimony of his contemporaries, among whom were apostles and evangelists; who, had he been an impostor, would not have admitted him to share with them in the apostleship and evangelical office. Peter acknowledges the genuineness of his character, and Luke records the wonderful works which God performed by his hand. Allow me here to press upon your attention, that none have any right to the character of apostles, or of 'successors of apostles,' or of persons "called and sent of God," unless they can produce in support of their pretensions "the signs of Apostles." This is the criterion of the genuineness or counterfeiture of those "who say they are apostles, but do lie." To this criterion, Jesus and Paul appealed for the truth of their pretensions; and the appeal was considered, as it ought to be, satisfactory by thousands of mankind. "We know," says Nicodemus, "that you are a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles which you do unless God be with him." When therefore, my friends, any gentleman presents himself to your notice "as a teacher called and sent of God," I counsel you not to receive him except he produces before you such credentials as such a high functionary is authorized and qualified to do. These few remarks we submit to the consideration of our clerical friend.

But, under this head, is there nothing else worthy of recollection in the life of the apostle to the Gentiles? Yes, there is; it is that of

his *conviction* and *conversion*. Of what was he convinced? Of the great truth that Jesus was the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world, according to the proclamation of John the Baptist, which was notorious among all the Jews. How was he convinced of the truth of this? By seeing Jesus on his road to Damascus. This ocular demonstration was overwhelming proof to the persecuting and Nazarene-reviling Saul, that the apostles were right in maintaining that the crucified Jesus had been raised by the power of God from the dead. Thus convinced, when and how was he *converted*? Arrived at Damascus, he put up at the house of one Judas. He remained there fasting for three days. Upon the third, Jesus sent a disciple; not a clergyman, but a layman named Ananias to the man of Tarsus. "Brother Saul," said he, "look up! The God of our fathers has chosen you to know His will, and to see that righteous person, and to hear a voice from his mouth; because you shall be his witness to all men, of those things which you have seen and heard.—And now, why do you delay? Arise and *be baptised, and wash away your sins, invoking his name.*"—(Acts xxii. 14). Such was the conversion of Paul. You perceive from this the subject-matter of his belief, and what he did to obtain the remission of sins: he believed the truth, *and obeyed it*; and, as you will find by reading the Scriptures, he went every where proclaiming it. He was an honest man. He practised and taught the things he believed and had himself obeyed. He did not pretend to be a Pagan while he hated their superstitions, and was doing all in his power to destroy it. He was straightforward and above board; and were he now in the midst of this assembly, and called upon to address it, he would not assume the guise of a Baptist if he were really a Presbyterian divine!

Who were these Galatians? They were inhabitants of Aisa Minor, among whom the apostles laboured for some time, discipling and teaching. In chapter iv. he tells that he declared the gospel to them; and that they received him as a messenger from God; and not only so, but that they obeyed the gospel: for Paul reminds them that they were all the sons of God through the faith; and that they had put on Christ by being baptised into him. These Galatians, then were certain Asiatics who had become the sons of God, by believing and obeying the gospel Paul preached; hence they were the 'brethren' of the apostle, by believing and obeying the same thing.

From these circumstances connected with the apostle and these Christians of Galatia, we have arrived at a knowledge of the things they believed and obeyed, or practised. Together, they made up the faith and the obedience of faith; or '*the gospel declared*' and '*the gospel received*' by them. Now concerning this gospel, which, in his epistle to the Ephesians, Paul terms the "ONE FAITH," he is exceedingly jealous.

He says, in his epistle to the Romans, that it is "THE POWER OF GOD FOR SALVATION," and that it is the rule by which "God will judge the hidden things of men;" and in the second chapter of the epistle before us, he says "that man is not justified by works of law (that is the Mosaic Law,) but ONLY through the faith (or gospel) of Jesus Christ." Now, if this be so, you cannot wonder at his sensitiveness when he learned that some of the Judaizing teachers, the clergymen of his day, had crept in among the Galatians and were "perverting the gospel of Christ," and so turning it into "another gospel,"—a sort of Presbyterianism, perhaps, which however, he declared most solemnly "is not another," that is, it is spurious. Now concerning these "*other gospels*" as substitutes for THE GOSPEL which he preached, and which the Galatians had believed and obeyed, and on account of which they had received the Spirit, he writes pronouncing the anathema in my friend's text, namely—"If even we, or an angel from heaven declare a gospel to you, different from what we have declared to you, let *him* be accursed." He emphasizes the curse upon the clergymen, and makes assurance doubly sure by telling these Galatians that the gospel he declared to them was the gospel *they had received*; therefore he imprecates again, and says, "As we said before, so now I say again, if any one declare a gospel to you different from what you have received, let him be accursed."

Now, the question crowds upon our attention, "Is the gospel according to Presbyterianism the gospel preached by Paul to the Galatians and others?" The identity between those notorious proclamations will depend upon the affirmative of another inquiry—are things which are different, equal to the same? If they are, then the two gospels are in truth one; but, if things different cannot be equal to the same, then the gospel according to John Calvin and John Knox, in other words Presbyterianism, is not the gospel Paul declared, and the Galatians received; and therefore, all and each of those who preach and teach it, are under the awful anathema of God's ambassador to the Gentiles! Do we avoid the question in its full extent? No; we affirm and truly believe, upon the strength of our friend's text, that there is no exception to this anathema. Be the preacher Presbyterian, Methodist, Episcopalian, Baptist, Campbellite, or whatever else you please to call him, if he is the teacher or preacher of any other than the ANCIENT APOSTOLIC GOSPEL, he is obnoxious to the curse.

But Presbyterianism, what is it? It is an ecclesiastical system of about 300 years old. Save the *presbyteries* or elderships of the Churches of Christ (in regard to which I am free to confess myself a believer), there is in the New Testament no allusion to Presbyterianism, except as a part of the great apostacy that was to overspread the nations. Even the presbyteries of Presbyterianism resemble those of the Churches of Christ only in name. It is an unscriptural system, because its type is



not to be found in the sacred Word. The Presbyterianism of the sixteenth century was Geneva Popery Calvinized; that of the seventeenth century was this Calvinistic Divinity which had previously been nationalized in Scotland, and authorized in England to oblige the Scotch; who upon condition of its establishment in the room of Episcopacy, agreed to supply the Long Parliament with troops to put down the unfortunate Charles the First. In this precious volume, my friend called "The Confession of Faith," we have the system in theory: if you want to become acquainted with it in practice, you must read the history of this ambitious system at home and abroad. We have often heard of that stale saying of Chillingworth, that "the Bible, the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants"—if this libel upon truth were so, what need would there be for such symbols as this. The Confession of Faith is far more essential to Presbyterian Protestantism than the Bible: take this away, but leave the Confession, and Presbyterianism may yet exist, in them at least; but destroy the Confession, and preserve the Bible, and Presbyterianism must ultimately perish for ever. Did you ever hear the great men of that Church quarrel and divide concerning the commands of God? But, at this time, they are combating about their Confession of Faith! The mere traditions of men, made orthodox in England by the Act of an Erastian Parliament! A parliament composed of men who regarded the government and orders of the church as things undetermined by God, and therefore matters of indifference! Presbyterianism is an anti-scriptural system. It is founded on a violation of the plain words of Christ, who said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and "he that takes the sword shall perish by the sword." His kingdom was never stained by the blood of his enemies shed by the hands of its citizens; but Presbyterianism is founded and baptized in human gore!

We have this morning been informed that the Baptists are a simple people, that they read the Scriptures, that they had the truth, that they honoured the Holy Spirit and therefore the Holy Spirit honoured them. Now if this be true, what must the Presbyterians be? The Baptists hold with adult immersion; and they used to consider in the times alluded to, that infant sprinkling was a dogma of Antichrist. We have heard our friend this morning, and himself being judge, say the Baptists are right in their sentence concerning this Presbyterian practice; for says Mr. Watt "they have the truth on their side!"

But why all this about the Baptists? Simply I conceive for the sake of instituting an invidious comparison between them and us. If they are simple, we must be compound; if they read the Scriptures, it is insinuated we do not; if they have the truth, we have error; if they honour the Holy Spirit, we do not; therefore the Holy Spirit has honoured them, while he is supposed to have heaped contumely upon

us, as we and the Baptists are not one people; if they are all that, we must be all this. But we plead 'Not guilty' to these crinations. We do read the Scriptures; they are our delight, and to them we make our appeal in all things, but we take exception to the judgment. We do not believe that a Presbyterian divine is competent to determine (if his theory in the confession be believed by him, which as things are is difficult to say) whether we have the truth or not; and that we are a straightforward and openfaced class of people, let those determine who know us best.

And as to the Baptists honouring the Holy Spirit, if I had their history at hand, I should be at no loss to show that in this country, at least, they had burlesqued, instead of honoured Him, by the most tumultuous fanaticism. As to the work of the Holy Spirit, we believe it to its fullest extent. It is a work which has been elaborated on a most magnificent scale. All nature around is a part of His stupendous work. By Him was a place appointed for the sun, the moon, and the stars; by Him were the heavens constituted, and peopled by the hosts thereof; by Him, man lives and enjoys the life that is; to Him, is he indebted for all: for it is by God, who is Spirit, that we are saved with a temporal and an eternal salvation.

The judgment, however, of Presbyterian clergymen upon this matter is of very passing consideration. We must again except to their competency to teach the religion of Jesus Christ. They are not agreed among themselves. Their rabbis, who rule the church, instead of all teaching the same thing, are split into divers factions, and for want of matters of sterner import to engage their minds, are killing time by slaying the orthodox standing of their rivals. I hold a paper in my hand called *The Presbyterian*. It is the organ of a party in the Presbyterian republic, which is construing The Confession of Faith according to its most obvious signification. This faction is termed the Old School, and claims to be orthodox; its rival is termed the New School, and though it also pretends to orthodoxy, the "true blues" regard them as heterodox. A rabbi of the new school thus sums up the dogmas of the old; which the *Presbyterian* acknowledges "substantially to convey the true doctrine on this subject:"—1. That man has no ability of any kind to obey God's commands or to do his duty. 2. That ability to comply with God's commands is not necessary to constitute obligation. 3. That God may justly require of man the performance of what he has no ability in his fallen state to perform, and may justly punish him for not performing it. 4. That all the powers of man for the performance of duty have been destroyed by the fall. "It is most true," says the *Presbyterian*, "that man has no *independent* ability of any kind to obey God's commands; it is also true that his obligation to obedience is not in the slightest degree impaired by the want of this

ability; it is furthermore true that God may rigidly exact the obedience, which man, by his fall, has lost his ability to render; and finally, it is true, that the powers of man have been so affected by the fall, that he cannot himself, spiritually and acceptably perform his duty. They who deny these positions, have but slender pretensions to Calvinistic orthodoxy, &c." Such is a specimen of the monstrous absurdity of orthodox Presbyterianism! I know not to which school my opponent belongs; nor does it matter in an examination of his religion; for Presbyterianism, whether new or old, is Presbyterianism still; though indeed the editor of this paper says, "If New Schoolism, the real object of which is revolution, should prevail, Presbyterianism would soon exist only in name." If he is of the Old School, then his religion is orthodox Calvinism of a genuine Servetus-burning spirit; for we conceive that none but such a spirit could interpret God's dealing with men so barbarously as set forth in the four preceding propositions; but if he avows his allegiance to the New School, then he is a revolutionist and a heretic, the general assembly of the Presbyterian church being his judge. Now, is it not obvious, that Mr. Watt has enough to do at home, without presenting himself to your notice as a corrector of my alleged heresies? "Physician! heal the disease which is preying upon the vitals of your own church before you pretend to cure others," is the prescription best suited to his unfortunate condition.

Now you will observe the tendency of these Presbyterian dogmata. If man has no ability to obey God's commands, it is necessary that God should operate upon him in some physical manner by His Holy Spirit, in order to enable him to believe; and if this be received, the machine can work comfortably enough. For God commands men to obey Him; but they cannot unless He enables them; it is therefore, not man's fault if he continues in disobedience; for he is willing, but unable to do his duty. Hence God is made responsible for the disobedience of every one who does not obey Him. Again, some men want to be saved; the clergy are also anxious that they should be saved, because it will increase their flocks and so enlarge the fleece; they therefore besiege heaven with their prayers: but some of these are not saved—why? Because God has not given them His Holy Spirit to enable them to obey, and therefore, it is God's fault, and not the clergy's, that sinners are not converted. This is the gospel according to Presbyterianism. Orthodox it may be in that church, but it is "another gospel" to that Paul preached, and therefore, spurious. If Presbyterian divines have nothing better or more rational than this to present to the people, the less they talk about the work of the Holy Spirit, or of Spirit-honouring Baptists, the better for their credit with the intelligent; for certainly a greater libel upon the character of God cannot be perpetrated than to maintain *in effect* that He is the author of sin. Sure we are, from the

fruits of Presbyterianism, that the Holy Spirit had never anything to do with such an unholy church, nor do we believe that he ever called or sent, or constituted Presbyterian "divines" as the expounders of his revelation to men. We except, therefore, to their judgment in the case, and unhesitatingly reject their views of the work of the Holy Spirit as unworthy of reception.

But, my friends, as I said before, so now I reiterate, that though I reject the *traditions of men* concerning the work of the Holy Spirit, yet I do most heartily believe in the Scripture account thereof. And here permit me to observe that you should always make a distinction between things that differ—between the *opinions* of a thing, and *the thing* itself. The work of the Holy Spirit is the thing; Presbyterian and popular views of this work are the opinions of the thing. Now the self-complacent critics of orthodox communities anathematize us, because we do not agree with them in their opinions of this work; and denounce us blasphemers of the Spirit; thus making our rejection of their dogmata tantamount to a rejection of the Holy One Himself. But this is not to be wondered at, for it has been the spirit of Antichrist through all ages; and it was this spirit of proscription which conferred the crown of martyrdom upon the victim of Geneva tyranny.

For myself, I believe that the Holy Spirit is the only authoritative, infallible, efficient, and sufficient teacher of the Christian religion, in all its parts. If I be asked what is the manner in which he teaches this religion, I reply in the same way that all teachers convey instruction to their pupils; *by words, either spoken or written*. Hence, it is *by the sacred Scriptures that he convinces* men of sin, righteousness, and judgment to come in these times, and indeed, in all the times subsequent to the apostolic age. God is simple in all His plans. He appears never to use intricate means, when the end to be effected can be produced by simple ones. *Simplicity* is the characteristic of all that he performs. He rules the heavens, he regulates the seasons, and he saves men upon few, but powerful principles. If one means is able to make man wise, we need not expect to find any other institution than that one to effect the same end. Now Paul, the author of my friend's text, says that the *sacred Scriptures are able to make us wise to salvation, by the faith* (or gospel) *which is through Christ Jesus*. What more do we want than wisdom in relation to this matter? If the sacred Scriptures are able to make us wise, we need no other instrumentality. The Holy Spirit *by the word*, without infusing a single idea into it more than it actually and ordinarily contains, and without any collateral influence, teaches us all wisdom and knowledge that is necessary. It instructs man concerning his origin, his constitution, his sinful state, and how he may, though mortal, *absolutely and unqualifiedly mortal*, yet attain to life and

incorruptibility; it informs him concerning the attributes of God, the creation, and the destiny of the earth and the race by which it is inhabited. Why, then, my friends, can we not be content with the means within the grasp of every one who owns the volume of inspiration? If the ecclesiastical world were content to learn the truth from "the Bible alone," and it honestly desired to obey the Messiah, there would soon be an end to Presbyterian and every other ism, by which "Christendom" as it is called, or "anti-Christendom," as it should be termed, has been for ages desolated. But the world loves not the truth; because therefore, they have "not embraced the *love* of the truth that they might be saved, God has sent them strong delusion that they might believe a lie; that all might be condemned who have not obeyed the truth." The sacred Scriptures are not a dead letter, as the clergy teach you; they are "living and powerful, and sharper than a two-edged sword:" this is Paul's testimony, and ought therefore to be received as true by all believers.

---

Mr. WATT then came forward. He observed that his friend had warned him that an effort would be made to turn the debate into a personal attack. He was drawn into this discussion rather against his will, and, as he thought, without provoking it. He then stated the circumstances which originated it—he had heard Dr. Thomas advance some of his strange notions in a sermon, and on speaking of them to some gentlemen, was asked "why don't some of you learned men answer him?" He intimated that he was not afraid to do so. Being desirous of ascertaining something more of his belief, he made inquiry concerning it of one of Dr. Thomas's friends, and was advised to call upon Mr. Anderson, a preacher of the same faith. He sent a message to Mr. Anderson to the purpose that he would be pleased to have some conversation with him, which Mr. Anderson, interpreted as a challenge to engage in debate, and wrote a note saying that he had received his challenge, and desired a conference to settle the preliminaries. Dr. Thomas had also published an advertisement in his paper, in which he says that "the challenge had been given by the reverend gentleman." Now this was not the case. He had expressed his *willingness*, but did not give a challenge. Dr. Thomas ought to have known that he did not give the challenge; it was Mr. Anderson who gave it in the note which he had sent to him, and which he understood to be an invitation to debate. In reply to this note he had answered, that he intended no such thing as a challenge to debate, but he was willing to have some conversation with him. He would read a copy of the letter he had sent to Mr. A.—(This will be found at the end of the debate, to which we refer the reader). In consequence

of this he had an interview with Mr. Anderson at Mr. Arvin's, and in the conversation between them he stated his willingness to preach a sermon in reply to the one he had heard from Dr. Thomas, and Mr. Anderson could defend it if he pleased. But Mr. A. did not fall in with this proposal, alleging as a reason that he disagreed with Dr. Thomas in some of his opinions, but that Dr. Thomas would defend his own opinions. It was therefore agreed that he might do so, and thus the debate commenced. He was sorry he was put forth as the challenger, as he did not intend to challenge; as he had said in his reply to Mr. Anderson, that "he did not feel completely at liberty to challenge anyone to a public debate;" and that "as to the title of reverend," which Dr. Thomas had printed in his advertisement in quotation, he would say, that they (his order) did not claim the title of reverend; but, if people choose to give it to them as a mark of respect, he did not know that any harm was done.

He was sorry to see the course which Dr. Thomas had pursued. Dr. Thomas had dwelt much upon what he said about his being an Englishman; but he did not appeal to natural prejudices *only* in favour of the Christian religion. Dr. Thomas was a foreigner, and he had come here to our country, and he still thought he had not spoken as respectfully of the ministers of the gospel of America as he ought to have done. He thanked Dr. Thomas for preaching from his text; he had told them a great deal about the divisions in the Presbyterian Church, but he did not think they had anything to do with the differences in that Church. He thought it would be more interesting to know something about the immortal soul! That's what they wanted to know. Had man a soul that could never die? that was the question. Did Dr. Thomas believe that? The immortal soul, Dr. Thomas, is the thing we want you, sir, to tell us about! It was not about the misunderstandings among the Presbyterians, who, though they might differ, were not in the custom of unchristianising one another. Abram and Lot differed, and their servants strove together, but they agreed to differ, and separated by consent. So it was with Presbyterians, who, he denied, had any object to effect in the State. They were republicans, and had shed their blood on the side of liberty. It was not doctrine, but slavery, that was the true cause of separation between Presbyterians of the North and South. Presbyterians were well-disposed to all denominations of Christians. Had they not invited all of every name to eat with them at the Lord's table? They were ready to receive all who would unite with them, and he would ask, *was it any new thing for Presbyterians to be liberal?* This was undeniable, and also true that Presbyterians had, from time immemorial, stood upon the foundation of Jesus Christ.

Among other things Dr. Thomas had found out a new meaning

for Baptism. He says, it means to die with the dying of God. And that unless men are baptised into the true faith, they will all be damned. Did the moderators think that this debate would ultimate in any good? He did not. He was prepared to prove that the immortality of the soul was taught in the Scriptures. He was not accustomed to address so large an assembly as that before him; and when unanimated, he could not speak at all. He did not pretend to be a very great man, though he had been charged with presumption in venturing to encounter the great Dr. Thomas. One of his followers had told him before the debate began, "to stand up to the rack, fodder or no fodder," and another had said, he did not know whether he had a soul or not.\* What was the use of religion without an immortal soul? If there was no immortal soul, there was no God; he was willing, therefore, to take Dr. Thomas on the ground of the tendency of his opinions to Atheism.

Dr. Thomas says that Eternal Life is conditional; and that its conditionality is the doctrine of Scripture. Eternal Life is a phrase used to signify all that God has to bestow in the world to come; but Dr. Thomas makes it refer to nothing but the perpetuation of existence for ever. What else does it signify but every thing God has to bestow, where it says—"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die?" It denotes that, as God is a God of truth, the soul must die: it must be deprived of all happiness; though the body should not die; for Adam's body did not die on that day when he eat of the fruit; therefore it must have been his soul.

DR. THOMAS: My opponent has told us of a certain warning which he received from his friends. In reply, I would beg leave to say, that in the remarks made by me, I had no intention whatever of attacking him in any other way than as a member of an order of men, who assume to themselves the attributes of ambassadors of Jesus Christ. If he, in common with his order, claim such high prerogatives, he must expect to have his pretensions canvassed by that public to whom he professes to be sent of God. As to personal attack, he is the last man that ought to complain, after the vituperation of which he has made me the subject as an Englishman and a foreigner, who has come over here to revile the religions of the country. But, my friends, how puerile is the clamour he has raised against my revilings, as he is pleased to term them. He would insinuate a marked insult on my part to Americans, because I speak of their religions according to my convictions; and why does he make this insinuation? I will tell you; in order that he may excite your prejudices as Americans against me. But, my friends, suppose it be granted for

\* This individual said, he was not prepared to say whether it was immortal or not.

argument's sake, that I do revile them, are they foreigners only who are guilty of this offence? Are there not thousands in this country, all native-born, who do the same thing? Do not Americans revile Americans in this particular? It is of Americans, and not of Englishmen, that he ought to complain in this respect, for my countrymen are the few; it is the native citizens of these States, who are the many in the attack and rejection of the religions of this country as mere modifications of the Great Apostacy. But, my friends, we deny the charge of reviling. We do not consider that to contend earnestly for the faith as it is written in the Sacred Word, and to speak of all *perversions of the faith* as they are spoken of on the pages of history and revelation, is reviling. Surely it is not reviling to speak the truth in defence of truth and in subversion of everything which opposes it. Michael did not bring any reviling accusation against the devil, neither do we against our opponents. But how absurd is it to charge me with reviling the religions of America as specially belonging to the soil! If I oppose the ecclesiastical system of this country, in doing so, I equally oppose those of my native island. What is Presbyterianism here, but the religion of Scotland Transatlanticized? Or Episcopalianism, but the religion of England and Ireland imported hither? In short the ecclesiastical system of America is neither more nor less than an epitome of that of Europe. It is *sectarianism sanctioned by law*. But furthermore, it is not true that I came over from England to teach you illiterate Americans, as my friend says. When I left England, I belonged to no church. I had been sprinkled in infancy; at least so my parents tell me, and I have no reason to doubt their word; but as far as I was concerned, who, in the affair of baptism, ought certainly to have been consulted first (at least common sense tells me so, though orthodoxy denies it), I know nothing about it and could by no means help it. But I say I was not a sectarian, for of sectarianism I washed my hands, and left it behind in England. When, therefore, I landed on these shores, I neither professed nor taught the Christian religion. It was in America that I became a Christian. It was by a native born American that my attention was first directed to the truth. It was he who was the instrument in enlightening me, and gratitude demands that in return I should labour to enlighten you. I conclude, therefore, that the object of my emigration from England was not "to teach you illiterate Americans," but even if it was, I ought on that account rather to be the subject of my opponent's praise than censure, for it would have been emigrating in the true spirit of missionary enterprise; and, I am persuaded, if an American were to sail for England with a like intention, he would be received courteously and without insult.

I make no complaint of Mr. Watt's personalities. He is at liberty, as far as I am concerned, to declaim as much as he pleases upon my



nativity and so forth. You will, I am persuaded, be able to discriminate between declamation and argument. I have given him full license to be as severe as he chooses, and as I told him before the debate began, I should not spare what I considered mere versions of the religion of Christ, or words to that effect. I shall only add in addition to what I have already submitted to you in relation to prejudice based upon the nativity of individuals, and the nations to which they may have belonged, that the bad feeling subsisting on that account, is for the most part to be attributed to the governments of the nations, rather than to the people themselves. In relation to God and the best interests of mankind, human government, though necessary as society is now constituted, is in truth a nuisance. It is God alone whose *right it is* to rule over men, and if men would acknowledge the right and agree to obey Him, such governments as now exist would be superfluous.

One would suppose from the contemptuous manner in which my opponent speaks of what he is pleased to term "baptismal regeneration," that there was no such thing in the confession of faith, which may very properly be styled the Presbyterian Bible. Regeneration by baptism, he assures us, "has always been the doctrine of those who have the form of godliness, but not the power." If so, then we must conclude that Presbyterianism is a formal and powerless system, as far as godliness is concerned. Let us hear what the Confession saith in chapt. xxviii: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a *sign and seal* of the covenant of grace; of his ingrafting into Christ, *of regeneration*, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, &c." Here then, the Westminster Assembly of Presbyterian Divines declares that baptismal regeneration is a part of Ecclesiastical Orthodoxy; for they tell us that the mark of regeneration is baptism; in other words, that baptism is a sign and seal of regeneration, and to prove it they quote Titus iii. 5: "He saved us by the washing of regeneration (baptism), and renewing of the Holy Ghost," and to demonstrate that it is also a sign and seal of remission of sins, they cite Acts ii. 38, a passage which some term Campbellism. But what is this sign and seal of Presbyterian regeneration? Why the Confession tells us that "the outward element is water;" that it is necessary to the ordinance that it should be administered "by a minister of the gospel, lawfully called thereunto;" that the water "is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling;" and the subject may be either a professor or "the infant of one or both believing parents." So that, according to Presbyterianism, there is such an anomaly in the Christian religion as a baptismally-regenerated infant. *Infant regeneration,*

then, is a dogma of Presbyterianism! A regenerated infant implies that there are such things as unregenerate infants. The former the worldly-wise men of Westminster term "elect infants." The latter are, therefore, non-elect, and by their master, Calvin, are said to "bring their damnation with them from their mother's womb." Now, what does the Confession mean by damnation? It means the punishment of sin. But have infants sinned? "Yes," say the divines, "they have:" and this is their speculation. "Our first parents being seduced by the subtlety of Satan, sinned in eating of the forbidden fruit . . . By this sin they became wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to *all* their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation." ". . . Every sin, both original (the imputed sin) and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God and contrary thereunto, doth, in its own nature, bring guilt upon the sinner (infant or adult), whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all the miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternal." Chap. vi.: Hence the damnation of the non-elect, or unregenerate infants, consists of "death with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternal." And to this agrees the doctrine of the founder of Presbyterianism, who says, "And so even infants bring their damnation with them from their mothers' wombs; for although they have not yet produced the fruits of their iniquity, they have the seed of it enclosed within them. Nay their whole nature is as it were a seed of sin; so that it cannot be otherwise than odious and abominable to God." *Calvin's Institutes*, lib. iv. c. 15, sec. 10. Again he says, "Infants, before being born to the light, are liable to eternal death." And again Piscator says, "Reprobates are absolutely ordained to this two-fold end; to undergo everlasting punishment, and *necessarily* to sin, and therefore, to sin that they might be justly punished."

According to this doctrine then, all infants are born into the world not only unregenerate, but "liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell for ever"—(*Shorter Cat. Ans. to Quest. 19*); because they are human, and therefore "odious and abominable to God." This is the doctrine of the religion of Messrs. Calvin and Knox, established in Scotland as the national faith, and temporarily enacted as a part of the ecclesiastical system of England by the representatives of the people.

But how does the confession of faith propose to save these poor innocents from "the pains of hell for ever?" By regenerating them. And how does it regenerate them? Hear it: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit. So also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being

outwardly called by the ministry of the word."—(x. 3.) And what is the sign and seal of this? Baptism, says the Confession. But if they should not be sprinkled, what then? Oh nothing! They would, if elect, only die without the sign and seal; for says the Confession, "although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it."—(xxviii. 5.) Hence, then, the elect may be saved out of the church, to assert which, it teaches us, is very pernicious, and to be detested. If then, the elect will be saved, do what they may, what use is there of religion at all? Reason says none, but orthodoxy maintains the contrary; for, if there were no "outward ordinances," as it terms the institutions of religion, there would be no need of priests, clergymen, or divines, which would be very deplorable, for then "Othello's occupation would be gone!"

But what becomes of the non-elect infants, who, according to John Calvin, the great Presbyterian authority, "bring their damnation with them into the world from their mothers' wombs?" The Confession says that "others not elected cannot be saved." What then? Why, when they die, they become the subjects of the pains of hell for ever!!

Now, my friends, read this orthodox Confession of Faith for yourselves. It is acknowledged at this day as "the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." It openly publishes to the world a baptismal regeneration, infant regeneration, infantile election, infantile reprobation, and the damnation of infants to the pains of hell for ever. According to my opponent, therefore, his church is a formal but powerless system of godliness.

I would now address myself to the maternal portion of my audience. An appeal has been made to your maternalism by my clerical friend. I also have to make my appeal, not to passion, however, but to reason. He has talked to you about your "beautiful infants," and so forth; but why did he not tell you that his church had consigned some of them to the pains of hell for ever? No, this would not have answered his purpose; to have told you this, would have been to fix the stigma of an execrable barbarity upon his own ecclesiastical system. His aim was to rouse your maternal feelings and to direct the current of their bitterness against me. You have heard the doctrine of his church; and I am sure you must have been horror-struck at the detail. In my judgment, none but the ferocious and dark spirit of a man, who could burn his opponent at the stake for a difference of opinion, could have originated such a fiendish dogmata. Your desire is, that your infants should be happy, and that you should meet them in heaven. This is very well, and natural enough. But you do not reflect that infants are unconscious of happiness? We have all been infants once;

but do any of us remember the pleasurable emotions of our infantile age? What intellectual enjoyments we had then? None! If conscious of anything, it was the present and transient consciousness of animal appetite. When hungry we cried; when satisfied we slept and were at ease. To have died then, would have been an end to us of hunger, thirst, and pain. We should have been at rest; and if happiness consist in the absence of uneasy sensations, we should have been perfectly happy. And you wish, likewise, to meet them in heaven! Well, if for argument's sake, we grant that they go to heaven as soon as they die, it depends upon yourselves and not upon my views or anybody else's, that your desires be fulfilled; for, unless you believe and obey the gospel, you will never meet them there. When your infants die, then, my friends, weep not for them, but for yourselves. For, whether they go to heaven or not, will never add to nor diminish their enjoyments, for no one can enjoy—infants or adults,—more than they have faculties to appreciate. To add to their faculties after death would be to create new and different beings, unconscious of everything antecedent to observation; so that when you meet, if ever you did, you would neither of you know the other, and therefore, would derive no gratification from such a source.

My opponent swelled greatly when he sounded in your ears that I had consigned your infants to what he calls the Damnation of Annihilation. He affected to be greatly shocked at the idea contained in the full-mouthed expression. How can we believe that his sympathy with your maternalism was anything but affected, while his own church subjects all non-elect, or reprobated infants, to the pains of hell for ever? You can patronize religions and teachers of religions, my friends, who can hold and propagate in their Confessions, such monstrous absurdities and barbarisms as these; but you are up in arms against the man who ventures to tell you what he believes the Scriptures teach in opposition to these traditions! How is this? It is owing to a radical defect in the nature of man, which induces him almost universally to prefer the darkness of error to the splendour and brilliancy of the truth. Dismiss, then, from your minds all prejudices which may have been excited in them by the phrase of my opponent. His creed represents the Deity as hating the innocent works of His own hands; mine, exhibits Him as acting in conformity to the purest sentiments of philanthropy, but without doing violence to His own appointments. His, sets Him forth as a being, vengeful, passionate, inconstant, and unjust; mine, as a God of Love, who takes no pleasure in the death of a sinner, much less in the torture of innocents; his, consigns non-elect infants to eternal life in torment; whereas mine teaches me that infants are born intellectually and morally unconscious. They live equally unconscious for a time, and if they die in infancy, they die

unconscious of dissolution, and totally unconscious they remain. The question as to infants, when stripped of the speculations of priests, is simply one of mortality or immortality, and not of salvation or damnation to hell.

But why do the clergy make so much ado about infants? I will tell you. They know well the sympathy existing between mothers and infants; to persuade the ladies that their infants were liable to the pains of hell for ever, was a sure way to get them to put their offspring under priestly tutelage; they sprinkle them as a sign that they are regenerated, and therefore elect; this satisfies the mother, and she blesses the holy man. Having thus secured the ladies, by them they control the men; next comes the purse and then the sword, by which they rule the world. This order of things, however, is now considerably broken up; never we trust to be re-established."

MR. WATT then rose, and observed, that he did not come there to make Presbyterians, but to maintain the *common* principles of Christianity. He came there to prove that Dr. Thomas's principles were *infidel* and *atheistic*: they tended to destroy Christianity, and to set aside the belief of the being of a God! The immortality of the soul was the doctrine of the Bible; it was taught in all its parts, and might easily be proved from the writings of prophets and apostles. He would go on to produce his proofs of the immortality of the soul, which was implied in the following text, "Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?"—(Ezek. xxxiii. 31.) This does not mean natural death, because all die, both righteous and wicked; but it refers to the death of the soul: "Why will ye die?" means, why bring the pains of the second death upon his soul? Again in John viii. Jesus says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see death," and "he that believes on me shall not die," that is the soul shall not die; therefore, the soul must be immortal. But if Dr. Thomas's theories are correct, Jesus did not speak the truth.

As to the Presbyterian religion, he would not maintain that it was the Christian religion, but a part of it; and in regard to the Confession of Faith, he did not believe in it.

What did Christ mean when he spoke of the worm that never dies, and the fire that is never quenched? Did not this prove that there was an immortal soul—a soul that should never die? Is not such a fire an eternal fire? and if so, must there not be a never-dying soul to be the subject of everlasting fire? And if there is no immortal soul, as Dr. Thomas says, what does Paul mean by the sorer punishment than

death? If man is all body and no soul, or nothing but body, blood, and breath, what sorer punishment can man be exposed to than to the punishment of temporal death? "If the righteous man turn from his righteousness he shall die:" that is, not his body only, but his soul shall die—therefore the soul is immortal.

In Ecclesiastes it says, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the *spirit* shall return unto God who gave it;" but Dr. Thomas says that man is nothing but dust. The Bible says that "there is a spirit in man," and that when the body dies, the spirit goes to God. Now which are we to believe? I leave it to Dr. Thomas to settle.

The Pagans believed in a hell and in a heaven, where the souls of men were received after death according as they had been wicked or righteous. Virgil and Homer have written about *hades*, or the place of immortal souls. It is clear that there is a place of departed spirits, from the passage which says that "Abraham was gathered to his fathers." Now we know that Abraham's ancestors were not buried in the Cave of Machpelah, because this belonged to the sons of Heth until Abram bought it to bury Sarah in; it does not mean, therefore, that Abraham was gathered to his fathers in the grave when he was buried there; but it means that he went to them in heaven. There is a difference, then, between soul and body.

The immortality of the soul was believed in the time of Jesus Christ. The Pagans, the Jews, and the Scribes and Pharisees all believed it. It was only the Sadducees who said there was no immortal soul. Dr. Thomas does not believe that *all* are to be raised again. According to his doctrine there is to be no resurrection of infants, no resurrection of Pagans, or of idiots; he consigns them all to the damnation of annihilation. But his doctrine and Christ's are at variance, for he says that "*all* who are in their graves shall come forth."—(John v. 29.) And John saw "the dead, both small and great, stand before the great white throne."—(Rev. xx. 12). The 'reverend' gentleman then pronounced a eulogium upon King James's version of the Scriptures. This was sufficient for him. It taught him that the soul was immortal; and turning to Dr. Thomas, said "Sir, ask me not to burn the Bible." Then addressing his audience, he continued that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were alive and in heaven. Their bodies had gone to corruption, but their immortal souls were in Paradise with God; for though dead to us, they were alive to Him, for He is their God, and "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living." Again, Jesus says, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Dr. Thomas denies that this refers to the spirit of man; but I say that it does mean the spirit of a man. Dr. Thomas is opposed to paraphrases, while his writing is one continued paraphrase

throughout. The *Harbinger* and he have had a controversy upon these things, but Mr. Campbell, as well as the celebrated Lord Brougham whose writings are quoted in the *Millennial Harbinger*, have clearly shown that he is wrong.

DR. THOMAS : You have been told, my friends, that I have denounced the Baptist preachers as "the accursed preachers of another gospel." This is not altogether true. There is no rule without an exception. What I have to do with, are my contemporaries. As we have shown, whoever preaches a gospel different to the ancient Gospel, it matters not by what name the preacher goes, it is the apostle and not I, who pronounces him accursed. If the Baptist preachers do not preach the truth, they are manifestly obnoxious to Paul's anathema. God is no respecter of persons, and whether they arrogate to themselves the title of "the ministers of the gospel of America," as my friend terms the clerical order, or of any other country, they are rejected by Him if they are not genuine. Many preachers who have done miracles in the name of Jesus, will call him "Lord" in the day of his power, to whom he will say, "Depart, for I never acknowledged you."

My friend asks you, what have Materialists been in all ages? He did not know, he says, that I was so ready to acknowledge that I am a Materialist. I have not acknowledged myself a Materialist. It is true I do not believe in the popular notions of what orthodoxy is pleased to term the "immortal soul;" but I am not for that a Materialist. A genuine Materialist believes at once that man has within him no such thing as a soul, capable of an existence separately and independently of the body, or the man; but he goes further, and denies that man, when once dead, will ever come to life again; that is that if the *race* were all dead, it would be extinct *ad infinitum* for ever. He admits the power of God to raise the dead; but does not believe that He will. This is Materialism as I understand it. But this is not my belief. The Scriptures teach me that man is but living dust; that when he dies, *if God were to interfere no more*, he would be eternally extinct; but, that God has not only the power, but that He will exercise it at an appointed time; and call *certain of the dead* from their graves, either that they may enjoy life, or that they may suffer punishment. If this is Materialism, it is the Materialism of the Bible.

But, my friends, I appeal to your own experience as to the influence of this doctrine. Compare the lives of your neighbours who believe and reject it. If the doctrine be the doctrine of the Scripture, we can reply most triumphantly that the lives of the primitive Christians abundantly illustrate the benignity of its influence. Do the lives of your acquaintances who believe with me, suffer any disparagement by a

comparison with the walk and conduct of those who oppose us? Are they not at least as moral, as upright, as honest, or as estimable? But shift the scene, and behold the fruit of those through past ages who have believed in the dogma of the immortality of the soul. The Pagan poets and philosophers, the obdurate Jews and hypocritical Pharisees have been cited as believers in this immortality speculation. All the churches of the apostacy, from the corruption by the Man of Sin to our own fanatical and degenerate age, have added their belief to the previously existing delusion! Their fruits are manifest; and history has abundantly portrayed the iniquity of the believers of this human tradition. It is of the mass I speak, and not of an excepted few.

Yes, my friends, this doctrine exerts upon us a salutary influence. Believing, as we do, that none will attain to "glory, honour, and immortality," save such as obey the laws of God according as He has delivered them in the several *aioms* or dispensations of time: it is our anxious, earnest, ardent desire, that we may, by any means, attain to the resurrection of the dead, which is the new way of life first disclosed by the Son of God. Our hope is well defined in the Sacred Word; we know not only in whom we have believed, but also for what we look. The horizon of our expectation is not beclouded by the doubts and uncertainties, the incongruities and absurdities of the Pagan, Papal, or Protestant heavens. These are undefined. If we enquire after them, we are told they are above, but nobody can tell us where. It is a place to which our immortal souls fly upon the wings of angels, but none can tell us what are these souls, and how far they fly until they reach the goal of flight!

Mr. Watt has spoken of the advertisement of this discussion. As far as I am concerned, the history of it is as follows: in consequence of his having engaged to debate with Mr. Anderson on certain things believed and set forth by me, which he supposed Mr. Anderson also believed, Mr. Langston Arvin came down to Amelia with a pressing invitation for me to be here on the present occasion. When he arrived, I was baptizing a gentleman of the Methodist Church, who, from the examination of the Scriptures, had determined to renounce the apostacy by being buried into Christ. He put a letter into my hand, by which I learned that Mr. Watt was to assail my views, and I was to defend them. In doing so, it was my intention not to let slip the opportunity of unmasking his religion. He objects to be regarded as the challenger: be it so. I considered the invitation, especially as I was to be assailed, in the light of a challenge. Accordingly, I so expressed it in the advertisement. In speaking of my friend, I styled him "Reverend" in the way of quotation. He says they do not *claim* the title; I am convinced they do not deserve it. The clerical



order accepts the title greedily enough! Some of them are not satisfied with "Reverend" alone, but they must be "The Very Reverend," and "The Right Reverend;" and the lord of the "Reverends" is still more aspiring, for he must be "His Holiness," and a very god upon the earth. Though my opponent does not *claim* the title, he has no objection to receive from men the same title of respect as in the Bible is claimed and conferred on God alone: "Holy and Reverend is His name." He alone is worthy of the title; and, in my judgment, when I behold an order of mortals accepting equal titles with the Divinity, it convinces me of their unholiness, irreverence, and anti-Christian character.

My friend is sorry to see the course I have pursued. I dare say no one can be more sorry, or has reason to be more sorry than he. He talks as though I came here only to be the butt of his ridicule, the mere target of his poisoned arrows. He can prowl round my entrenchments, and make a dash here and another there, and I am only to defend such breaches as he may condescend to indicate! He would like very well to get me right upon the doctrine of the "Immortality of the Soul," without making any introductory arrangements. He knows that the prejudices of the public are all in his favour, and against my views: hence his anxiety that I should come abruptly to the point. But my friend has "caught a tartar;" he will find that he has got hold of rather an intractable subject, who can be moved only according to his own convictions of propriety. I shall work my way along until I arrive at the great heresy, when, I doubt not, he will find himself involved in some very awkward and uncomfortable dilemmas.

My friend tells us that it was only in favour of the Christian religion that he appealed to national prejudices. In reply to this, I would say that such an appeal indicates the grossest possible misunderstanding of the spirit and genius of that institution. Presbyterianism may derive support from such appeals, but the Christian religion has no need of them at all. It stands by the power of truth, and it offers that truth with the strong recommendation of evidence, testimony, and reason to sustain it. The spirit of Christianity, as found in the Scriptures, though not in Confessions of Faith, is to assuage the passions of men, to unite their factions, to hush up their rivalries and national animosities, and so to elevate them above the impulses of animal feeling. Did you ever read of apostles or evangelists appealing to the national prejudices of their audiences in favour of their proclamation? No! With them it was, knowing the terror of the Lord, they besought men of every nation to be reconciled to God; and, forsaking their evil works, to submit to the righteous gospel of Jesus. National prejudices did exist between the Hebrew and Gentile disciples, but did the apostles fan the spark into a flame, or did they not rather

do their utmost to extinguish the veriest scintillations of discord or of disaffection?

Mr. Watt's definition of eternal life is not satisfactory. He says that "eternal life is a phrase used to signify all that God has to bestow in the world to come." This definition confounds things that differ. Eternal life is one thing, and the things which God has to bestow another. The eternal life is the "life and immortality," or incorruptibility, which has been brought to light in the ancient gospel by Jesus Christ; but that which God has to bestow on the immortalized man, is termed "the inheritance." This is described by Peter as "incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading." Whoever attains to eternal life, will attain to the inheritance; for the estate can be obtained only by a resurrection from the dead, or by a transformation of the living baptised believers of the gospel, who, at his second coming are found "walking in the ordinances and commandments of the Lord blameless," and earnestly looking for his appearing. "To them that look for him will he appear a second time, without a sin-offering unto salvation."

What a glorious prospect; what an animating hope do the Scriptures set before the true believer! Our life here is but temporal: it is but a vapour, and soon passes away. A few years, at most, perhaps in threescore years and ten, and the youngest of this assembly may be numbered with the dead. But the Christian, though dead, died in the sure and certain hope of a resurrection to glory, honour, and immortality; his treasure is in heaven, not in his perishing mortality; it is laid up where neither "moth nor rust can corrupt, and where thieves break not through and steal." "Our life," says the apostle, "is hid with Christ in God; and *when* he, who is our life, shall appear, *then* shall we be with him in glory." Our life, or the immortal principle, if you will, of "the Sons of Abraham" is not *in* them, as the dogmata of human tradition inculcate; no, it is laid up, it is hid in the Ark of the Testimony in the holiest of all. It is not already distributed among men in the form of "immortal souls;" it is one principle, not many abstract and independent essences; it is one undivided, undistributed, life-evolving principle, by which Christ who is the life of the world, will re-animate the mortal bodies of all true believers. We reject the speculations of the "orthodox" as the mere phantoms of a vain philosophy. They are the idealisms of the spectre-times of Pagan and Papal romance. They amuse the imagination of the world, and sicken the sterner mind of the intelligent aspirant after a never-ending life, with their fantastic shades and ærial heavens! They would have us believe that heaven is the receptacle of human thirds, which they, in imitation of a Pagan speculatist, are pleased to term "immortal souls!" But, my friends, though this may be very popular, there is no such

doctrine in the word of God. Heaven is for man, the whole man, "body, soul, and spirit," the whole person immortalized. *Nothingness* is the state of man, if I may so speak, between death and resurrection. He is dust, organized and animated while living; he is dust, disorganized and inanimate when dead—(Mr. Watt here interfered, that he might assure himself of Dr. Thomas' views in this particular; did Dr. Thomas mean to say that *man was nothing but dust*. Dr. Thomas replied in the words of the Lord God, as recorded by Moses: "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return;" but this did not satisfy Mr. Watt; he wished a reply in Dr. Thomas' own words; which Dr. T. did not think proper to give.) From his dust, the ruins of his former self, termed his "mortal body" by the apostle, he is re-moulded, and like the fabled Phoenix, from his ashes becomes man again. The first man was animal and mortal; the second, spiritual, splendid, powerful, and glorious.

The last thing I would notice to-day, by way of conclusion, is this remarkable declaration of Mr. Watt. "As to the Presbyterian religion," he says that he does "not maintain that it is the Christian religion; but a part of it, and that in regard to the Confession of Faith, he did not believe in it." From this, I judge that it is truly a singular aspect in which he views Christianity! Presbyterianism is part only of the religion of Jesus. Was not Christianity entire in the apostolic age? Was it not a compact whole? As it appears upon the fair and unsophisticated pages of the New Testament, this whole was made up of the truth, or doctrine to be believed; of "one Lord" to be obeyed; of "one baptism" to be submitted to; of "one body" to be united to; of one church, my friends, and only one, to which all the baptized believers of the gospel belonged. There were, indeed, many small communities of Christians, but these communities, or churches, were all uniform in their faith and worship; they were all alike, or homogeneous, parts of one harmonious whole. But look at things as they now are in Christendom. Anciently, for several years in the beginning, they all spoke and practised the same things; there were then no Romanists, no Protestant Presbyterians, no Protestant Episcopalians, no Protestant Methodists, nor Protestant Baptists; there were no Œcumenical Councils, General Assemblies, Synods, nor Conferences—all rival bodies claiming spiritual jurisdiction over masses of men, women, and infants; the government and order of the Churches of Christ were one: men were then saved by believing and obeying the gospel; but now they are cheated out of their salvation by "parts of the religion of Jesus Christ." Presbyterianism a part of the religion of Christ! Why, three hundred and fifty years ago there was no such thing in existence. To save men and women, it requires a *whole religion*; yes, "the whole truth." A part is not sufficient. According

to my friend's hypothesis, before a man can get the whole of the religion of Christ, he must become a Methodist, an Episcopalian, a Baptist, and a Presbyterian of course. But who authorised him to leave out the whole host of the religious factions of Christendom besides? These by his order are considered as the four great orthodox communions of the American Christendom; the innumerable minor sects go for nothing. Not to go further, then, a man in search of salvation should go the round of these at least; for these are the great "parts of the religion of Jesus Christ." So that a man should be sprinkled in baby-hood, and immersed when adult, and so forth. But perhaps to avoid those inconsistencies, a member of the one part may be considered as in fellowship with the great four; but even this will not do, for "the influential and powerful body" of Protestant Baptists will not receive at *their* table their Presbyterian, Episcopal, and Methodist brothers. But of course this is all as it should be according to Mr. Watt, for, says he, "the Baptists have the truth on their side," *ergo* they must be right, and the other "three parts of the religion of Christ" all wrong! But, my friends, such a quadrupartite religion will not do to die with; it may do to live by, so as to enjoy the smiles of men; but it will never give you a title to that "glory, honour, and *immortality*," which God has promised to those only who obey Him. For myself, give me a whole life-eternizing religion, or none; if you want the remission of sin and eternal life, you can obtain them only by believing and obeying the ancient apostolic and undivided religion of Jesus, which is distinct in part, spirit, and whole, from the clashing and discordant faiths of Christendom.

I cannot forbear pronouncing an encomium upon the superior sagacity of my opponent. I regard him certainly as far in advance of the old school brethren of his denomination. His intelligence has taken a vault which has left them egregiously in the rear. They, groping in the gloom of Geneva darkness, construe the politico-ecclesiastical Confession of Westminster by the glowing embers of a Servetan fire; while he, by a steadier light within, rejects, as unworthy of his belief, so absurd and dire a symbol.

At the conclusion of this day's debate, Dr. Thomas exchanged civilities with Mr. Watt, and observed that they had been warmly engaged, though for his part without any personal feeling; hoped they should continue to do so in good humour; and upon parting, remarked that he did not doubt but he should be able to make a "Campbellite" of him before they had done.

---

## SECOND DAY.

Mr. WATT.—He would take another text, though it was not his intention to preach from it; he might not mention it again; he should quote it, however, as the motto of his sermon. He did not take it from the Bible, but it was made up of four lines of poetry.

“Hear the just judgment of the Supremely Wise!  
He that hates truth shall be the dupe of lies;  
And he that will be cheated to the last,  
Delusion strong as hell shall bind him fast.”

In proceeding to address the audience, he observed that they had heard how pertinacious Dr. Thomas had been in bringing before them the merits of the Presbyterian Church. He had dwelt a good deal upon the division in that body, and had attributed it to the Confession of Faith: but this was not the reason of the split; the leading cause was the unfortunate question about *abolition*. For himself, he believed in Jesus Christ, and in nothing else. In saying that he did not believe in the Confession, he did not consider that he had renounced it. If there was any important perversion in it, he would reject that. Presbyterians do not believe in the Confession because it is the composition of men, but because it is a correct interpretation of Scripture. For himself, he held to the Confession, which he loved as well as the church, in which he gloried, because of the piety and morality of its professors. Look at the history of the Presbyterian church, and see how austere their morality is! Do we not call Connecticut *the land of steady habits*? We say *honest Drunkards* for the same reason, because of the purity of their faith and steadiness of habits, and honesty of life go hand in hand.

The Presbyterians are charged with seeking an alliance with the State. This is a stale and often refuted calumny. And where does it come from? It may be found in the papers of infidels. Presbyterians are the target of infidels, at which they shoot their poisoned arrows. But this is honourable to the church. Jesus was scoffed at by infidels. Compare his case with that of the Presbyterians, and they will appear to be closely related; for this cause, therefore, they inferred that the hostility of infidels to them was because of the relations of Presbyterians to Jesus. This was a death-blow, he considered, to such attacks. Have any people manifested half the enthusiasm in support of liberty as we have? Look at the Puritans, our Pilgrim Fathers, who fled from English tyranny to these shores. They and we have ever been on the side of the people fighting against monarchy. Dr. Thomas was an Englishman, and, therefore, a monarchist. Presbyterians make very good soldiers. There was

Colonel Spencer, of Charlotte (we think he said), an elder of the Presbyterian church. He was in the Revolutionary War. He was a brave man, and is said to have killed seven Englishmen with his own hand. It is true that American liberty is the child of English liberty. We went to war for our rights, as subjects of the British crown, against the principle of taxation without representation. The Presbyterians were persecuted as well as the Baptists. Patrick Henry was for all paying something for the clergy, without favour or exception; but Smith, of Sydney, opposed it. Would Dr. Thomas never let poor Presbyterians grow any wiser? In Calvin's days, it was necessary to have religious establishments, and it cannot be denied but that they did burn some few persons. When has religion flourished so much as in America? She has gained more power in the last fifty years here than elsewhere. For himself, he loved Presbyterianism as his soul, and desired to love it more; and he would say that it cannot be proved that Presbyterians harbour any such intentions as a union with the State, unless they were madmen.

Dr. Thomas had said that he regarded all governments, whether monarchical or republican, as a nuisance. And this declaration he had made before an American audience. For himself, he put his foot upon it. It was the doctrine of Fanny Wright. The government of the ladies, of fathers, of masters, &c., were these a nuisance? But, as far as he was concerned, he did not care if Dr. Thomas held this in its most noxious form.

In his Tussekiyah discourse, he had said it had become fashionable to suppose that people went to heaven as soon as they died; and that it was absurd. The speaker then quoted from the *Advocate*, but found he had turned to the wrong place. He continued that he wanted to know what became of the immortal soul; he wanted that answered.

The immortality of the soul is proved by the case of the thief on the cross. Is he not in heaven? Is not his soul there? Jesus said, when the thief asked him to remember him, "*To-day* shalt thou be with me in Paradise:" that is, your soul shall be with me in heaven. But hear this great reformer, Dr. Thomas! In his *Apostolic Advocate*, vol. II, page 244, he says, "I come now to the problem of the thief on the cross, which is the veritable *pons asinorum* of orthodoxy. We are told by this sapient teacher of theology "that the dying thief rejoiced to see the sin-cleansing fountain of the blood of Jesus;" nay, it even makes the thief a prophet, saying to Jesus, "Honors divine await thee soon, a sceptre and a crown; with shame thy foes shall yet behold thee seated on thy throne;" and it makes Jesus respond to the prophetic thief, "*To-day* your *parting soul* shall be with me in Paradise;" nay more; it has even constructed an institution for the remission of sins of ungodly men, who have served Satan until they are physically

unable to serve him any longer, when, at their last gasp, they give a *sign* and die! This is sufficient to send them to the Catholic and Protestant heavens, 'borne on angels' wings away!' " Thus writes this reformer! For the last eighteen months Mr. Alexander Campbell has been making efforts to reclaim him. He has reasoned with him, and so forth, but all has been useless. He had published some conversations in the *Harbinger*, which are supposed to have taken place at a Father Goodal's. In one of these, he treats upon the passage he had read just now. Mr. Wickliff, one of the party, requested Mr. Payne to hand him the volume of the *Advocate*, when we read the following passage. "How many strokes of an angel's wings, with a dead and a live man on one of the pinions, does it require to translate the nondescript from earth to the nearest world—say the Moon, which is about 240,000 miles distant?" Dr. Thomas may smile; but on hearing this, Father Goodal says, "Shut the book! shut the book! Mr. Wickliff." Many wish that you would explain these things to them, Dr. Thomas. They do not wish you to read from the newspapers about the divisions in the Presbyterian Church.

He would read another extract. "And what do you expect will be the cause of the resurrection of the animal human world, when the spring time of human existence shall arrive? Do you suppose it will be caused by myriads of disembodied ghosts rushing from heaven to earth, to search each one for his old clay tenement? Ha! ha! my dear friend, what a Papistical conceit you have fallen upon! What a scrambling will there be among the ghosts to get out of hell, purgatory, and heaven to look after their old mortalities. What a whooping of fiends, what a squalling of sprinkled babes, what a gabbling of old wives and priests (here the audience could not refrain from laughing) —why methinks when the gates of the Papal and Protestant Shades are flung open, the road from these umbrageous regions will present to the calm, unimpassioned observer, perhaps the most vivid picture of a protracted revival that ever was witnessed on earth, either among the howling dervishes of Mahommedanism, or the equally riotous devotees of Protestant Camp Meetings," &c. page 223, vol. II. *Adv.* The speaker read again. The reference lost. He has full swing. What, he continued, shall we think of this mockery of sacred things? Well might Father Goodall exclaim, "shut the book! shut the book!"—for there are few passages equal to such in the writings of Voltaire or Tom Paine. He had been accustomed to keep company with gentlemen, and could leave their society at pleasure; but in the present instance, he found it impossible. (Here the Moderators interfered, and observed that if Mr. Watt did not refrain from insulting language, they would refuse any longer to sit or preside at the debate. Mr. Watt was heard

to remark, that he supposed he must submit, but that it was with a very bad grace, or to that effect. Dr. Thomas observed, that he hoped the Moderators would pass over his opponent's conduct, as he himself did not regard it. Mr. T'schnerer Woodson replied, that if the Doctor would, they would consent to do so. Mr. Watt proceeded, and Dr. Thomas wrote on a piece of paper, which he handed to the Moderators, expressing the hope that no obstacle might be thrown in Mr. Watt's way. His reason for this was, he was afraid Mr. Watt would fly the track, and the debate consequently be brought to an abrupt conclusion). Dr. Thomas is a great enemy to commentaries, and yet his works are a running commentary on Scripture. He says, it was an angel and not the spirit of Christ that released Jesus from the tomb. Turning to Dr. Thomas, he asked, How do you know that the angel rolled away the stone? You know there is no such a thing in the book; you should study longer, Dr. Thomas, and pray more. Jesus says that he had power to take up his life, and lay it down again. He was not dependent upon an angel to raise him from the dead. Jesus Christ was God; he did not know if Dr. Thomas believed in the divinity of Christ.

He would ask, was the thief no prophet in what he said? According to Dr. Thomas, forasmuch as the thief could not be immersed, he ought to have been sent down to the damnation of annihilation; for he tells us that no one can be saved unless they are baptized, or immersed.

What is meant by paradise as found in Corinthians and Revelations? Dr. Thomas, he believed, says that paradise means the grave. Jesus said that the thief should be with him in paradise; was the body of the thief with that of Jesus? No, it was not; in what sense, then, did Jesus say he should be with him in paradise? It was his soul, his immortal soul, that was to be there. He believed that Dr. Thomas had got Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament with him, he ought to have known that Griesbach was a Unitarian, and that he carefully excluded all the passages that established the Divinity of Jesus. But let him remember, that plagues are denounced upon all who take from or add to the word of God. They would not have it "to-day," because that would prove the divinity of Christ and the immortality of the soul.

---

DR. THOMAS.—There were always two sides to the question, my friends. You have heard one side this morning; it now devolves upon me to lay before you the other. Mr. Watt has laboured to produce on your minds the notion that I am an infidel and a reviler of things sacred. Were I guilty, the opprobrium he has endeavoured to heap upon me, would indeed be sufficient to sink me into the abyss of what he so swellingly terms, "the damnation of annihilation." But, I demur to



the charges he brings against me ; and, I doubt not, but your own good sense will enable you to discern the difference between the satirizing of the dogmas of superstition and the mockery of things divine.

He has set out to prove my principles infidel and atheistic in their tendency, and he has talked to you this morning about Presbyterians being the target of infidels with whom he would class me. As to my infidelity, my friends, I would observe, that in relation to Presbyterianism and its contemporary versions of Christianity, I am an infidel. I am an unbeliever in the validity of their pretensions to an identity with the genuine religion of Christ. Compared to this, they are as sidereal glimmerings of the solar beams ; or as ephemeras of an hour to an Ancient of Days. Neither do I believe in *their views* of God. In this sense, then, my principles may be atheistic in their tendency. Sectarianism exhibits a God who commands, but is indifferent whether his laws be obeyed, provided his creatures are ignorantly sincere. They pourtray him as fierce, cruel, unreasonable, and unjust ; reaping where he has not sown, and gathering where he has not strawed. The religion of the New Testament, and the exhibition of the Divine attributes, as set forth in the Bible, especially as they beam in the face of Jesus Christ, are diverse in all their points. Each sect regards God by the twilight of its own symbols. The god of the Romanists and the god of Presbyterians, Methodists, &c., though they differ in some points, yet they all agree in this, that they are diverse in all respects from the God of truth. As I have said, I neither believe in sectarian religions, nor in sectarian views of the Deity ; and therefore *in this sense*, I am both infidel and atheistic. But in this avowal do not mistake me. I believe with all my heart in the religion taught by the apostles, and in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as revealed on the sacred page.

There is another thing I would notice here, and that is Mr. Watts's perversion of what I said concerning *governments*. I did not say that governments, abstractly considered, were a nuisance ; nor did I insinuate that obedience to authority, either parental, magisterial or political, was a usurpation of the rights of men. This is Mr. Watts's perversion of what I said. His aim seemed to be to leave the impression upon your minds that I was an anarchist of the Fanny Wright school. I was speaking of *right*—inherent right. My position was, that human government was based upon a usurpation of the *rights* of God. That the *right* of governing man was *inherent* in God alone ; but that for wise purposes, he had legitimized, as it were, man's usurpation of self-government. For human government is based upon a usurpation of the rights of God. In the beginning, He gave laws to man, but man refused to obey them, and chose rather to be a law to himself. Now, if all men would agree to obey God, human governments would be superfluous. A principle of love would be the foundation of all their

actions—love to God and love to one another; which is but another phrase for perfect obedience and harmony. And this is the end of God's dealings with mankind: it is to re-establish with honour to Himself His rightful sovereignty; for the time is coming, as the Scriptures teach, when all the governments of the world, whether Monarchical, Constitutional or Absolute; or Republicanism, Federal or Central, will be abolished and become the sovereignties of our Lord and of His Christ; "for he must reign until He has put all enemies (or institutions adverse to his rule) under his feet." But, as society is now constituted, human governments are indispensable. Society is constructed upon the grosser sentiments of man as he is. Acquisitiveness, combativeness and cautiousness—these are the faculties upon which are primarily based the political elements of the world. Hatred, and not love, is the principle which actuates the mass: "every man for himself and God for us all," is the unsocial and repulsive maxim of rebellious man. If all our minds were but enlightened by the word of God, and we sincerely believed it, how earnestly we should long for that day when the governments of the nations would be superseded by that of the great King Jesus, whose sceptre is merciful, mild and just. Then, when the "knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea," mankind will dwell together in unity and peace. There will be no national prejudices then—no wars of governments to cause heart-burnings in the people. Men will then tread the earth in security, and enjoy the fruits of their labours and wear out the works of their hands. Confidence will be restored. He that meets another will not need then to propitiate him; but man, accosting man, will be assured that he encounters a friend. Were it not for the governments of the nations, the peaceable and orderly of men could not live upon the earth. It is the powerful standing armies of Europe that maintain order, and protect the well-disposed from aggression. It is true they are oppressive; but the masses, under the influence of their unenlightened and licentious dispositions, require an oppressive and repressive force to keep them in anything like sobriety. With these views, then, I believe that "the powers that be are ordained of God," and that the sword is committed to magistrates that they may be a terror to all who would disturb the political order of things by *evil-doing*. Still, I regard these things as only provisional, and based upon the first and great transgression.

Mr. Watt has put this question to us, which ought certainly not to go unanswered: "Is it," said he, "anything new for Presbyterians to be liberal?" For myself I answer that, judging from history and his course in this debate, it is certainly quite a new thing under the sun. "The Blue Laws" of Connecticut, "the land of steady habits," according to which, no man was to hold even the meanest office in the

community, unless he was a member of the Church; the barbarities practised upon the Quakers, in Massachusetts, where, in 1656, four of them were put to death; the persecution of the Baptists;\* the wars to establish Presbyterianism; and their intolerance toward Episcopalians in Scotland—all go to illustrate the wonderful liberality of those who have imbibed the gloomy and ferocious sentiments of the destroyer of Servetus. Time and opportunity serving, we, who are denounced as disorganizers and heretics, would be permitted likewise to taste of some of the liberality of Presbyterians; but thanks to providence, who has emancipated this country from the ascendancy of a sect, Infidelity has put all sects upon an equal footing, and has proclaimed liberty and equality of political and religious rights to all. It has broken the sword of ecclesiastical despotism, and accorded ample latitude of speech and free discussion to all who would bear testimony for God or otherwise. Yes, it is, my friends, by virtue of this protection, that I am secure in standing before you this day to plead my cause against the attacks of orthodoxy.

Mr. Watt is exceedingly anxious that I should come right down upon "the Immortality of the Soul." He is quite uneasy under the examination of the pretensions of his religion to an identity with that of Christ. We shall arrive at that question in due time and order. He must remember that he opened this discussion, and that in doing so, he thought proper to attack me exclusively. He did not confine himself to one point; but embraced many. In this way, he has put me on the defensive, and I can assure him that I am not going to make "a hop, skip, and a jump," as it were, over all other topics, that I may get at a particular one to gratify his impatience. When I agreed to debate with Mr. Watt, I expected to meet a gentleman who knew how to reason, though it might be on the wrong side; but my astonishment is heightened every hour while I discover that he is constantly adducing "proofs" which defeat his own positions, and that he fails to perceive even the tendency of his own opinions. He appeals to prejudice, occupies his time in desultory excursions, gives a quotation here and there of dog or rather of scrap-Latin. (Here Mr. Watt interfered, considering himself insulted because Dr. Thomas had called his Latin "dog-Latin." Dr. Thomas explained that no insult was intended. That if it was disrespectful, it applied equally to himself as a physician; inasmuch as the Latin used by doctors was familiarly termed dog or

---

\* The sentiments of the Baptists spreading into Massachusetts, in 1651, the general court passed a law against them, inflicting punishment for persisting in the promulgation of their doctrines. In 1656, Quakers making their appearance in Massachusetts, the legislature of that colony passed several laws against them. No master of a vessel was allowed to bring anyone of this sect into its jurisdiction on penalty of £100. Other still severer penalties were inflicted upon them in 1657, such as cutting their ears and boring their tongues with a red hot iron. They were at length banished on pain of death, and four refusing to go, were executed in 1656.—*Plain Truth*.

scrap Latin; because of it being made up of words and phrases not to be met with in classical authors. The scrap used by Mr. Watt, was the trite phrase *credat Judeus Apella, non ego*. The Moderators decided that Dr. Thomas was not out of order). Dr. Thomas continued. I have replied to many things adduced by Mr. Watt, but he takes no notice of them. My illustration of his text seems entirely to have eluded his regard; why does he not attend to this? A grievous sin is laid at the door of his order: why does he not take it up and show that the accusation is false? To keep some of the things before his mind we have discussed, we would read from our notes as follows:—1st. *He has to show that the gospel according to Presbyterianism is the gospel that Paul preached*; 2nd.—*That Presbyterian views of the work of the Holy Spirit is the Scripture doctrine concerning it*. By the time he has disposed of these, we shall supply him with further materials of thought.

He would persuade us that Abolitionism, and not the Confession of Faith, is the cause of the divisions, or factions, in the Presbyterian Church. Now, which is to be believed, Mr. Watt or the editor of the *Presbyterian*, the organ of the old school, or orthodox party? Mr. Watt attributes it to one cause, the editor to another. There is a discrepancy here. They cannot both be right. Error lies between them. (Mr. Watt again interfered, under the impression that Dr. Thomas affirmed that he lied. Dr. Thomas explained. The Moderators said they understood him, and that he was in order). Dr. Thomas continued—The Moderators have decided that I am in order. I was saying that the error lies between the editor and Mr. Watt, and there we must leave it.

In respect of some of his texts to prove that man has, what orthodoxy terms, an "Immortal Soul" within him, we will in passing, notice one or two. "Why will ye die, O house of Israel," he says means, why will you bring the pains of the second death upon your soul. This is proof that man has an immortal soul within him. But suppose we grant it proves anything in the case, it only shows, that there was a something appertaining to the house of Israel, called 'soul,' and that it was liable to 'death;' and therefore, not immortal or deathless, but on the contrary, destructible! Again, he quotes Ezekiel xxxiii. 5, 16: "If the righteous man turn from his righteousness, he shall die," which he says signifies not his body, but his soul; and, therefore, his soul is immortal! Again: "He that believes in me shall not die," said Jesus; therefore, the soul of man is immortal! Again: "Thou shalt surely die," he tells us means that as God is a God of truth (yes it would be well for Mr. Watt to remember this), the soul must die, though the body should not die! This to me is something like proving the mortality of the soul, and the immortality of the body! Such is the nature of some of Mr. Watt's *proofs*, from which, if he only saw the tendency of his own comments upon them, he would

clearly see that he had proved the soul of man to be both mortal and destructible !

But this spectre, my friends, termed Materialism is no new heresy, as the orthodox are pleased to term the Bible doctrine of immortality. It was one of the things which divided the Baptist church some years ago. Mosheim, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, which may be termed the history of the corruptions, perversions, and prostitutions of Christianity by the unenlightened passions of men, gives us an account of the tenets of the General Baptists, or English Mennonites. In his summary, I find a resemblance between their tenets and many things we maintain in this day in opposition to the dogmas of the Apostacy. MENNO, with whom they agreed to a considerable extent, maintained a principle in connection with his brethren, which is a favourite one of our own ; and one by which, in our own mind, we are accustomed to try the merits of religious sects, rather than by their hair-splittings in divinity. The principle was this: "THAT HOLINESS OF LIFE AND OF MANNERS WERE THE AUTHENTIC MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH." The standard of holiness and purity being the most obvious sense of the New Testament, no man can claim to be *holy or pure* who is not *separated and cleansed* from sin according to the gospel requisition. Hence, all who have put on Christ, though they may pass among men for righteous, are unsanctified ; and you know that nothing can be in a sanctified state which is impure.

They believed in the reign of Christ upon the earth for the period indicated in the Apocalypse of John. Who that believes the Scriptures, and studies it by the light reflected from its own pages, can reject a doctrine so clearly taught ? It is the purpose of the Most High to eradicate the wicked from the earth, as a cultivator of the soil would destroy from his land thorns, briars and noxious weeds. The wicked shall not inherit that estate which is promised to the meek of the earth. The earth was fitted up for an upright man : the wicked have usurped it, but to the righteous it will be restored. He that is to be the Restorer is Christ, who with his holy ones will reign until the kingdom is delivered up to the Father, that God may be all in all. Jerusalem restored—the city of the Great King—is the vision of peace to the heirs of eternal life.

"They believe," says Mosheim, "that the soul, from the moment that the body dies until its resurrection at the last day, remains in a state of perfect insensibility." This is something like the position I maintain, though not exactly. I would state it thus: *man, from the moment he dies, until his resurrection, remains insensible to all animal, intellectual or moral impressions, from within or without.*

---

Mr. WATT proceeded to make some observations concerning the origin of the debate, which did not exactly coincide with Mr. Albert Anderson's conviction of the matter. The latter was allowed to explain the part he had in it. Having sat down, Mr. Watt rose and observed in effect, that he had not such a memory as to be able to remember what he did say. He then repeated an anecdote concerning a conversation he had with one of "Dr. Thomas's followers," in the presence of a Mr. Silas Sherburne, who, as he reports, declared that he "did not know whether he had a soul or not." He had endeavoured to prove that man had an immortal soul within him; and he acknowledged that he was indebted to Mr. Alexander Campbell for most that he had to say on this subject. He had not met with a single individual who agreed with Dr. Thomas as to the soul. He was really very sorry that he was called upon to defend his veracity. (Here Dr. Thomas interfered, and addressing the moderators, said that he had not impugned Mr. Watt's veracity, to which they agreed.) Mr. Watt continued that he thought Dr. Thomas had; but he was very absent himself, and supposed he hadn't paid all the attention he should to what was said. As to the Presbyterians, everybody knows that they persecuted in the days of Calvin; but his answer to every question about their intolerance was that they had shed their blood in the cause of liberty against British tyranny. But he considered the accusation against the Church of Geneva as not at all applicable to him. Presbyterians have it in their power to make the Church tomorrow what it is not to-day. Dr. Thomas had no more right to charge upon him the things practised of old, than he had the evil deeds of others upon him. He would say that Dr. Thomas was a Baptist, but he would not charge upon him the sins of "the Madmen of Munster."

Dr. Thomas had said that he had proved the soul to be mortal. If he had, he was not conscious of it, for he did not mean to assert that the soul was destructible.

As to Dr. Thomas, he would just read from his own paper, the *Advocate*, page 127, vol. iii. the estimation in which he was held even by his brethren.

From the *Gospel Advocate*.—"Dr. John Thomas of the *Apostolic Advocate*, a Factionist.—We are informed that this restless, ambitious individual, whose course we have long considered exceedingly reprehensible, has actually been the occasion of a division of the congregation that met at the Sycamore M. H. Richmond, Va. It has long been suspected that Dr. Thomas was aspiring to head a religious party in this country. It is now confirmed, at least to the satisfaction of many very intelligent brethren. We cannot but look on him as a Factionist. He has taken a party off with him in his wild speculations on the subject of Materialism, Anabaptism, &c. There

was much more of Infidelity than Christianity in his Thirty-four Questions that appeared in the Dec. No. of the *Apostolic Advocate*, 1835. A brother of more than ordinary intelligence, and who is well acquainted with the intricacies of scepticism, after reading those Questions, said that the writer would be an avowed Infidel in less than twelve months. I expressed a hope that it would not be so; but I confess I begin to entertain some fears, for not much more than half the time has elapsed, and the Dr. is certainly fully half gone.

Will the friends of the Reformation sustain such an individual, who is striking at the very foundation of our religion; a Factionist, who is sowing the seeds of discord among us, and leading off a party after him; who never has had any respect for the feelings of friends or opponents; and who, to say the least, has done as much harm as Alexander, the coppersmith, did Paul?

Should the Dr. demur to this notice, we hope he will assign his reasons for doing so. He must prove that he and we are advocating the same cause. If he will convince me of that, I will acknowledge my mistake, and pursue a different course in future.

PLAIN DEALING."

After that no further comment was necessary from him!

(One of the moderators observed "Your time is out, Sir!" Mr. Watt replied, "I am glad of it.")

Dr. THOMAS.—On parting with my opponent the other evening, I told him that I did not doubt but I should make a Campbellite of him before I was done. Little did I think, then, that I was so prophetic of the truth! He has publicly confessed himself to be a disciple of Mr. Alexander Campbell; for he acknowledges that he is indebted to him for most that he has to say on the subjects in debate. Of this I have long been convinced from the identity of their "proofs." In his quotation of texts, &c., the disciple has faithfully followed his master! But I would say to my friend that his case is hopeless; for if Mr. Campbell, the teacher, has failed to establish the Platonic dogma of the "immortality of the soul," I am quite sure that Mr. Watt, his pupil, will not succeed.

I would ask Mr. Watt why he is so inattentive. And why does he not reply to the things I have submitted? "Did'nt you say so and so, Dr. Thomas? I'm sure I thought you did, but I was'nt paying much attention," is the lethargic spirit with which I have to contend. He acknowledges he has not paid as much attention as he ought to have done; talks of his defective memory, and of his absence of mind, and then, without any qualification, goes on to affirm "Dr. Thomas says so and so!" How can one who acts in this way, successfully defend and prove?

Mr. Watt's religion is certainly a very militant one. The spilling

of their own blood seems to be a proof of everything with Mr. Watt, in favour of Presbyterians! I always thought, since I learned how to think aright, that Scotch divinity was a very combative affair. History abundantly testifies that it has been thoroughly baptized in the blood of friends and foes. But, my friends, the religion of Jesus is stained only with the blood of its friends. Its weapons are not carnal; it claims no affinity with the sword, the rifle, or the spear. No, it teaches men to love their enemies, not to burn them; to save, and not to kill. But we proceed, leaving "Plain Dealing" to his own reflection, to consider the subject of the "immortality of the soul," as Plato and his disciples term a something alleged to be in man, which they cannot define.

Words are signs of ideas both common and revealed. Revelation in its restricted meaning, signifies the things revealed or made known by the Spirit of God. Hence the ideas contained in the Scriptures are spiritual ideas or things; and these are expressed in spiritual words and phrases, or signs adequate to their conveyance. Thus Paul says, "Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which comes from God, that we might know the things which are gifted to us by God. Which things also we speak, not in words taught by human wisdom, but in words taught by the spirit, explaining spiritual things (or ideas) in spiritual words." Now here are two classes of words—first, "*words taught by human wisdom,*" and second, "*words taught by the Spirit;*" the former may be termed the language of Ashdod, and the latter the language of Canaan. It is a rule, which you will find sustained throughout Scripture, that spiritual ideas are never couched in the language of the philosophy contemporaneous with the writers of the word, nor are human traditions clothed with spiritual words. Hence, if a phrase current among the philosophers of old and the people, be not in the Bible, the *idea* of the phrase is not there either. Now, the phrases "immortal soul" and "immortality of the soul," belong to the first class, namely, of "words taught by human wisdom," for neither of them is to be found in the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation. The phrases were first used by the leaders of the multitude; who in Scripture are termed "animal or natural men." My opponent tells us that the "immortality of the soul" was believed in the time of Jesus, by Pagans and Jews. We grant it, and what then? That natural or animal men understood certain of the "mysterious wisdom of God" before Jesus revealed it? To say this would contradict the Scriptures; for Paul says that the Wisdom of God on these topics had been "hitherto concealed," and that "life and immortality were brought to light by Jesus Christ *in the gospel.*" The doctrine of immortality is a "spiritual thing," and, therefore, from its very nature, was incomprehensible to the world of animal men, until spiritually revealed. "Now," says Paul, "an animal man receives not the things of the Spirit



of God ; for they are foolishness to him." This is true ; for when the apostle announced the immortality of man by a resurrection from the dead, at Athens, the Epicurean and Stoic leaders of the ignorant multitude, mocked him for a babbler. And even now the Scriptural teaching on this topic, is as incredible and absurd in the estimation of my opponent and the mass as it was to them.

I have said that the phrase "immortal soul" or "immortality of the soul" is not in the Bible ; therefore, I conclude, that the idea or thing is not taught there. But among "the words taught by the Spirit," there are "immortal," "immortality," "spirit," "soul," and so forth ; hence the ideas or things signified are there too. But soul is one idea, an "immortal soul" quite another ; and immortality is one thing, and "immortality of the soul" another. Soul, immortal, immortality, are indeed found in the Bible ; but "immortal soul" and "immortality of the soul," are not, but chiefly in the speculations of Plato, and in the systems of scholastic divinity.

It is important when persons listen to the conversation and discourses of others, that they should, if they would comprehend one another, understand the language or terms used by the speaker. "Define your terms," then, is good advice, introductory to the investigation of any controverted subject. We will take the hint, and endeavour to ascertain the signification of certain words, with which we have to do. And here I would just observe, that I believe in the soul, spirit, and the doctrine of immortality as taught in the Bible ; though I do not at all believe in the traditions of the apostacy concerning them. The former I receive with all my heart, and the latter I reject as Pagan, Papistical, and absurd.

First, then, as to the word *soul*. In ascertaining the meaning of the word, we must consult the Hebrew ; for the Bible word which is translated *soul*, existed in common use among the Jews hundreds of years before the English language was spoken. That is, when David wrote in the Hebrew language, that God would not leave Messiah's soul in the grave, there was no such word as our word soul. It will not do, therefore, to consult English Dictionaries for its definition ; they merely give the *opinions* of Englishmen and Americans ; that is, they define the word soul according to the theories of these people. The proper way to arrive at the truth is, to see how the Hebrew word is used in the Bible. And here I would observe, that in interpreting the Scriptures, we must define the words of Scripture *by the doctrine and by the sense put upon them by the context*. It will not do for us to say that the word soul, for instance, means "a separate and independent immortal spirit," and then put that construction upon it wherever we may find it in the word. For instance, it says, "and every living soul in the sea died ;" it would be absurd to say, "and every separate and

independent immortal spirit died." "Why will ye die, O house of Israel?" according to our friend's version, or rather perversion of that passage, and definition of the soul, would mean, "why will you bring the pains of death upon your separate and independent immortal spirit?" "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die," according to him would be "in the day that thou eatest thereof, thy separate and independent immortal spirit shall die." And so on.

Hence we conclude that the word, or in fact words in general, are never used absolutely or unqualifiedly, but always contextually; that is, that the words soul, spirit, immortal, &c., have as many significations as they have different contexts. We shall now proceed to ascertain the meaning of the word used by the Hebrews, and rendered by the English translators of the Scripture, *soul*.

The Hebrew word is *nphsh*, or *naphash*. It is a substantive noun, or name of something which has a being. Its gender is common to male and female, but more usually feminine. It is also a verbal substantive, that is, it is a noun derived from the verb *naphash*,<sup>6</sup> which signifies "to breathe strongly, to pant;" it also signifies "to take breath," as after fatigue. The noun *naphash* has a great variety of meanings, all of which depend upon the connection in which they are used. Gesenius, whose Lexicon is before me, has arranged them under five classes, with phrases selected from the Bible illustrative of each definition. Under the first head, its contextual significations are "breath, breath of life; also odour, perfume, which anything breathes or EXHALES;" and, would you believe it, my friends, but this word, which has been so arbitrarily defined to be "an independent and immortal spirit," is here reduced to a connection with the humble term "smelling bottles?"—(Isaiah iii. 20.)

Under the second head we read as follows:—"The vital spirit," in Greek "*psuchee*," in Latin, "*anima*," through which the body lives, *i.e.* the principle of life manifested in the breath, (compare *ruach* Lat. *anima* collated with Gr. *anemos*) and whose seat was supposed to be in the blood.—(Lev. xvii. 11; Deut. xii. 23; Gen. ix. 4, 5.) Hence life, vital principle, animal spirit, (Gen. xxxv. 18), "as her spirit was departing," that is, "as she gave up the ghost," or "her life." 1 Kings xvii. 21: "Let now the spirit of this child return to him again," that is, let his life return. Exodus xxi. 23: "life for life." This life, spirit, *anima* itself, is said to live, (Gen. xii. 13; Psalm cxix. 165.) And, my friends, mark too, that this same *naphash*, or soul, is also said "TO DIE."—(Judges xvi. 49.) Also "to be killed," (Num. xxxi. 19)—to be asked for (1 Kings iii. 11)—to be poured out, as if along with the blood,

\* If these words are read with the Masoretic points, the verb may be pronounced as if written *nophash*; the *o* as *o* in *not*, and the *a* as *a* in *ram*; and the noun, *nephesh*. The orthoepy, however, of the Hebrew being lost, the pronunciation is arbitrary if the points are rejected, and does not at all affect the signification of the terms.

(Lam. ii. 12; Isaiah liii. 12.) It is very frequent in phrases which have respect to losing or preserving of life. Farther also, in many expressions which have respect to the sustenance of life by food and drink, and the contrary, where the English version often renders *naphash* by *soul*, but improperly. Thus the *spirit, anima*, is said to be *satiated* with food and drink (Prov. xxxvii. 7; Isaiah lv. 2); so to *fill*, *i.e.* to satisfy one's spirit (Prov. vi. 30); and hence *Naphash* is itself *put for aliment* (Isaiah lviii. 10); "if thou draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul," or if thou give out thy *food* or *aliment* to the hungry that he may be filled. So the opposite; *my spirit hungers* (Prov. x. 3, xxvii. 7); *thirsts*, (Prov. xxv. 26); *fasts* (Psalm lxix. 11); *abstains* from certain kinds of food (Lev. xxx. 3); *is polluted* by them (Ez. iv. 14.) Also the *spirit* is *empty, i.e.* hungry (Isaiah xxix. 7); *to open wide the life spirit, i.e.* tropically for the jaws, throat, (Isaiah v. 14; Hab. ii. 5.) And, says Gesenius, "of the spirit as separated from the body."—(Job. xiv. 22.) But, on turning to this reference, we find that he is not sustained in this definition. It reads, "His flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn." Job was talking about the calamities to which a man is subjected in this life, the effect of which is to fill him with painful and sorrowful emotions. "Thou washest away, O God, the things which grow out of the dust of the earth," which things are the hope of man who tills it; "thou destroyest" says he "the hope of man" by floods, and so forth. Now what is the effect of these misfortunes upon cultivators? The answer is in the mind of every planter, that he is "altogether pained;" his hopes of abundant crops being dashed, he is pained and troubled in body, soul, and spirit, the whole man.

Under the *third* head, *naphash* is rendered "the rational soul, mind, animus, as the seat of the affections, feelings, emotions of various kinds;" in other words, it signifies the *brain*, which is demonstratively the seat of the feelings, affections, and emotions. To it are attributed *love* (amativeness); *joy* (the pleasing emotions which flow from the gratification of acquisitiveness, love of approbation, hope, &c.); *fear* (cautiousness); *piety* toward God (veneration); *confidence* (hope); *desire* (acquisitiveness); longing or appetite, *e.g.* for food (alimentiveness); *revenge and slaughter, hatred and contempt, vengeance and sorrow, and as the seat of warlike valour*, (destructiveness, combativeness, and self-esteem). It is spoken of the feelings in general: "*ye know the feelings of a stranger, or how a stranger or a foreigner feels*"—a knowledge, which has been but little displayed toward me in this debate. 1 Sam. i. 15: "I have poured out my soul before Jehovah," *i.e.* have laid open to him my inmost feelings.

Words also which themselves express feelings of the mind or soul, are often used in connection with *naphash* in this sense; thus the soul

is said to weep, to be poured out in tears, to cry for vengeance, and also to invoke blessings. More rarely things are attributed to the soul which belong rather to the mode of feeling and acting: as pride, patience, and impatience; to the will or purpose; to the understanding or faculty of thinking.

Under the *fourth* head, concretely it signifies animal in which is the *naphash*, anima, or life. Joshua x. 28: every animate or living creature; v. 30, 32, 35, 37. After *animal or life*, i.e., endowed with life, *living animal*, or as more commonly in English, *living soul*, *living being*, Gen. ii. 7; and very often collectively for *living things*, living creatures, Gen. i, 21, 24; ix. 10, 12, 15; Lev. xi. 10. In Gen. ii. 19, and whatsoever Adam called them, the living creatures (or souls), that was their name. Deut. xxiv. 7, to steal a soul, i.e. to steal a man. Lev. iv. 2, "if a soul (that is, if any one) shall sin."—In a census of the people, seventy souls, i.e. persons. Gen. xii. 5: "the slaves (the souls) they had acquired in Haran." *Naphash*, or soul, in certain contexts signifies ONE DEAD, A DEAD BODY, A CORPSE.—(Num. vi. 6,) "let him not come near to a (*naphash*) *dead body*."

Under the *fifth* head, with a suffix, or particle attached, it is very frequently used for *I myself*. "The German *selb*, *selber*, Swedish *sjel*, English *self*, are all from the same root with the German *seele*, in English, *soul*."—(*Robinson's Gesenius*, under the word *naphash*.)

From all this, it is obvious that no arbitrary, absolute, or unqualified definition, nor any consistent doctrine can possibly be constructed upon the word used for soul in the Hebrew Bible. If one say that the *naphash*, in English *soul*, is an immortal spirit, another would turn to Num. vi. 6, and shew that the word meant "a dead body;" or if a third should affirm that soul was "a dead body," a fourth might turn to Joshua x. 28, and shew that it signified "a living creature;" and so throughout, to the utter confusion of every hypothesis framed upon any one definition of the word. Hence, if called upon to define the word *soul*, insulated as it were from every collateral phrase or word, it would be utterly impossible to do it; for the meaning of the word depends upon the context to which it stands related.

Mr. WATT impugned Dr. Thomas's consistency in using a *Lexicon* translated by Dr. Robinson, an orthodoxy professor in the Andover Theological Seminary, in support of his own heretical sentiments, whilst he, at the same time, professes to have such an utter abhorrence of all orthodox men and orthodox seminaries. Dr. Thomas can oppose and ridicule Presbyterians, and yet he can avail himself of the labours of one who is in fellowship with them! He didn't think this was right. If Dr. Thomas was opposed to them, why did he use their books? This is not fair, Dr. Thomas: you oughtn't to do so; at least I think so.

He then proceeded to comment upon Psalm xvi. David says "thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*." Dr. Thomas contends that it means *dead body*, and not the separate and independent spirit. But it doesn't mean this. It must mean "the immortal soul," and can mean nothing else. He read from *Webster's Dictionary* the definitions of *soul*, and observed that the *Hebrew Lexicon* had only five meanings. He did not consider that the Bible had any right to fix the meanings of the words of the English language. There was the word "let." In the Bible this word was used to signify *hindrance*: but that wasn't the meaning of the word as defined in Dictionaries of our language. The Bible, therefore, was not the standard. One of the meanings of the word soul is "an independent existence." One of the meanings is die. We read in the newspapers that "so many souls perished," when speaking of the loss of a ship at sea. He spoke of words in their theological sense, and then observed, if Dr. Thomas will define the meaning of the word *soul*, and stick to that definition, he would not object. He was for taking words in their ordinary sense, for if taken out of their common acceptation, they were liable to be mistaken. He wanted to know what *animal life* was; but he could never get at Dr. Thomas' idea of it. If Dr. Thomas, a physician and theologian, would only tell us what is the idea, it would very much facilitate the progress of this discussion. He would thank Dr. Thomas if he would write it down.

Dr. Thomas has said in his writings, if eternal life be conditional, then Matt. x. 28, must be so rendered. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." There, Dr. Thomas, doesn't that mean the independent spirit, the immortal soul? But Dr. Thomas says that soul here means animal life! According to him it would read: "Fear not them who can deprive the body of animal life, but cannot prevent you from living again, but rather fear Him who is able to deprive you not only of animal life, but to annihilate you for ever." And this interpretation he founds on the doctrine of the conditionality of eternal life. But he affirmed that by soul here was meant the immortal spirit. He only wished he had Dr. Thomas anywhere but there, before a theological society; he would there show the visionary and sophistical nature of his speculations. ("The Reverend Gentleman" being unable to fill out his half-hour, was under the necessity of sitting down before its expiration.)

Dr. THOMAS.—I doubt not, my friends, but Mr. Watt would be very well pleased to have me before some "Star Chamber" or inquisition of the kind he has just indicated. But "the times are changed;" the days are gone, never, I trust, to re-appear, when clergymen could cite

honourable men, of whom the world was not worthy—whom they deemed heretics—before courts and juries packed by clerical influence. I have often said elsewhere, and again remark in your audience, that if I was to be tried for any offence, I should prefer to be judged by avowed infidels than by a bench of clergymen; for history and experience have convinced me that their “tender mercies are cruel.”

The next words we have to examine are *immortal* and *immortality*; and, in doing this, we shall have recourse to the contexts in connection with which they are found in the Bible. In the first place, then, we observe that the word *immortal* occurs only once in the Scriptures, and that *not* in connection with the word *soul*. It is found in 1 Tim. i. 17: “Now to the King Eternal, immortal, invisible, to God alone, be honour and glory, for ever and ever.” Here, then, the word *immortal* is used adjectively in relation to God the Eternal and Unseen, and obviously signifies *undying*. God is a King, uncreated by any antecedent power, and, therefore, eternal. As in His royalty there was no beginning, so also, there will be no end; and, therefore, He is a King Immortal; and as no one has ever seen this King, He is, therefore, invisible. Cannot a man believe in the existence of this King—of this Undying Monarch, who has reigned over all creation as King Supreme for countless ages, before He spoke into being our infant world—without believing that in every man, woman, and child, Pagan, Mohammedan, anti-Christian, and Infidel, sane, and insane, there is an incorruptible, undying principle, called by the rulers of this darkness “an immortal soul?” Yet my opponent tells you that a man must be an Atheist to deny the existence in man of such a phantom; “for,” says he, “if Dr. Thomas believes there is a God he believes it without evidence, if he denies the immortality of the soul; for there cannot be a God if there is no immortal soul!” But we shall notice this in another place; and perhaps demonstrate that there is more of Atheism in his heart than mine.

The word “immortality” is only used *five* times in the Bible, and those altogether in the New Testament, which is emphatically the book of eternal or immortal life. It is first used in Rom. ii. 7: “To them who seek for glory, honour, and immortality, God will render eternal life.” Here we have the idea of never-dying expressed *substantively*: that is, immortality is used as the name of something that exists. But this existence is *without* and not at all within a man. It is set before him; it is propounded to him as a thing *to be sought for*, to be longed or hoped for, and to be attained. Would you seek after a thing you possessed? Would you hope to obtain a thing you already had? Would you strive to attain to a boon of which you were actually seized? As well might you seek for something which you had really found, as seek after immortality which was, in truth,

within you, and of which you were assured! Immortality in this passage signifies the *quality of never-dying after having attained life*. Immortality in relation to man has a beginning, and, therefore, does not imply eternity in the same sense as when affirmed of God. A thing may be immortal and yet not eternal. Man may be immortal, but cannot be eternal. God only is eternal, because His being had no beginning. "God is life;" hence life is as eternal as God. Man is not immortal; he is mortal in all his parts, but may become immortal, if he seek after immortality in the appointed way. And what, it may be asked, is that way? We reply, *by doing well*. As man is a sinner, this phrase, when used in relation to him, implies a beginning to do well; and every man, who has so begun, is required to *persevere in well-doing* if he would attain to immortality. Under these times, to begin to do well is to believe the gospel, and to obey it, by putting on Christ, by a planting in likeness of his death and burial; and to persevere in well doing, is to walk before God in the footsteps of Jesus, through subsequent life.

The next places where this word is used are in 1 Corinthians xv. 53 and 54. Paul is here teaching the doctrine of incorruptibility, or immortality, which are synonymous, that is, they mean the same thing. Were the apostle to appear among men, and talk to them about immortality, as he did to the Corinthians, certain worldly-wise men of our times would condemn him for a speculator or a "babbler," as did the Epicureans and Stoics of Athens. Now, if their imaginings were correct, we should naturally expect that when he treated of this, it would be in connection with "the abstract human spirit" of Plato and his admirers! But no, Paul says not one word of such a phantom. In the passages before us, he is discoursing on the immortality of the body at the era of the resurrection of those that are dead! So that, if we were to admit the phrase immortality of the soul, it should be understood of the body, and not of a ghost! But we reject the phrase as of Ashdod or Babylon.

"For this corruptible," says Paul, "shall put on incorruption; and this mortal body shall put on immortality. Now, *when* (that is at the transformation and resurrection) this corruptible body shall have put on immortality, *then* that saying of Scripture shall be accomplished, "Death is swallowed up for ever!" Here corruptible and mortal are synonymous: they both indicate *death*; and, on the other hand, incorruption and immortality are the same, and used antithetically, or in opposition, to corruptible and mortal, and signify not only life, but *life without end*, which is the opposite likewise to death in all its relations. "Corruptible," "mortal," "animal," apply to man as he is; and "incorruptible," "immortal," and "spiritual," as he will be. His present constitution is incompatible with a life unending. His organiza-

tion must be changed or broken down, and re-constituted from its ashes before he can be an incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual body. *As he is*, man is in corruption, in dishonour, in weakness, and animal; but *as he will be*, he will flourish in incorruption, in glory, in power, and as spiritual. "If the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead be in you, He who raised up the Christ from the dead, *will make even your mortal bodies alive* through His Spirit (or power) which dwells in you."—(Rom. viii. 11.) "Even we groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, namely, the redemption of our bodies."—(v. 23.) "But we are citizens of heaven, whence also we **EARNESTLY EXPECT** the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transform our humble body into a like form with his glorious body, according to the energy of his power, even to subdue all things to himself." Such are some of the passages which speak of immortality; not one of which has the least referēnce to what metaphysicians and Platonists term "the soul."

The next reference is I Tim. vi. 16. This annihilates at one blow the "traditions of the elders" of anti-Christ about their *imatte immortality*. They tell us that every descendant of Adam has immortality within him; and this abstraction of their brains, which they define to be an indefinable, separate, and independent spirit, they tell us blooms in immortal youth when liberated by death from its mortal and corporeal clay. Consistent people! This liberated immortal they reconfine in another prison house at a resurrection, after a liberty of centuries in the enjoyments of their ideal paradise. But what says the apostolic teacher of immortality? Does he say that all men, women, and babes have immortality? Hear him! "The appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, at the proper season, the Blessed and Only Potentate, the king of Kings, and Lord of lords, will exhibit; WHO ONLY HATH IMMORTALITY—dwelling in light inaccessible? whom no man hath seen, or can see." Jesus said, John v. 24: "He who hears (or understands) my doctrine, and believes Him who sent me, *has eternal life*." But *where* has the believer of the doctrine of Jesus got it? Has he it in possession within himself, or has he it as "treasure in heaven, where neither moth nor rust do corrupt, nor thieves break through and steal?" Let one of the apostles of Jesus reply:—"Your life" (eternal,) says Paul, "is **HID WITH CHRIST** in God. **WHEN** Christ our life shall appear, **THEN** you shall also appear with him in glory."—(Col. iii. 2.) Here the apostle answers two enquiries. *Where* is our immortality? And *when* shall we receive it? Now, if it be with Christ who is at the right hand of God, it is not in us; and, if we are to receive it when he appears, then from the Christian's death to Christ's appearing, he is nothing but dust and ashes; and, therefore, the doctrines of the clergy and their associates in this matter are nothing but tradition of the flimsiest texture.



The fifth place in which the word immortal occurs is in 2 Tim i. 10. There it stands related to the context as a part of the favour or grace given through Jesus Christ, as a matter of purpose or promise before the times of the ages, or of the organization of the descendants of Abraham into a nation under the Mosaic law. Until the coming of Jesus Christ, this promise of life and immortality was not manifested. The Jews "searched the Scriptures, because by them they thought to obtain immortality, or eternal life;" but they searched unsuccessfully, for although "life and immortality" were promised, it was not known to them in what way it was to be developed, until Jesus Christ brought the doctrine and conditions of it to light by the gospel. "God has saved us, and called us with a holy calling; not on account of our works, but on account of his own purpose and favour, which was given us through Christ Jesus, before the times of the ages, and is *now made manifest* by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who has, indeed, vanquished death, and brought life and immortality to light by the gospel." Now Plato lived before Jesus Christ, and he taught what is currently believed by the world, and tenaciously adhered to as if for its very life. If he taught the true doctrine, then, "life and immortality" were brought to light by Plato and not by Jesus. But Paul says that Jesus brought it to light, and, therefore, the dogmata of Plato, though he is said to have "reasoned well," are false, and an excrescence on the doctrine of Christ.

But "life and immortality" are brought to light by the gospel. Yes, this is the great secret of Christ, made known to the Gentiles by Paul. It is in the doctrine of the gospel that the conditions of eternal life are set forth. Patriarchs, Israelites, and Christians will attain this great boon by virtue of the redemption of their transgressions by the sacrifice of Christ, which the blood of animals could not effect; and by their obedience to the appointments of God, under their several times. There is no life nor incorruptibility in store for those who obey not the gospel; but an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.

### THIRD DAY.

MR. WATT again referred to the origin of the debate. He saw clearly that the part to be acted by Dr. Thomas was to attack the religions of his country; and he was convinced that he was determined to *shirk* the question of the immortality of the soul. Dr. Thomas was very fond of the word *shirk*, but there was no such word in the language.\*

---

\* This is an egregious mistake. It is derived from the word *shark*, and signifies to evade by a trick.

He appealed to the generosity of Dr. Thomas. Was it kind to be occupying the attention of the people with attacks upon Presbyterianism, when they had come to hear about the immortal soul? He wanted to provoke Dr. Thomas to take up the subject of Materialism. He knew that the Dr. was considered not only exceedingly smart but sophistical. Well, they had been a long time anxiously looking for the big gun, and now it had come at last. Public sentiment had compelled him to break through his sophistical mazes, and to take up the subject of the immortal soul. He appealed to the generosity of the people. Did they think that it was right in Dr. Thomas to attack the Presbyterian Church as he had done? He had failed to answer his proofs of the immortality of the soul. But he would say nothing in defence against Dr. Thomas' attacks; for he had been prevailed upon not to say a word in defence of the Presbyterian Church. He did not know what their Arminian friends would do, had they not the 'Confession of Faith to contend against. He really felt unable to answer Dr. Thomas: he was so sophistical. Dr. Thomas had charged the Presbyterians with consigning infants to the pains of hell for ever; but he had himself never met a single Presbyterian who believed that infants were lost. If such was the belief of Calvin, it was not his belief. Christ said, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." He believed that infants went to heaven; and that they were with Christ in glory. He did not believe that it was to the glory of God that infants should be annihilated throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity, as Dr. Thomas affirms. (Dr. Thomas upon this appealed to the moderators, that he had made no such declaration; and to which they assented.) Mr. Watt continued that he believed that it was for the glory of God that they should be saved, and that he did not doubt, but that they would partake of the fulness of all joys in the presence of God, and so forth.

He had undertaken to show the tendency of Dr. Thomas' views to infidelity and atheism; and they had all heard him acknowledge that he was an infidel. (Dr. Thomas appealed to the moderators by way of explanation, that he acknowledges, that in relation to Presbyterianism and other anti-Christian systems, together with the views of the Deity as set forth in them, he is both an unbeliever or infidel, and atheistic; but that as regarded the religion of Christ, and the Bible exhibition of the Supreme, he was not. He believed firmly in the Father, and Son, and the New Institution. The moderators considered the explanation satisfactory.) Mr. Watt continued that he could perceive no difference in Dr. Thomas' views and the Presbyterian views of an infidel. An infidel was an unbeliever; and the Dr. had avowed himself to be one. There were many infidels called Christians, who, like the German Neologists and Dr. Thomas, had published to the world *a new doctrine* under the name of Christianity.

Dr. Thomas had said a good deal about the sense of Scripture being determined by the words in their context. But the meaning of the Bible is the Bible, and not the words. The words are to be understood according to their definition in Johnson and Webster. He had quoted from *Calvin's Institutes*; but who translated John Calvin, and how were they to know that he was correctly interpreted? John Calvin wrote in Latin, and it was very probable that in some places he was misrepresented for sinister purposes, for he was a much abused soul. Dr. Thomas terms Presbyterianism the religion of Calvin; but they considered Jesus Christ as the founder of the Christian religion, and that Presbyterianism is a part of that religion. He was sorry to take up their time in saying these things, but he would observe that Presbyterians had a right to put their own construction upon the Confession of Faith. He would read from Paul's second epistle to the Thessalonians in order to show that though Dr. Thomas professes to renounce Calvinism, he is himself a Calvinist. Dr. Thomas has said in his writings or speeches somewhere, that God has sent upon the clergy "strong delusion that they should believe a lie;" and, in support of this, he quotes these words—"for this cause God will send them strong delusion, that they may believe a lie, that all may be condemned." Now, if God had sent this upon them that they should be condemned, it is clear that they could not help it; and in other words, that they were predestinated to be damned, which Dr. Thomas of course believes, and, therefore, he is a Calvinist. Now the doctrine of election, which was one of the *five points* of Calvinism, was the doctrine of Scripture; for it says in Rom. ix. 11, "not being yet born, neither having done any good or evil; that the purpose of God might stand by an election, not on account of works, but of him who calls." Here then, they would see that some are reprobated, and some elected to salvation before they were born.

Presbyterians believed that man is so helpless that he can do nothing without the aid of the Holy Spirit. He did not know what Dr. Thomas meant by the Holy Spirit being the *e*-ficient teacher of the Christian religion. *E*-ficient teacher, Dr. Thomas; is that the way to pronounce the word *ef*-ficient? He never heard *ef*-ficient pronounced *e*-ficient before. But he supposed it was all right as the great Dr. Thomas so expressed it. Man could do nothing of himself; yet Dr. Thomas maintained that he could believe without any collateral operation; by the word alone. But Dr. Thomas very often says things he is unable to prove.

He referred again to the case of Adam. He contended that Adam died on the natural day on which he ate of the forbidden fruit. They all knew that his body did not die; for he lived 930 years, and begot sons and daughters in his own image, and must, therefore, have lived

bodily many centuries after his committing the original sin. It was his soul that died on that natural day. It was the death of his soul that was pronounced upon him as the punishment of his transgression.

Yesterday, they had at length been favoured with a very learned dissertation on the Hebrew word *nepshesh*, soul; and to his astonishment, Dr. Thomas had been using an orthodox book to confute orthodox sentiments. Now the word *nepshesh* (or *narpash*, according to Dr. Thomas,) had five meanings. He would confine himself to the first. Here it signified "breath, breath of life; also odour, perfume, which anything breathes or exhales." Now this appeared to him as if *nepshesh* meant something like a spirit. But there is one meaning put upon *nepshesh* by Dr. Thomas, which Dr. Thomas ought to have known was the translation of *two* words instead of *one*. The Lexicon referred to Isaiah iii. 20. Dr. Thomas, he continued, had told them yesterday that this word, in that part of the Bible, meant a *smelling-bottle*. But it never meant a smelling bottle from the creation of the world to the present day, and never would mean a smelling bottle to the end of time. For it took two words in that place to which Dr. Thomas referred, to mean smelling bottle, namely, *bottæ nepshesh*—bottles of wind, or bottles of perfume; the word signifying bottles (*bottæ*), being entirely different from the one commonly translated soul. Now, Dr. Thomas was either ignorant of the phrase smelling bottle being the translation of two Hebrew words, or he had been guilty of making a wilful misrepresentation. In either case, his conduct was highly censurable. Nothing, he conceived, could be more criminal in one professing to be a teacher of the Christian religion, than for him to impose upon an unsuspecting community by pretending to understand the language in which the Old Testament was originally written; and, consequently, to be qualified to correct and alter the English version of the Bible, whilst he was himself utterly ignorant of the very letters of the Hebrew alphabet.

"Dr. Thomas," said he, "how would it answer to translate this word smelling bottle in many places in which it occurs in the Bible? How would it answer for instance to make David say in the xlii. Psalm, 'Why art thou cast down, O my smelling bottle. And why art thou dispirited within me, O my smelling bottle?'" (Here Dr. Thomas observed, knowing the total irrelevancy of Mr. Watt's remarks, "you are beating the air, Sir!" To which Mr. Watt replied, "I am not beating the air, I am beating Dr. Thomas.") He continued, "Hereafter, Sir, whilst travelling about from place to place, if you should at any time see a rattlesnake before you in the road, you may put forth your hand and take it by the tail; but never do you again touch a Hebrew Lexicon, until you know more about the Hebrew language.

DR. THOMAS.—Before we proceed any further, my friends, I would submit again to my opponent certain propositions for his consideration growing out of what has been already presented.

1.—That the Gospel according to Presbyterianism is not the gospel of Christ as presented by Paul.

2.—That Presbyterian views of the work of the Holy Spirit are not the Scripture doctrine or teaching on the subject.

3.—That the Holy Spirit being the only authoritative, infallible, efficient, and sufficient teacher of the Christian religion in all its parts, the reason why men do not believe and practise the same things, that is, are separated into sects, is, not because they can do nothing, as Presbyterian "Divines" affirm, but because they do not learn from the same teacher, who teaches by the written word.

4.—That the word *soul* has no absolute meaning in the Scriptures, but that all its meanings are relative and dependent on the several contexts in which it occurs.

5.—That "the immortality of the soul" and "immortal soul" are phrases nowhere to be found in the Bible. And, that as words are signs of ideas, and the words of these phrases, as such, do not exist there, it must, for this reason, follow that the ideas attached to these terms were not in the mind of the Spirit when he dictated the doctrine of immortality to his scribes.

The affirmative of these propositions, I have, I believe, in a general way, shown to be untenable. I wish very much that Mr. Watt would turn his attention to them. He is on the affirmative side of the question; do pray, therefore, for the sake of humanity, let him set about the proving of them. He must perceive that a very grievous charge is contained in the first proposition against his sect. If the Presbyterian gospel he preaches is not the gospel according to Paul, in what an awful relation he and his clerical order stand to God and man. Paul pronounces a curse upon such a clergy. Would it not, my friends, be better for him to direct his energies to the proof of the affirmative set forth, rather than to be consuming his time attempting to prove the tendency of my principles to infidelity and atheism? There is something worse than infidelity at work in his own household, and that is a *palming upon mankind a spurious gospel*, and so practically "denying the faith:" which is worse than being an infidel.

Having examined the signification of the words immortal, immortality, and soul, we shall proceed to ascertain the meaning of *spirit* and *spiritual*. It is a metaphysical proposition, that *all spirit is in its own nature immortal*; but this I undertake to deny, and in opposition affirm that *spirit is oftentimes mortal*. In proof of this may be cited 1 Peter iii. 19: "He preached to the spirits in prison." Now the context shows, that these spirits were the ungodly inhabitants

of the world before the flood. They were all drowned, and thus shut up in the prison of a watery grave; they were therefore *mortal spirits*, for they tasted death.—(Eccles. iii. 21.) “The spirit of a beast goeth downward to the earth;” now as none pretend that there is anything immortal in a beast, it follows that “all spirit” in its own nature is not immortal; and lest it should be objected that this does not apply to man, we quote from the same inspired writer “that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast” (v. 19); so that what is applicable to the mortality of spirit in the lower animals, is also true of the mortality of spirit in man. Mr. Watt has quoted Job, who says “there is a *spirit* in man.” Well, we believe it; but does the existence of a spirit in man prove that it is immortal? Certainly not! the existence of a spirit in man is admitted; the immortality of that spirit is an assumption of the metaphysicians, and therefore, not worthy of belief.

But we may go farther, and from the same premisses affirm that *spirit oftentimes signifies man, and is, therefore, something corporeal*. It is sufficient to remark that the men of the antediluvian world are called spirits by the apostles. But *spirit also signifies something corporeal and immortal*, as well as corporeal and mortal. The proof of this is 1 Cor. xv. 45—“the last Adam was made a *vivifying spirit*.” This last Adam is Jesus Christ, whom he terms “the Second Man, the Lord from heaven.” This man was made a *vivifying spirit* by a resurrection from the dead; as the apostle says in his letter to the Romans, “he was declared the Son of God, with power, as to his holy spiritual nature, by his resurrection from the dead.” Now this the apostle quotes in effect to prove a proposition, which he had affirmed, namely, that “*there is a spiritual body*,” if, therefore, there is any force in his proof, “a *vivifying spirit*” and “a *spiritual body*” must be the same thing. In 2 Cor. iii. 17, Paul says “the Lord *is* the Spirit;” that is, the Lord from heaven is the vivifying spirit, or the Spiritual Man who makes alive the dead.

Spirit, then, besides other things may be corporeal and mortal, or corporeal and immortal. The types of corporeal and mortal spirits are the individuals which compose the animal kingdom, from the lowest animal *that breathes* to man as he is; while the type or pattern of corporeal and immortal spirits, is that Spiritual Body begotten from the tomb by the power of God. This Spiritual Body is the Lord Jesus Christ. He was a spirit, or an object of sense; that is, an object which, as John expresses it, “we have seen with our eyes, which we have contemplated, and our hands have handled.” John once thought that the risen Lord was a ghost or apparition, the mere creation of an affrighted imagination. But Jesus had convinced him to the contrary. He reminded his disciples that such things had neither flesh nor bones as they saw him have. Well then, my friends, *an immortal human spirit*

is a substantial being. It has eyes to see with, ears to hear with, &c.; it has a head, a trunk, superior and inferior extremities. In short, *it is a man raised from the dead to die no more.* The word spirit, by way of summary, like the word soul, has many meanings, which depend upon the context in which the word is found.

*Spiritual*, when used in connection with anything, is designed to express some quality of spirit respecting it. Thus a *spiritual body* is a body partaking of the qualities of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Spirit. So "*the law is spiritual,*" that is, it is "holy, just, and good;" which are qualities essentially opposite to what is fleshly under sin. And Jesus said that "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit;" that is, it is spiritual. For example: if an animal man be begotten to a belief of the truth by the word of truth (which comes by the Spirit through prophets and apostles), and in consequence of that belief, be baptised, or born of water, and thereafter sow to the spirit in the doing of those things required by the spirit, and reap the results of that sowing at the resurrection, in being changed into a spiritual body, *he is then born of the Spirit*, and not before. Such are called the children of God even now: "Beloved, now we are the children of God;" therefore, though animal and mortal, they are in a sense spiritual now, because their Father is Spirit. Hence he is called the Father of our spirits. Now, though these spirits die and are entombed, yet when Christ shall appear, they will be raised from the dead, divested of mortality; they will be spiritual bodies like him, and see him as he is.

"That which is born of the Spirit is spirit," is a mode of expression peculiar to the Jews. When they designed to say that one thing bore certain relations to some other thing, they would say that it was that thing. "This is my blood," "this is my body," "that rock was Christ," may all be explained upon the same principle. This wine is related to my blood as type and thing typified; or this wine signifies my blood, &c. And that which is born of the Spirit is related to the Spirit as parent and offspring, and, therefore, is spirit or spiritual. That which is born of the flesh is flesh or animal, and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit or spiritual. Thus it appears to me in brief. But we will proceed.

I will now submit to you certain propositions, which, if true, necessarily destroy the whole speculation of Plato and his Protestant disciples, in regard to the existence of an immortal principle called soul in man. These propositions are founded upon Paul's reasoning in 1 Cor. xv. concerning the resurrection of the dead.

The propositions are as follow:—

## PROPOSITION 1.

*The resurrection of the dead is necessary to their eternal existence.* In proof of this, the apostle says "if there be no resurrection, they who are dead are *perished*." Now, this proof turns upon the meaning of the word *perish*. And here I would observe, that *to die is not to perish, though to perish we must die*. Illustrative of this, I would cite the example before me of the dying of grain. The apostle says "what you sow is not made alive except it die." Now, as farmers, you all know this to be true; but suppose the seed after it had died did not come up, that nothing was re-produced, you would then say that your seed had *perished*, would you not? Certainly! Well then, to PERISH is *to die and never to come to life again*, but to DIE signifies *to lose life and to recover it again*. This is the essential difference between die and perish in the passage before us. Die is sometimes used without limitation, and perish with restriction, so arbitrary is the application or use of words; but in the question of the resurrection, as Paul has stated and illustrated it, there can be no mistake.

Well, then, if these premisses be correct, the apostle says, "if there be no resurrection, they who are dead will never come to life again;" it follows, therefore, as a matter of course, that the unresurrected dead are not now alive in any sense; consequently that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not now alive, because they are unresurrected, and, therefore, when they and the rest of the dead were alive on the earth, they had within them no other life than that which is animal, and, therefore, no immortal soul.

## PROPOSITION 2.

Seeing that the resurrection is necessary to the life of the dead, if Jesus, who is "*the resurrection and the life*," had not been raised, he would have perished; and all mankind who die, would also perish as the brutes.

In proof of this, Paul says, "if there be no resurrection of the dead, the Messiah has not been raised," and "if the dead are not raised . . . they who are fallen asleep (of whom Jesus was once one) . . . are perished." Now to this agrees the doctrine taught in the 30th Psalm. In that portion of "the Word of Christ," there is a prophecy that the Christ "should not go down to the pit," (that is, see corruption); but that he should be "raised from the grave." The Psalm is composed as if spoken by the Messiah himself. In the 8th verse, he is represented as saying,

"I cried unto thee, O Jehovah,  
To Jehovah I made supplication."

and the subject-matter of his supplication, cry, or prayer is set forth in the ninth and tenth verses, as follows:—



"What will my blood profit Thee that I should go down to the pit?"

"Can dust praise Thee? Can it (dust) declare Thy faithfulness?"

"Hear, O Lord, and have pity upon me.

"Be Thou, O Lord, my helper!"

Now the doctrine taught here is, *that Christ's death, unless followed by his resurrection, would be unprofitable for all things which the shedding of his blood was designed to effect.* He was delivered for the offences of the world, but it was necessary that he should be raised for its justification to eternal life; but had he not been raised, as the apostle says, the proclamation of the gospel was a vain thing, and those who believed it were yet in their sins, and those who had died in the belief and obedience of it, were gone to unending death. A slain but unresurrected Messiah could, in no sense, be termed "the resurrection and the life;" a purely dead man could never be the life of the world or the Prince of Life.

To go down to the pit, signifies something more than to go down to the grave. A person may go down to the grave; that is, die and be buried, and yet not go down to the pit; but a person cannot go down to the pit without first going down to the grave. Jesus went down to the grave, but God "kept him alive that he should not go down to the pit:" that is, by His reserving power, He prevented him, during his entombment under a Syrian sun, from running into decomposition, and so seeing or becoming the subject of corruption. Now, so little idea did the prophetic Messiah entertain of an immortal soul within him, capable of an immediate entrance into the presence of the Father, where it should be in a disembodied state, praising Jehovah and declaring his faithfulness, that he significantly enquires, in effect, if a man reduced to dust can celebrate his praise? Certainly not; for, as saith the prophet,

"In death no praise ascends to Thee;

In the grave, who can give Thee thanks?"—(Ps. vi. 5.)

And again he says—

"The highest heaven is for Jehovah;

But the earth He hath given to the sons of men.

The dead praise not Jehovah;

None who go down into silence!"—(Ps. cxv. 16, 17.)

The conclusion, then, from these premisses is, that if men possess within them immortal souls, which they derive from Adam the First, the non-resurrection of Christ would not be their perdition; and Paul must have made a mistake. But, if the resurrection is necessary in order to enter life, and if the dead as we shall hereafter show more fully, have no consciousness; if their resurrection depends upon the resurrection of Jesus; and if he is the author of this eternal life to them only who obey him—then it follows, that man has within him no such abstraction as an "immortal soul," which, at the death of the body, is

"borne away on Angels' wings" to the realms of light and glory.

Again, it is manifest that there is no principle of immortality in the human animal world from the consideration that it was this destitution of immortal life that was the occasion of the Word of God being sent among men. This Word became man; that is, it assumed the nature of the seed of Abraham. In this Word was life, hence it is termed *THE LIFE*; and it became the light of men. Now this life, when it had animated "a body prepared" for it—was born of a woman, and named Jesus, because he was to save his people from their sins. Among other titles conferred upon it, the life was termed the Way, and the Truth, and the Resurrection. The account he gives of himself is that he descended from heaven to do the will of Him who sent him; and that this is the will, that "whosoever recognises the Son, and believes on him, should obtain eternal life, and that He should raise him again at the last day." He says that it was out of love to the world that God sent him; for "that God has so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son, that whosoever believes on him may not *perish* (or die and never come to life again), but may obtain eternal life." But if, on the assumption of Plato, all the individuals who make up the world have in them immaterial, and, therefore, immortal lives or souls, there is no danger of the world perishing; and if they have these deathless or ever-living principles in their constitutions, the world has eternal life, and needed not either then or now, that anyone should be sent to it to bestow life upon it. But the truth is, that the constitution of man has not a particle of immortality in it; the consequence is, that if the philanthropy of God had not interposed, the world of men would have finished, races of men would have gone on succeeding one another, until by the operation of natural causes, they would have become extinct; and the earth would again have become 'void' or empty. The life descended from heaven, then, to give the world what it did not then already possess. It came, that those who chose to accept it upon the terms of the Bestower, might, after death, rise again, and live eternally in the complete enjoyment of glory, honour and immortality.

Mr. WATT said that when he was at the seminary, they were made to prove everything from the Greek. Dr. Thomas had been talking about *spirit*, and he had made it out to be material and mortal. But he believed that the spirit, like the soul, was immaterial, and therefore, immortal. Spirit in the Greek was *pneuma*, and it signified the separate and independent thinking principle in man. In Hebrew it was *ruach*, and signified the same thing. The Holy Spirit was termed *pneuma*, and was that material? It meant the immortal spirit in man. God was termed "the Father of Spirits," and the devil is the father of the spirits of the wicked. Why was God the Father of human

spirits, but because they were breathed into men by Him? God was the Father of *His* spirit; but the devil became the father of spirits by their wicked deeds. It was true that one event happens to all. All go to one place. "The dust returns to the earth as it was; and the spirit unto God who gave it." This was enough for him. It proved to him that the body was left in the grave, while the immortal spirit was carried upwards into the presence of God. But Dr. Thomas says that the dust is annihilated,<sup>o</sup> and he ridicules the idea of the immortal spirit soaring upon angels' wings to heaven! Dr. Thomas says that dust is the residuum of man when gone to decay, and that it is this dust which is to be raised from the dead; but when a man dies, and his dust is scattered by the winds, where is this residuum to be found? How can that which is all driven away be raised to life again, having the same identity? But nothing is too difficult for Dr. Thomas, who says that *nepheesh* means a smelling bottle!

Dr. Thomas has said many things from Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. I'm sure I can't tell where he gets them all from. He says that to die is not to perish. He believed Dr. Thomas was wrong in this. Esther said "I will go in unto the king, which is not according to law, and if I perish, I perish." Now he contended that the Queen did not mean by this that if she perished she would be annihilated; but if she died, then she must die. He quoted other passages also to show the same thing. The word in the Greek was *apoolonto*, from *apollumi*, from *apo* and *luoo*, to destroy. Couldn't a thing be destroyed and yet be conscious for ever? Were not the wicked said to be destroyed, and yet did they not live in the pains of hell? Dr. Thomas said that seeds die before they put forth. How can a seed put forth, or vegetate, if it died? Botanists said that the seed begins to die; his impressions were that the seed did not die, and that there was no material difference between "to perish" and "to die."

In his Tussekiah discourse, Dr. Thomas had told them that people did not go to heaven before they were raised from the dead. Now this he considered one of Dr. Thomas' out of the way notions. Didn't Moses go to heaven before he was raised? Didn't the spirit of Moses appear with Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration? But Dr. Thomas said it was not his immortal soul, but the man Moses himself. He (Mr. Watt), however, believed it was his immortal soul, for his body died and was buried; and his spirit returned to God who gave it; and consequently, people did go to heaven as soon as they died, and before they were raised. There was the case likewise of Lazarus, which was quite sufficient to set aside Dr. Thomas' notion. He died and was immediately carried by angels away to Abraham's bosom; not his

---

<sup>o</sup> This is not correct. We neither affirm nor believe such a thing.

body, but the spirit of Lazarus. Here was the departed spirit of a man borne away by angels to heaven, and yet Dr. Thomas ridicules the idea of such a thing. The rich man's spirit was in hell in a state of torment; the destiny of these two, therefore, was fixed, and they were both the subject of it without any resurrection; and, therefore, Dr. Thomas' idea of people not going to heaven or hell before the resurrection, is altogether out of the way.

Having consumed the remainder of his time in *badinage*, the "reverend" gentleman sat down.

DR. THOMAS.—"The Father of our spirits," my friends, is a phrase which occurs in Hebrews xii. 10. It is used by the apostle in contrast with the expression, "Fathers of our flesh;" and is applied to those only of mankind to whom God is related as a Father. Sinners have fathers of their flesh, but they have no father of their spirits in the sense of the apostle. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and nothing more. It has nothing of which God is spiritually the Father. In order to have spirits of which God can or will acknowledge himself to be the parent, they must be begotten of the Father according to His will *by the word of truth*, and then be born of water into His spiritual family. They will then be his adopted children and enrolled in heaven; and being the subjects of a perfect remission, they will be recognized by the Judge of All as perfectly justified human Spirits.

Somewhere about the beginning of this debate, Mr. Watt adduced the case of Abraham being gathered to his fathers, as a proof of the immortality of the soul and its disembodied existence in heaven after death. In doing this, however, he unfortunately proved too much; for, without intending it, no doubt, he has proved that idolators go straight to heaven at the period of their decease. Now, if this be true, certainly he deserves the thanks of our Universalist friends; for while they save *all men*, though some of them through ages of fire, Mr. Watt takes a shorter cut, and, sparing them the pains of a Universalist punishment, delays not the salvation of the wicked for a day, but despatches them in the twinkling of an eye into the heavenly world.

It is clear, says Mr. Watt, that there is a place of departed spirits, and therefore, departed spirits themselves, from the passage which says, that "Abraham was gathered to his fathers." Now we know that Abraham's ancestors were not buried in the cave of Machpelah; because this belonged to the sons of Heth until Abraham bought it to bury Sarah in; it does not mean, therefore, that Abraham was gathered to his fathers in the grave when he was buried there; but it means that he went to them in heaven. Now, my friends, by this Mr. Watt teaches that "the souls" of idolators who have died such, are in heaven; for the father of Abraham was an idolator, as we are informed by

Joshua, who said unto all the people, "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old times, even Terah, the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor; *and they served other gods*"—that is, they were idolators. Mr. Watt's divinity teaches, then, that men may have other gods besides Jehovah, and yet take up their abode in the highest heaven where the true God is; and consequently that men dying in their sins,—yes, in the practice of a sin equal to witchcraft and rebellion against God, where He is may go, though Christ says they cannot. Such "divinity" may do for New Platonists, but for the taught of God, it can be held in no other light than fabulous.

But when it says that Abraham, or any one else, was gathered to his fathers, the phrase neither indicates that they and the deceased met as spirits in heaven nor corporeally in the grave. "All go to one place," saith the Scripture. And what place is that? It is *the place of the dead*; and because it is *invisible*, it is by the Greeks termed *Hades*. This word is composed of *a* (alpha) which has the power of a negative, as of *no*, *not*, or *un*, *in*, &c., in composition; and *idein*, to see. If then *idein* be to see, *a-idein* is *not to see*. So that when this word *aidein*, or by contraction *hadees*, is translated into plain English, it signifies simply, *obscure*, *dark*, *invisible*, *unseen*. The one place, then, which is the common receptacle of the dead, is generically, as of the whole, termed *obscure*, *dark*, *invisible*, or *unseen* by the living. One dead and buried is in *hades*, because he is in a dark place and invisible; and if two persons in remote parts of the earth, who are related by blood as father and son, successively die and are buried, the latter deceased may in strict propriety be said to be gathered to his fathers, when corporeally deposited in the dark place of the dead. Much mystical learning has been displayed, to the amusement and bewilderment of common sense, in defining the meaning of this Greek word. The controversies which have been held upon it owe their origin, not to the difficulty of the word itself, (for there is no more occasion for a controversy about *hades* than there is for one about the meaning of *invisible*, *unseen*, or *dark*)—but to the metaphysics of Socrates and Plato concerning a soul separately existent after death. If such an abstraction be admitted, then a place must be provided for it; but if there should happen to be no such thing, then all the learned speculations about the *unseen*, or *hades*, fall with the evanishing of their ideal ghost.

Abraham was gathered to his fathers, who had long before become the tenants of the dark. A place into which no ray of light penetrates—no beam to disperse the surrounding gloom. A profound and snoreless sleep holds there, whose repose the loudest thunder cannot disturb; while darkness is the winding sheet of those who lie in the

place of corruption in the land of forgetfulness.

"Canst Thou, O Jehovah," says the prophet, "show wonders to the dead?  
 Shall the dead arise and praise Thee?  
 Shall Thy goodness be declared in the grave?  
 Or Thy faithfulness be declared in *the place of corruption*?  
 Shall Thy wonders be known *in the dark*;  
 And Thy justice in *the land of forgetfulness*?"—(Psalm lxxxviii. 10.)

To these questions we may answer, Yes! For the dead in their graves, among whom are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and come forth to the enjoyment of life, even of that life and that inheritance promised to them by the Almighty, and confirmed to them by two immutable things—Himself and His word—which it is impossible for him to falsify.

Mr. Watt has cited the case of Lazarus, in order to prove the immortality of the soul and its immediate translation to heaven on the wings of angels, when separated by death from the body. This case of Lazarus is a fable or a parable. It was spoken to illustrate what Jesus had been teaching, namely: "*sooner shall heaven and earth perish than one tittle of the law fail.*" It was not intended to illustrate the doctrine of an intermediate state, or to teach anything about the region of the dead at all. Three speakers are introduced into the parable, Dives, Lazarus, and Abraham. The last was respected as the greatest of men by the audience with whom Jesus was conversing. Hence, he puts into the mouth of Abraham a declaration which indicates the importance of attending to that law which should not pass away until every jot and tittle of it be fulfilled. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets," says Abraham, "neither will they be persuaded though one should arise from the dead."

Much might be said on this parable, in consequence of the numerous old wives' fables which have been incorporated with it by Doctors of Divinity. But we do not deem it necessary, upon this occasion. One thing we would observe, if Mr. Watt can prove that Abraham is in heaven, we will readily admit that Lazarus is there. He affirms that the spirit of Abraham is in glory: I deny it. Let him, then, produce his proofs, and having examined them as presented, I will, if the affirmative can be sustained, cordially embrace it. Till then, his interpretation of the parable is mere speculation, and can only be regarded as such.

But to proceed. As I have already hinted, my friends, Mr. Watt, in the acuteness of his reasoning, has proved the soul to be mortal, though, doubtless, without intending it! So, then, according to Mr. Watt the soul of man is mortal! Why need we, then, dispute any further? I maintain that man is mortal—corporeally, intellectually, and morally: that the whole man, in all his faculties, is mortal and no

more; and to this Mr. Watt seems to agree; "for," says he; "what else does eternal life signify but whatever God has to bestow, where it says, 'in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die?' It denotes that as God is a God of truth, the soul must die: it must be deprived of all happiness, though the body should not die; for Adam's body did not die on that day when he eat of the fruit; therefore, it must have been his soul." This appears to me like proving the mortality of the soul; but I confess I have no faith in Mr. Watt's conclusion, although it brings him to conclude with me. He says that the passage proves his view of eternal life, which signifies all that God has to bestow. Now, though it is true, that he who attains to immortality will receive all things connected with it, yet life is one thing, and the things of that life another. The Lord God was not referring to the latter when he said "in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die." Neither was it his soul or body that died in *fact* upon that day. In the margin of some Bibles it reads, "dying thou shalt die." That is, on the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt begin to die or to return to the dust out of which thou wast taken. But the best interpretation that can be given of the threatened punishment for disobedience, is contained in the sentence pronounced, namely, "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread TILL thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Here the sentence sets forth that man should be the subject of a returning to dust; in other words, that a process of decay should obtain in his constitution till he should be prostrated in the dust from which he originally came. He died in law on the day he transgressed, he died, in fact, aged 930 years; and these periods limit the beginning and the ending of his returning to his mother earth.

Mr. WATT.—Dr. Thomas teaches that when infants, idiots, and pagans die, they become the subjects of the damnation of annihilation. According to his theory they die like brutes, and there is an end of them! They are all mere mortals, destitute of immortal souls; and, if he is right, only those who obey the true gospel ever enter upon eternal life! He and his followers, of course, who have been baptized with the true baptism, among the number! But I can prove that Dr. Thomas is wrong, unless Christ and the apostles didn't teach the truth.

In John v. 29, Jesus said that "all who are in their graves should come forth." Now I should like to know what *all* meant, if it did not mean all the dead of all classes and ages—infants, idiots, and pagans? Does Dr. Thomas mean to say that when Jesus said *all*, he only meant a few? In Rom. v. 18, the apostle says, "as by the offence of one, judgment came upon *all* men to condemnation, even so by

the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon *all* men unto justification of life." Here you will see all the posterity of Adam died in consequence of his transgression; don't infants and idiots *all* die? To be sure they do. Well, *all* these, by the righteousness of Christ, are justified to life; for, "by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." This is sufficient to convince me that not one of the posterity of Adam will go down to the gates of death to remain there the subject of the damnation of annihilation. But if Dr. Thomas isn't satisfied with this, I will refer him to 1 Cor. xv. 22: "As by Adam all die, so also by Christ shall *all* be made alive." Here death was as extensive as the human race, and so immortality is as universal also. All mankind, therefore, have immortal spirits, and will all rise again, although Dr. Thomas might teach the contrary.

Dr. Thomas has favoured you with the meaning of *nephesh*, soul or smelling bottle; I will try to say something about another Hebrew word, which is often used for the separate and independent spirit also; though I can nowhere find that it means a smelling bottle. This is *ruach*, in Greek *pneuma*. It signifies *spirit*, the vital spirit, the principle of life, and with another Hebrew word, *ruach aleim*, the Spirit of God. Now, what is the principle of life but an immortal principle, the human spirit, termed *ruach elohe*, because breathed into man from God? It was God that breathed the *ruach*, or rational soul, into the nostrils of the man he had formed; it was a part of his own nature, and therefore, immaterial; and because immaterial, therefore immortal.

Mr. Watt then proceeded to amuse the audience by jesting about Dr. Thomas and smelling bottles, as much to the amusement of Dr. Thomas as of himself. He, therefore, laid down his pencil, and in enjoying the exhibition, omitted to take further notes of this speech.

DR. THOMAS.—My friends, my opponent has asked me in effect the very important question, "What is man?" He is very desirous for me to say in the peculiar phraseology in which he put the query, if man was *nothing but dust*; to which I replied, "dust thou art and to dust thou shalt return." But, I might have replied in the words of Abraham, "I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, who am *but dust and ashes*;" or in the language of the prophet, who says, "the Lord knoweth our frame, he remembereth that *we are dust*." Yes, we are but dust and ashes; for out of the ground we were taken, and thither must we return. But is it not possible to ascertain the constitution of our nature from that book which is a revelation to man of his origin, nature, and final destiny? I believe it is, if we will only approach its revelations in the disposition of children, and be content to learn, and not presume to teach the Almighty.



Well then, in answer to the question, I affirm the following

PROPOSITION.

*That an animal man is but dust, formed by the hand of God, and made alive by His power; that this animated dust is called a living soul in Scripture; and that the living soul is mortal, but that on certain conditions, it may become immortal.*

Now this proposition I affirm, and feel confident I can prove. If I cannot, then, of course, I fail to establish the absolute mortality of man as a whole; nevertheless, my failure will not prove that there is an immaterial, and therefore an immortal principle in man, capable of an existence separate from and independent of the body; that can see without eyes, hear without ears, speak without a tongue, think without a brain, walk without legs, and so forth. That fictitious thing, as I regard it, requires positive evidence to establish its existence; a something more rational and demonstrative than the metaphysical axiom, "I am, because I think." Because I think, and because a dead man cannot think, and because a man capable of thinking without a cerebrum has never existed in the world—for these reasons, the conclusion ought to be "because I think, &c., I have a living brain;" or assuming the brain to be the speaker, it would say, "I (the brain) am, because I think:" this would be a much more rational, or rather common sense decision.

But as to the *terms* of my proposition, by an *animal* man I mean a *natural* man; that is, a man as he is found in the kingdom of nature. A man who is subject to the same laws as all other animals; but differing from them principally by the great perfectibility of some of his organs. The native of Van Diemen's Land and New South Wales is an example of an animal man at the extremity or lower limit of the race, on the one hand; while Bacon and Sir Isaac Newton may be cited as illustrations of the same animal being at the upper. By an *animal* man, then, I mean an organized and sensuous creature, capable of acting only in conformity with the imperfect material organs or faculties of which he is composed.

By *formed*, I mean, made up of parts, which when duly arranged, give shape or form to the dust; by *form* and *organization*, I understand the same thing. To form or organise the dust of the ground in the work of the six days, was to mould it into the form of all animals, from the lowest up to man. By *animated dust*, I mean, the dust formed into a man and made alive; by *mortal*, subject to death; and by *immortal*, imperishable, incorruptible, indestructible, undying.

In proof of this proposition it is written: 1.—"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."—(Gen. ii. 7.)

2.—“And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground he made to grow *the TREE of LIFE* in the midst of the garden, and *the TREE of KNOWLEDGE of GOOD and EVIL*. And he commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for *in the day* that thou eatest thereof *thou shalt surely DIE*.”—(v. 8-17.)

3.—“Cursed is the ground for thy sake, O man! In sorrow shalt thou eat of it *all the days of thy life*; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, *till thou return unto the ground*; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.”—(Gen. iii. 18, 19.)

4.—“And the Lord God said, Behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, *LEST he put forth his hand and take also of the TREE of LIFE, and eat, and LIVE FOR EVER*: so he drove out the man.”—(v. 22.)

5.—“I have taken upon me to speak to the Lord, who am but dust and ashes.”—*Abraham*.

6.—“The sons of men—are beasts (or animals). For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one (*ruach* Hebrew, *pneuma* Greek, *spiritus* Latin or) breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast. All (both men and beasts) go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.”—(Eccles. iii. 18-20.)

7.—“There is an animal body; for thus it is written, the first man, Adam, was made a living soul.”—(1 Cor. xv. 44, 45.)

8.—“The wages of sin is death; but the gracious gift of God is everlasting life (immortality) by Christ Jesus our Lord.”—(Rom. vi. 23.)

Now the first point in our proofs to be observed, is that the dust of the ground was *first* formed or organised, and that this organic dust was called man; and *second*, it was then *animated* or made alive, and was then denominated a *LIVING SOUL*. According to Moses, then, a living man is a living soul, and not a something within him. I believe in living souls, my friends, although there are interested persons who, for their own bye-ends, would persuade you, that I deny the existence of souls. Can I help believing in living souls when I see with my natural eyes so many men and women before me? If I had been born blind, I might have doubted, had I neither heard nor felt them; but seeing, hearing and feeling, I believe the evidence of these senses.

Now, that a living soul is nothing but animated organic dust, that is, an animal or living creature (for that is the meaning of the Latin word *anima*), appears from our seventh proof. The apostle Paul

affirms a proposition, and says "there is an animal body." Very well; so Paul asserts and we believe; but what proof does he adduce to establish his proposition? for he must prove it, or it rests upon his assertion only at the place referred to. Why, he quotes the testimony of Moses in my first proof, and continues "for thus it is written, 'the first man, Adam, was made a *living soul*.'" Now, if this citation be any proof of the apostle's proposition, *animal body* and *living soul* must signify the same thing, namely, a *natural creature*. Hence we can account for Moses applying the term soul or living soul to all other animals besides men. Anything formed of the dust, and breathing the vital air or breath of life, is a living soul according to the Scriptures. Now the kingdom of living souls precedes that of spirits or spiritual bodies; "for," says Paul, "there is an animal body and there is a spiritual body; however, that was not first which is spiritual." Popular theologians consider what they call "the immortal soul" and "the living soul" as identical; but Paul, as we have seen, did not. "There is a spiritual body," says Paul, "which is incorruptible, glorious and powerful;" but the living soul or animal body he teaches is corruptible, dishonourable, weak and mortal. Nevertheless, he consoles us that this corruptible, animal body, or living soul, shall put on immortality, when death, or mortality, is swallowed up for ever.

But that this living soul, called the animal man, is entirely mortal, is still more apparent from our proofs. Our second teaches us that the earthy or animal man was placed in the Garden of Eden, sometimes called Paradise, because of the delights it contained, "to dress and to keep it." His occupation was earthly, and his gratifications sensuous; yet until he transgressed he was 'very good.' Now, you will observe, that by placing him in this garden the Lord God had brought him into *new relations*. Before he entered the garden, he was the subject of unmixed good; for he was very good, and everything was very good around him. In short, it was impossible for him to become the subject of evil as well as good, until a law should say to him *thou shalt not do this or that*. But when placed in Eden, his relations were increased. For in the garden there were two trees: the one may be termed the TREE OF MORTALITY, because it possessed the property of imparting *death* to the eater; and the other may be termed the TREE OF IMMORTALITY, because it possessed the power of imparting *unending life* to him who should eat of its fruit—even though he had eaten of the tree of mortality; that is, it could perpetuate life, though it could not deliver the eater of the forbidden fruit from the evils thereof. Now the man, the subject of nothing but good, was placed in relation to these two trees. And here let us pause while we propound a common sense enquiry to our audience. If mortality resided in the one tree and immortality in the other, what was man in relation to these things? If

one reply "he was mortal," we rejoin that cannot be; for mortality was a consequence of his doing what at that time he had not done: mortality was a property of the tree, and where would have been the sense of interdicting the man from eating on pain of becoming mortal, when he is alleged to be already so? Our eighth proof says "the wages of sin is death or mortality;" but Adam had not yet sinned, therefore he had earned no such wages, and mortality consequently was not a part of his constitution before his fall. If another reply, "he was immortal," we rejoin, that cannot be either; for immortality was predicated of the Tree of Life, and not of the man. Besides, had Adam been immortal, the wages of sin could not have been death; neither could immortality be the gracious gift of God *by Jesus Christ*, the Second Adam, unless that which is immortal can die, and that which is already immortal receive what it already possesses as a gift by another person. What, then, do you make of Adam, exclaims a third; if he be neither mortal nor immortal, what was he then? The answer to this question is, that Adam, when in Eden's garden, *was placed there on probation*. The probationary state was necessary, and seems to be in conformity with God's moral government throughout. Jesus was placed on probation in the wilderness for forty days; Abraham also when called upon to offer up Isaac, and so forth. These were put to the proof to test their obedience to God's law; and both of them proved themselves more virtuous than the earthly Adam. He was called upon to judge himself worthy or unworthy of eternal life. He was free to obey, and as free to transgress. He was constituted an intellectual, moral, and physical being, capable of living an endless life, or of having his life cut short by death. Adam was neither mortal nor immortal, but *capable of becoming either*; he was interdicted from eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil under the penalty of death; but he listened to the tempter through Eve. She gave him of the fruit, and he did eat, and from that time forth the bounds of his experience were enlarged, and he became the subject of evil as well as good. He incurred the penalty of death on the day itself prescribed by the law of God.

But the penalty was not immediately executed, and, for a time, he still remained a tenant of the garden. Hence his danger was still imminent. It was a sore evil to have incurred the punishment of death, with all its forerunning evils, to which flesh is subject; but it would have been a sorer had he put forth his hand and taken also of the Tree of Life; for, if it be a calamity to live 930 years, the sorrowful and laborious cultivator of the ground accursed; the toiling subject of trouble, anxiety, and disease—how much greater would that calamity have been, had Adam become the *immortal* victim of such a state. To live for ever the subject of good and evil. Who among us

would desire it? Three score years and ten are too long, but what would a "forever" be?

Now in all that God has done for man, he has had a view to his happiness on earth. "The earth he has given to the sons of men;" hence he had always designed to make it fit for the excellent to dwell in. This, therefore, has rendered the punishment of sin necessary in order to correct its consequences, which would be to make it untenable by the just. In inflicting vengeance, then, upon any portion of man's race, the Almighty does it out of regard to human kind—the species is punished for the preservation of the genus man. Now, upon this view of the case, we see the goodness and philanthropy of God, in visiting Adam with death as the consequence of his becoming the subject of good and evil. After living for centuries the subject of sorrow, mixed up indeed with some good, God kindly released him by *an extinction of sensation and reflection.*

Again, the goodness and philanthropy of God are conspicuous in our fourth proof. For, said the Lord God, "LEST Adam put forth his hand, and take also of the Tree of Life, and eat, and *live for ever*"—therefore he expelled him from the Garden of Eden. But some may inquire, wherein is the loving-kindness of God conspicuous in that he should endeavour to prevent the man from eating that which would confer on him eternal life; for it says *he drove him out lest he should eat, and live for ever?* The answer is, that His goodness is manifest in that He expelled him *lest he should eat, and live for ever the subject of good and evil:* for, though by eating of the Tree of Knowledge, he had become the subject of good and evil, yet by eating of the Tree of Life, the extinction of life would have been superseded by the perpetuation of his existence for ever. The Lord God, therefore, knowing that he had imparted this property to the Tree of Life, and *not desiring that man should live for ever the sorrowful inhabitant of a hapless world,* he broke up his relation to the Tree of Life in Eden by an expulsion, and by setting up sentinels to prevent any access to it afterwards. "So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the Garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the Tree of Life."

And here I would propose this query—if the man was expelled from Eden's garden, that he might not eat and live for ever, was he mortal or immortal? That is, had he any principle within him by which his existence could be perpetuated eternally, or had he not? If any one say he had, then why expel him from the garden lest he should become immortal? In such a case, if he ate of the Tree he could be no more than immortal; if it were a property of his nature to live for ever before eating of the Tree of Immortality, nothing would be superadded to him by eating thereof. The truth of the matter is briefly

and simply this; Adam ate of the Tree of Knowledge, and, therefore, chose mortality for his inheritance; he was expelled from the garden to prevent him from becoming the immortal subject of sorrow; therefore, the Tree of Life having imparted none of its virtue to the earthy Adam, he continued altogether mortal, "in body, soul, and spirit, the whole person:" and hence, "as was the earthy, so also are the earthy," his animal descendants, who bear his image—mortal in all the parts, or elements of their constitution. Thus "sin," the transgression of law, "entered into the world by one man," Adam, "in whom," as the animal parent of all living, "all" are regarded as having "sinned, and by sin, death" or mortality; so death came upon all men, his descendants.

All the progeny of Adam, then, are born of the flesh into a *state of sin, a necessary attribute of which is mortality*. This sinful state, which makes up the animal existence of man, is more or less mixed up with good and evil. None of the human race are exempt from the evil; though they partake in different proportions of the good. Pestilence, famine, and war; the earthquake, volcano, and flood, mingle in their desolations men, women, babes, and beasts alike. One common lot happens to them all without exception. But if God mercifully subjected the creature to frailty, and placed it, in His wisdom, in the bondage of a perishing state, He has said to all *who come within the sound of this word, let him that is thirsty, come*:—"whoever will, let him come and take of the water of life freely." If He has expelled their earthly progenitor from Eden's Tree of Life, He has set before His descendants "the Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God;" *and to him that overcomes, He says, "I will give to eat of it."* Now the superiority of the Tree of Life in the paradise of God, over the Tree of Life in the Garden of Eden, consists in this, that whereas the eating of Eden's Tree would have perpetuated man's existence eternally in "a perishing state," that is, in a state ever renewing and becoming old and decayed; the eating of the fruit of the tree in the paradise of God will perpetuate his life for ever in "an inheritance which is incorruptible, and undefiled, and unfading"—an inheritance into which "nothing unclean can enter." It will be a state of pure and unmixed good—no alloy of evil will be there.

From these considerations, then, it must be apparent that man has no such thing as "an immortal soul" within him; that he is purely mortal in all his faculties; that immortality is in the Tree of Life in the paradise of God; and, therefore, that whoever longs after, or thirsts for it, must seek that he may obtain it.

I consider, then, that my proposition is fully and abundantly sustained.

## FOURTH DAY.

Mr. WATT commenced by observing that many of his best friends had advised him to have nothing to do with the debate. He had undertaken it contrary to their wishes. He had endeavoured to tell Dr. Thomas that he considered there was a tendency in his doctrines to Atheism. He had defied him on his principles to prove that there was a God. He that believes in a God without evidence, was not very far removed from Atheism; and it was his conviction that if Dr. Thomas denied the existence of the immortal soul, he must deny the existence of the Deity. A spiritual effect must have a spiritual cause. The soul of man was a spiritual effect; it was a particle of the divine essence which God breathed into his body when he formed him, and God was the spiritual cause of its being. But if the human soul was not spiritual, then it was merely natural, and could not have God, who is a spirit, for the Father of it. Now, if Dr. Thomas knocked from under him the belief of the immortality of the soul, he would take from him the belief of the being of a God; for, if there was no immortal soul, then there was no God.

Dr. Thomas was incessantly urging upon him a string of propositions. He had nothing to do with them. He expected that Dr. Thomas should take up his reply to his Tussekiah discourse, and consider that. He had told Dr. Thomas that the soul was not the blood, but a separate and independent spirit; that Materialism was repugnant to common sense and contrary to all true philosophy, and amounted to Atheism. Now, let Dr. Thomas consider these things; he expected that his reply to that discourse should be answered; but instead of doing so, Dr. Thomas kept asking him to reply to his propositions.

Dr. Thomas had said that he had proved that idolators were in heaven, but he did not understand what he meant by saying so; he was sure he did not intend to prove any such thing. He hoped, however, that Dr. Thomas would take up the meaning of the phrase "things in heaven," which he had used in his discourse at Tussekiah. "Things in heaven," he thought, were far away from this world, and were to be found only where God reigns; but Dr. Thomas made things on earth the same as things in heaven. Now, this he regarded as false, and convinced him that a very serious charge lay against Dr. Thomas. It was a charge that ought to make him tremble; for it was no other than that of misrepresenting the Holy Spirit. This was an awful thing, and Dr. Thomas had most arrogantly and presumptuously done it. For his part, he could not speak of the man respectfully. He could not help it, but he spoke as he felt. He supposed that where Jesus was there was heaven, and it said that Jesus had passed into heaven itself. The things of that heaven were the heavenly things,

Paul wrote of ; but Dr. Thomas had told them at Tussekiah, that these heavenly things were on earth. He makes baptisms, saints, prayers, the Lord's Supper, &c., "things in heaven." But for his part, he thought there had been disputing enough about baptism here without disputing about it in heaven. Would Dr. Thomas not let poor man be free from disputing in heaven ; he thought they had had enough of such work upon earth.

While Dr. Thomas was thinking over these matters, he would make some further remarks upon the word *nephesh*. He had no doubt, though some had, that Dr. Thomas had said that *narp hash* meant smelling bottles. As soon as he said so, he (Mr. W.) wrote down his words. Holding up a smelling bottle to the eye of the audience, Mr. Watt continued.—Now could Dr. Thomas possibly think that there was in reality any resemblance between the human soul and the little bottle he held in his hand. He proceeded: "Notwithstanding, my hearers, the magnificent display of Hebrew learning with which Dr. Thomas thought proper to favour us the other evening, my mind is under the painful impression that he does not know the letters of the Hebrew alphabet; for in the first place, he did not pronounce correctly the word, the meaning of which he undertook to expound. He called it *nawpash*, and behold it is *nephesh*. And again, he could not see that there were two words instead of one, where the meaning given in the Lexicon is smelling bottles. Now, Sir, addressing himself to Dr. Thomas, I have chosen to say this to your face, and not behind your back, that there may be no complaint about it. If I am doing you any injustice, I exceedingly regret it. If, however, I am in an error, I can easily be set right. There is a Hebrew Bible. If you do really understand the Hebrew language, take it, open it, and read us two or three sentences out of it, and we will generously acknowledge that you are a Hebrew scholar.

He observed, that he had proved that either Dr. Thomas or James Shelburn was the subject of the damnation of annihilation. If Dr. Thomas preached the gospel, then James Shelburn preached a different one, and was accursed; but if he preached the truth, then Dr. Thomas was doomed by the apostle to the damnation of annihilation. They had heard Dr. Thomas deny the existence of the soul; he would not allow that the immortal soul had a being; yet David says, "My flesh shall rest in hope; for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell;" or, as it reads in the *Septuagint*—which was published about 300 years before Christ—in *hades*, the place of departed spirits. Now here, the flesh refers to the body, which goes into the grave, and the soul, to the immortal spirit, which returns to God who gave it. The flesh sees corruption, while the soul is ushered into the presence of God, where there is fulness of joy and pleasures for evermore.



The immortality of the soul has been believed through all ages. Socrates, one of the greatest of ancient philosophers, taught that the soul of man was immortal, because it was immaterial. It was believed to be a particle of the very essence of God Himself, and that as it was originally an inhabitant of light and glory, so it gave to man that longing after glory in heaven, which all had more or less. The Pharisees believed in the immortality of the soul before Christ came; the Greeks and Romans generally admitted it, and so have all nations since. The Sadducees, however, denied it, and like Dr. Thomas, maintained that the soul was mortal. The mortality of the soul was a Sadducean doctrine, newly revived in our day by Dr. Thomas, who with them rejected the belief of spirits. Dr. Thomas very truly says, "that the Mahommedan, who believes in the instantaneous translation of the 'spirit' to Paradise, will condemn him; the worshippers of wood and stone, who have a paradise of their own peculiar formation, to which their spirits immediately depart on the extinction of life, will condemn him; the poor Indian of the forest, whose spirit goes with the velocity of lightning to a community of warriors, and to the fair hunting fields of his elysian abode, would tomahawk him were he to question the sudden transfer of his ghost from the prairies and wilds of earth, to the country of deer in heaven; and thus he would prove, to him in a summary manner, that he was not only unfit to be 'admitted into Christian company,' but that he was unworthy of the society of the wildest Seminole."—(*A. Adv.* iii. 29.) Yes, all these would condemn him, and pronounce Dr. Thomas 'unfit for Christian company.' Dr. Thomas might get a little knot of followers around him, that were willing, for the sake of novelty, to go with him all his lengths; but the evidences of the immortality of the soul were too plain to be generally renounced. Why, they were so manifest, that the most stupid Indian believed it. Mankind in general never became so stupid or so debased as to disbelieve so palpable a truth. It is true, that it is not revealed in the Bible, because everybody knows it; and if this doctrine, which was so popular in ancient times among the Jews, was not true, why did not Jesus preach against it, as Dr. Thomas has in our day? He would like to be informed of the reason of that.

DR. THOMAS.—I am under the necessity, my friends, of again calling up my propositions to the attention of my opponent. That he may not forget them, I will repeat them, together with those which have accumulated upon our hands since yesterday. Dr. Thomas then read the *five* propositions already stated on page 62, and proceeded to add:—

6.—The resurrection of the dead is necessary to eternal life, and seeing this is true, it follows that if Jesus, who is the resurrection

and the life, had not risen, he would have perished ; and consequently, all mankind who die, would also perish as the brutes.

7.—That Christ's death, unless followed by his resurrection, would be unprofitable for all the things which the shedding of his blood was designed to effect ; there would, therefore, have been no remission of sins : so that, upon the principle of one dying in his sins being excluded from the presence of God, there would have been no life and incorruptibility for man.

8.—That to die is not to perish, but that to perish we must die.

9.—That a thing is not necessarily immortal because it is spiritual, nor spiritual because it thinks.

10.—That the expulsion of Adam from Eden proves that he was altogether mortal ; because he was expelled that he might not eat of the tree of life, and so live for ever.

11.—That Abraham is not in heaven. Mr. Watt says that he is, but this I deny ; therefore, let him prove it. I deny also that men dying in the sin of idolatry are in heaven ; but Mr. Watt's 'proofs' declare they are: this also I deny, and therefore call upon him to examine the matter.

I shall now proceed to comment upon some other matters entering into the composition of my opponent's learned speeches. He has elicited your laughter this morning, as well he might (for how could you forbear laughing at such simplicity), when, with such a serio-comic air, he drew forth a smelling bottle from his pouch. The "reverend divine" reminded me very much of an anecdote I had read of an old monk in Portugal, who, to impress his audience with a deep solemnity at the destiny which awaited them, drew from beneath his cloak a death's head and cross bones, and holding them up to the people, propounded them as the text of a sermon on mortality. And so my opponent, having little power of argument, and being scanty of his proofs withal, has set before your eyes a smelling bottle, best fitted to illustrate his own absurdity.

You have heard a great deal, my friends, about my ignorance of the Hebrew language. It has been alleged that I know nothing of Hebrew, its pronunciation, or even the letters of its alphabet. Now suppose this allegation were true, does it prove that there is an immortal principle in man? One thing I would observe, and that is, that however ignorant I may be, I know enough of Hebrew to understand a criticism, to secure myself against clerical perversions of the original. As to my Hebrew scholarship, the history is simply this, and one which I think, will be sufficient for all purposes of explanation, refutation, and defence. About fifteen years ago I studied Hebrew by the help of *Wilson's Grammar*. Professor Wilson's system was that of teaching without the use of the Masoretic points. These points, the majority of

the learned say, were superadded to the written words of the language about 900 years ago ; hence the Hebrew was originally written and pronounced before they were conceived of, according to the power of the vowel letters contained in the alphabet. The pronunciation of the Hebrew in the third century was widely different from that which results from adopting the Masoretic reading. It matters not how a Hebrew word is pronounced, it does not at all affect its signification. The true sound of its words is lost ; hence it makes no difference, except as a matter of taste, whether you pronounced *nphsh*, the word for soul, *naphash*, *niphish*, *nephesh*, *nophesh*, and so forth ; the radical letters which make up the word remain the same. Well, this was the doctrine I imbibed from the dissertations of Professor Wilson on the unpointed reading of the Hebrew. After a while I became acquainted with a gentleman who was about going to Oxford to study "divinity." Not having furnished himself with elementary Hebrew books he borrowed mine—as I supposed for a short time (they were Wilson, Buxtorf, and a copy of the Psalms,)—but forgot to return them. This interrupted my Hebrew studies, which have not been seriously resumed from that day to this ; not having at hand, when inclination prompted, books to gratify the desire. Thus, my friends, you have the history of my case. Having had weightier matters to engage your attention with, than the rigmarole of my opponent, I have left it to him to consume his time to his own bitter amusement, while I labour to establish in your minds the true doctrine of eternal life.

I come now to the consideration of "the thief on the cross." This has been made a great handle of by clergymen, and those who learn their religion from the distillations of their lips ; termed by certain of their admirers, "the droppings of the sanctuary." They have taken the case of this Jewish malefactor and constructed an institution upon him for the remission of the sins of all who on their deathbeds "give the sign and die ;" an institution which supersedes all obedience to the gospel and its requirements, and saves every slave to unrighteousness by a word, and sometimes by merely a thought and an inaudible sign. Death-bed repentance, my friends, is a thing for which there is no example under the Pentecostian Dispensation. Jesus *in effect*, pardoned the thief, but you will remember that he was the only one authorised to forgive sins. He could absolve a sinner in an unprecedented way. He could say "thy sins are forgiven ;" but no one ever lived before or since, who could give assurance to any one of the forgiveness of their sins *independently of a strict obedience to some prescribed institution* for that purpose. The priests of the Mosaic economy could only forgive sins in conformity with the law ; the apostles, though authorized to remit and retain sins, could only do it in an appointed way ; and although many since their day have arrogated

to themselves the right of forgiving sins, and of shutting up and letting out of *hades* or purgatory whom they would, yet it is an assumption of a divine attribute, which will bring upon its administrators a condign punishment. There is no salvation under this dispensation my friends, *save by an intelligent obedience of the gospel*. If a man devote his life to the service of the god of this world, and think, that by tears of remorse, called by some repentance, professions of dying in peace with God and all mankind, and promises of what would be done if he should get well; if, I say, such an one should imagine he would escape the resurrection of the unjust to suffer punishment, he but deceives himself. God is not to be mocked; and though the clergy may point you to the thief upon the cross, and console you with the notion that you are no worse than he, and that

While the lamp holds on to-burn  
The vilest sinner may return!

be assured that in the book of eternal life there is neither precept nor precedent to sustain such tradition. "If you die in your sins, where God is, you cannot be;" there is but one way of emancipation from sin, and that is by believing the gospel, forsaking your sins, being baptized, and continuing thereafter in well doing.

Mr. Watt says that the immortality of the soul is proved by the case of the thief on the cross, and that he is in heaven; or rather, that his soul is there. I do not, however, see any connection between the two. Before the one can be a proof of the other, it must be shown that when Jesus said "you" he meant "your immortal soul," and that by "paradise" he intended the "heaven" of anti-Christian sects. Now I deny, that by "you" and "paradise" he meant what "divines" term the "immortal soul" and "heaven." The meaning of the passage in Luke, in my view, is altogether different from what is generally supposed; and entirely diverse from the conceptions of my opponent. I shall, therefore, proceed to interpret it according to what I believe to be its true import.

It was the national expectation, founded upon the prophecies of the glorious reign of a king who was to be anointed by Jehovah, to reign in righteousness, to live for ever, and to sit as king of Israel upon the throne of David, that when the Christ, the Messiah, or the Anointed One (for they are all equivalent) should appear, "he would redeem" (Luke xxiv. 21), or "restore the kingdom to Israel" (Acts i. 6). That is, that he would be raised up as a prince for their deliverance in the house of David—for their deliverance from their enemies (the Romans), and from the hands of all who hated them (Luke i. 69). The Israelites contemporary with Jesus expected that their promised Messiah would vindicate their national rights, and restore to them their independence. At that time, they were oppressed by the

Romans; their country was reduced into the form of a Roman province, and much of its territory possessed by idolators, who had settled themselves in its cities, plains, and valleys as artizans, agriculturists, and military officials. The Israelites sighed for deliverance from these intruders, and hoped that God would interpose in behalf of His chosen people, and reinstate them as an independent nation transcendently above all the glory of ancient times. Many efforts were made by false Messiahs to vindicate the national honour, and to free the people from a foreign yoke, but they all miserably perished by the Roman power. Nor was the national hope without foundation; for the prophets abundantly testify the things they expected; but *they had mistaken the time*. They, like the apostles before they were corrected, thought that these things would be fulfilled at the first coming of the Christ. They had mistaken the prophets, who predicted two comings: the first, when the Christ should come as a *sufferer*; the second, when he should come to *deliver them as a nation out of the hands of all their enemies*. This was a principal cause of their rejecting Jesus; for by coming as a sufferer, all their hopes of immediate deliverance were dashed.

That the nation did expect such a Messiah, is obvious from many passages in the New Testament. Simon, when he took Jesus unto his arms, blessed God, and in his invocation to Jehovah, declared that he then beheld the deliverer, whom he styled "thy salvation (*to sooteerion*) a light for the illumination of the nations, and for the glory of thy people Israel." When Jesus proved to Nathaniel his omniscience, the guileless Israelite exclaimed "You are THE KING OF ISRAEL." The miraculous power with which Jesus was endowed uniformly impressed those who believed on him, that he was as much provided by Jehovah to be their king, as was Saul or David; for when he multiplied "the five barley loaves and two small fishes" so exuberantly, the Israelites said, "This is certainly the prophet who was to come into the world." Upon which saying, says John, "Jesus, knowing that they intended to come and *carry him off to make him king*, withdrew." Upon another occasion, alluding to the death he was to suffer "the people observed, We have learned from the Law, that the Messiah (anointed king) will live for ever. How, then, do you say that the Son of Man must be lifted up?" From these premisses, it is manifest that "*the people*" *expected a king who was to be a prophet, and immortal, or deathless*.

Furthermore, this doctrine of the law was proclaimed to the Virgin Mother of Jesus, by Gabriel, who said "the Lord God will give him the throne of David his father. And he shall reign over the house of Israel for ever: his reign shall never end."—(Luke i. 32; see also Isaiah ix. 5, 6.) What can be more distinct and positive? Gabriel and

Isaiah announce to Israel that the Virgin's Son was to be their anointed king, to sit upon David's throne, and to reign for ever!

In conformity with these notorious predictions, Jesus promised to his apostles the honours of royalty as their reward. He indicated the precise time when they should become kings *in fact*, as they were kings *elect* or chosen. This era he terms "THE RENOVATION." At this period of Jewish History, he declared that he should sit "upon the throne of his glory"—the throne of his father David; and that they also should sit upon twelve thrones, ruling (*krinontes*, ruling as sceptre-bearers) the twelve tribes of Israel.

I would observe here, that it is common to say that Jesus and his apostles are on their thrones. Those who affirm this, ought to prove it; and thereby to show that Jesus ever sat on "the throne of David his father," and that his apostles ever ruled over a single tribe. I content myself here with denying; and observe, that before either of these events can happen, Jesus must descend from heaven, and the apostles must be raised from the dead. When these things shall take place, *the renovation* will have arrived, and not before.

When Jesus was arraigned before the national council, the president or High Priest asked him if he were JEHOVAH'S ANOINTED KING, in other words, "*the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One?*" (Psalm ii. 2; Mark xiv. 61) to which he replied, "I AM:" and for this avowal, he was judged worthy of death as a blasphemer. From the Temple he was removed to the Prætorium, and placed at Cæsar's bar. There the same question was put to him in the phraseology of the Gentile procurator. "Are you the King of the Jews?" To this inquiry, Pontius Pilate was incited by the accusations of the rulers of Israel, who charged him with perverting the nation, or exciting the people to revolt, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, calling himself "Messiah the King." Thus, they accused him of setting up his own pretensions against the imperial majesty of Rome. To Pilate's question he answered in the affirmative, that he was the King of the Jews, and for this end born; but the result of this examination was, that he was innocent of any attempt to excite the people to revolt in his favour. Pilate was, therefore, disposed to release him, but the Jews exclaimed, "If you release this man, you are not Cæsar's friend. Whoever calls himself *king*, opposes Cæsar." Upon this Pilate consented to condemn the innocent for his own safety. He, therefore, had him brought out to the pavement, and having ascended the tribunal, said to the Jews, "Behold your King." But they cried "Crucify him!" "What," said he, "shall I crucify your king?" The Priests answered, "We have no king but Cæsar."

And having clothed him with the insignia of a mock-royalty, the soldiers did him homage, crying "Hail, King of the Jews." He

was then led away to suffer death as an aspirant to the throne of Israel, then held in vassalage by the Emperor of Rome. And over his head upon the cross, they inscribed the cause of his crucifixion in three different languages, "*This is Jesus of Nazareth, THE KING OF THE JEWS.*" A Jewish king suspended on a cross was an object of contempt to those whom he claimed as subjects. They reviled and derided him, saying, "If he be the King of Israel, let him now descend from the cross, and we will believe him."

The history of these singular events informs us that the King of the Jews was suspended between two robbers upon crosses. They both manifested the same feeling of contempt as the spectators below them; and upbraided him in the same manner, as a pretender to the crown of Israel. But *at noon*, the power of Jehovah began to attest him; for day was changed into night and the whole land of Palestine was enveloped in darkness. Seeing this, one of the thieves relented, and appears to have concluded that the pretensions of one to the throne of David, whose death all nature mourned, must have been just; he rebuked, therefore, the derision of his companion, who was saying, "If you be the Christ (as your superscription says, for his title of *king* implied his *anointing*), save yourself and us." And then addressing the King of the Jews, said, "Remember me, O king,\* when thou returnest† to thy kingdom."—*Mneestheeti mou, Kurie, HOTAN elthees en tee basileia sou.*

Now, you will notice the point of the malefactor's petition—it was a request to be remembered by the King of the Jews *at a particular time*: and that time is expressed as *in the day* WHEN he should return to his kingdom. To those who understand the doctrine of the reign of Jehovah's Anointed King, no question can be more simple, direct, intelligible, and definite. The robber was a Jew, and partook of the national hope. He, in common with the rest of Israel, expected the appearance of a descendant of David under the peculiar favour of God, who was to sit on the throne of Israel, and to reign for ever supreme over all the world. This day was anticipated as the day of Israel's glory. Like the rest of his countrymen, he derided

\* In the original, it is *kurios* in the vocative case. Parkhurst says that Plutarch informs us that *kurios*, the name of Cyrus, who in the Old Testament is called Curush, did in the Persic signify the *sun*. This name then seems an evident corruption of the Hebrew *churos* the sun, the great ruler in material nature, and worshipped accordingly by several nations, under the title of *Melec* the king, and *Baal* the ruler, lord; so from the word *churos*, may be deduced the Greek *kuros*, authority; *kurios*, lord. It was a title of the Roman Emperor, and therefore, the derivation and context agreeing, may fairly be rendered *kurie*, O king.

† *Thou returnest*. The original is *elthees* from *erchomai*. "It primarily and properly denotes motion from one place to another. *Ho erchomenos*, he who cometh, is a title of Messiah. In John xiv. 18, the same verb is rendered *return*; thus, "I will not leave you forlorn; I will return (*erchomai*) to you:" so also in verse 28, "I go away and will return (*erchomai*) to you:" also in verse 8, "after I have gone and prepared a place for you, I will return (*erchomai*) again." The only difference between *erchomai* and *elthees* is a matter of tense: they are of the same verb. With these examples, then, of the use of the verb, there can be no objection to the rendering we have given.

Jesus as an impudent pretender to this glorious crown, and joined his companion in guilt in his jeers and taunts. He scorned to acknowledge the pretensions of a king who was suffering an ignominious death: a death, which to all appearance, was fatal to the aspirations and ambition of the Nazarene. But when he witnessed the manifestation of the power of Almighty God in rending the rocks and veiling the face of heaven, as it were in sackcloth black as hair, his views of things were changed. He had heard the chief priests, and scribes, and elders, insultingly say, "He saved others; cannot he save himself? If he be the king of Israel, let him now descend from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God. Let God deliver him now, if He regard him; for he called himself God's Son." The robber had himself "upbraided him in the same manner."—(Matt. xxvii. 42, 44.) If then, a Roman centurion, upon witnessing these extraordinary phenomena, could exclaim, "*This was certainly God's Son,*" no marvel that the robber, less hardened than his fellow, should come to the same conclusion. He knew not but that He who sent darkness over the land at noonday, might interpose to deliver him, and to place him upon the throne of Israel; be that, however, as it might, he was anxious to secure his favourable regards before he surrendered his life; being well persuaded that God could recal His Son to life and give him the kingdom of David. WHEN, therefore, this should take place, he was desirous to partake of the national joy; *in that day* WHEN the king of the Jews should come—called "*the day of his coming*"—his petition was, that the suffering monarch would remember him, his companion in misery though not in innocence.

In many manuscript copies of Luke's testimony in Greek, the petition of the thief is recorded in these words, according to Griesbach: *Mneestheeti mou kurie, hotan elthees en tee heemera tees eleuseoos sou*—which signifies in English, *Be mindful of me, O king, when thou returnest* IN THE DAY OF THINE ADVENT. Now, although this reading varies from that of other manuscripts in phraseology, yet *in substance it is the same*; for the day of the advent or coming of Jesus is *the time* "when" he will come, or return, according to his promise, take his great power and commence his reign.—(Rev. xi. 18.) It was "*IN THAT DAY,*" yet *future*, that the thief petitioned his sovereign, "the king of the Jews," to remember him. When Jesus was put to death, it was the day or hour of the Prince of the World that then was; but, when he shall ascend the throne of David his father, to rule over the house of Jacob for ever, it will be "*THE DAY of the Lord,*" which, says Paul, cometh as a thief. From a note to this passage, appended by Griesbach, I perceive in his edition before me, that he is in favour of the reading, "when thou returnest in the day of thine advent;" he says, "*notat omissa a nonnullis, sed nostra iudicio non omittenda.*" This judgment,



however, of Griesbach is no recommendation in the estimation of my opponent, who charges him with Unitarianism; and would, if he could, attach the stigma of that *ism* to all who, regardless, and perhaps ignorant of Griesbach's 'divinity,' if Unitarian, which has no more charms for me than Mr. Watt's. In my estimation, the reduction of "*the image of the invisible God*" to a mere prophet, and the dogma of an "eternal son" are alike unscriptural, though not equally absurd. But to proceed.

The rejoinder of the King of the Jews to the humble petition of the robber, was in exact conformity thereto. The petitioner had specified a particular day—the *day of his return to his kingdom*. With reference to *this day*, his king replied, "*Seemeron*"—ON THIS DAY you shall be with me in (*paradeisoo*) paradise. Now, this word *seemeron* signifies either an artificial or natural day; and from the context we have been considering, it is obvious that it refers not to the natural day on which Jesus was crucified, but to the artificial day of his coming to his kingdom. It was to this artificial day that the robber referred, when he said "in the day of thy coming," or "when thou comest, or returnest to thy kingdom;" and it was *on that same day of his coming* that Jesus promised that he should be with him in paradise.

But what is the signification of *Paradise*? † It is an Hellenized-Persian word; that is, a Persian word adopted with a slight alteration into the Greek language. It signifies a *garden, park, or enclosure*, full of all the valuable products of the earth. The original word, *pardes*, occurs three times in the Old Testament, and three times in the New. In each of these passages, the Seventy and the Christian scribes have rendered it by *paradeisos*.—(Neh. ii. 8; Eccles. ii. 5; Cant. iv. 12; Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7.) In the Old Testament, the word is translated, but in the New it is left untranslated; and for which I see no just cause. The rendering of the word in Canticles iv. 12, is the best verbal definition for *paradisos* as found in the New Testament. It reads there, "*a garden enclosed*;" and this *paradeisos*, or enclosed garden, in the same sentence is termed "*my sister spouse*:" the whole stands thus: "*a (paradise or) garden enclosed is my sister spouse*." Now this Song of Solomon, from which this text is quoted, is regarded as the veil of a sublime and

\* *Seemeron* or according to the Attic dialect *teemeron*, is an adverb derived from *tee heemera lautee*, on this day, to-day, this day; denoting either an artificial or natural day.—*Parkhurst*.

† *Paradeisos*. This is without controversy an *Oriental* word. The Greeks borrowed it from the Persians, among whom it signifies a *garden, park, or enclosure* full of all the valuable products of the earth. Both these particulars are evident from a passage in *Xenophon's Economics*, where Socrates says that "the king of Persia, wherever he is, takes particular care to have *gardens or enclosures*, which (*paradeisoi kaloumenoi*) are called *paradises*, full of every thing beautiful and good that earth can produce." And in this sense the word is applied by *Herodotus, Xenophon, and Diodorus Siculus*. *Jul. Pollux*, a Greek writer, says "*Paradises* seem to be a barbaric name; but, like many other Persian words, came by use to be admitted into the Greek language."—*Parkhurst*.

mystical allegory, delineating the bridal union between the King of kings and his purified and resplendent church; which in the New Testament is represented as his spouse, and, because born of the same Father, his *sister* bride. This sister spouse, in the 16th verse, says, "Let my beloved come into his garden (or paradise) and eat his pleasant fruits." Upon hearing which the king rejoins, "I am come into my garden (paradise), my sister spouse." Now this enclosed garden, the sister spouse of the king in the Christian Scriptures, is also termed his *kingdom*; which is compared to a field, a vineyard, mustard seed in a garden, and so forth. In the prophets, Jerusalem, the metropolis of this kingdom, is termed "a lodge in a garden or paradise;" and Ezekiel, in foretelling the future glory and delights of Palestine, says that when it is recovered from its desolations, travellers who visit it shall say, "This land that was desolate has become like the *Garden of Eden* (paradise); and the waste and desolate and ruined cities are become fenced and inhabited." Now when this "*renovation*" of Palestine takes place, "the king of the Jews" will return to it, and rule over it, on "the throne of David his father." Instead of being a desolate country then, as it is now, it will be changed into a paradise, abounding in all that is pleasant to the taste, and agreeable to the eye, and fragrant to the smell; it will then become luxuriant and fertile, flowing with milk and honey; and

"There shall be an abundance of corn in the land;  
Even on the tops of the mountains its crops shall shake like Lebanon,  
And the citizens shall flourish as the grass of the earth."—(Ps. lxxii. 16.)

The same writer likewise testifies concerning "the king of the Jews," termed also "THE GREAT KING" who shall reign over Israel, "*in that day*," that

"In his days shall the righteous flourish,  
And great shall be their prosperity, as long as the moon shall endure.  
He shall have dominion from sea (Asphaltites) to sea (Mediterranean),  
And from the river (Euphrates) to the ends of the land;\*  
The inhabitants of the desert (the Arabians) shall bow before him,  
And his enemies shall lick the dust.  
Yea, all kings shall bow down before him;  
All nations shall receive him;  
And daily shall he be praised—  
His name shall endure for ever—  
All nations shall call him blessed."

Such was "*the hope of Israel*"—"the hope of that promise made to the fathers; to which the twelve tribes, worshipping continually, night and day, hope to attain." It was that he might share in the joys of such a paradise—termed "the kingdom," by Jesus—that the crucified malefactor petitioned when he said, "Be mindful of me,

\* This is the extent of the territorial domain promised to Abraham and his seed, the Christ.—(Gen. xiii. 14, 15; xv. 18—21.)

O king, when thou returnest to thy kingdom;" or "when thou comest in the day of thine advent;" and it was a promise that, on that very day of his glorious appearing in his kingdom, when he should return from his journey into the far country, he would remember him—when the king of Israel rejoined, "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise:" that is, "You shall become an immortal citizen of my resplendent and bridal kingdom by a resurrection from the dead, when I return."

Such, then, appears to me to be the true interpretation of this much perverted passage. It has no more to do with Plato's immortality speculation, or with the "disembodied spirits" and *hades* of "divines," than it has with the paradise of Mahomed. The king of the Jews said nothing at all about "departing souls," or "the place of departed spirits;" but, as we have seen, he had regard to the resurrection and the day of his return to his paradise or kingdom. There can, therefore, from the passage before us, be deduced no proof or argument in support of the dogma of an immortal soul in an animal man; but on the contrary, as we have shown, every reason against it.

But arguing with reference to the popular view of the case, the thief did not enter the paradisaic kingdom of Messiah on the day of his death. His kingdom is founded upon his resurrection as well as upon his death; for, as we have shown elsewhere, had the king of the Jews not risen, he would have perished, and there would then have been an end to him, and all glory connected with him. The dominion of the king of Israel, predicated on his resurrection and exaltation, was in nowise manifested until fifty days after his crucifixion; nor can it be said that Jesus was in heaven on the day of his death; for on the third day he declared that to that time he had not ascended to God. If, then, the kingdom of heaven was not existing, and till the third day Jesus had not entered God's presence, and if the tomb is not paradise, and seeing that the thief was not laid in the same sepulchre—if these things, I say, be so, it follows that on the natural day of the crucifixion, neither Christ nor the thief was in paradise, and consequently could not be together. Paradise is no imaginary or invisible thing. When the time arrives, it will be developed on the theatre of the miracles and sufferings of Israel's king. At that epoch, the righteous dead will be raised, and among them the robber Jew. At present, he is mouldering in the dust until his change comes. The voice of him who is "the resurrection and the life" will wake him from the sleep of death; and, aided by Almighty power, start him forth from his grave into a new and never-ending life in the paradisaic kingdom of the Father.

---

MR. WATT complained that he had put questions to Dr.

Thomas, and that he had not answered them. He had asked him to tell them about the immortal soul ; to reply to his answer to his Tussekiah discourse, and to tell them what he meant by " things in heaven," and so forth ; and yet Dr. Thomas kept asking him to reply to his propositions. He thought it very strange that Dr. Thomas should act in this way. He had reflected upon him in his last speech, for employing another to find out his words for him in the Hebrew lexicon : he didn't know that there was any harm in this ; and he thought he could ask a friend to assist him to find certain passages as he might want them. He knew that the people depended on Dr. Thomas as a very learned man ; and therefore he had said what he did about Dr. Thomas and the Hebrew, that he might give him an opportunity of proving to them if it was the case or not. He did not wish to injure Dr. Thomas, he was sure ; and if he had said anything which did him injustice, he was willing now to retract. He did not know whether Dr. Thomas held with Materialism, but he thought so. Dr. Priestley was a Unitarian and a Materialist ; but Dr. Thomas says he has never read his works, but says, if he holds anything in connection with Dr. Priestley, he has it from the Bible. Well, he would not make Dr. Thomas what he was not ; for he was sure that Dr. Thomas deserved as much pity and compassion as could be shown to him. He never knew so sophistical a person ; he would pretend not to hear any arguments urged against him, but slipped off to something else that suited his purpose. He assailed the Christian denominations : Episcopalian, Methodist, and Presbyterian, all came in for their share. He said they were anti-Christian, which he denied. The Presbyterian interest had descended from that great and good reformer, John Knox, who preached the true gospel against the Church of Rome ; and the Methodist friends could boast in the piety and learning of a John Wesley. But Dr. Thomas was an enemy to sects—to all sects but his own ; nor had he any sympathy with Protestantism, which in his paper he denounced as one of the horns of the apocalyptic beast. He wanted to provoke Dr. Thomas to come out, but if he could not provoke him, he was sure he should not follow in his way. He supposed that Dr. Thomas was afraid of him that he did not take to meet him directly ; but if Dr. Thomas was afraid of *him*, what would he do with one able to cope with him ?

Dr. Thomas had started to prove that there is no immaterial spirit in man, but had departed from his attempt. He must confess that he did not attend as particularly to what Dr. Thomas said as he ought to have done, but he understood him to say, the threat "*thou shalt surely die*" did not mean so. Dr. Thomas said the phrase signified " dying thou shalt die," and that it did not refer to the death of his soul, but to his body several hundred years after. Now, he wanted to know if it did not say "*in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die?*" Adam

must, therefore, have died in some sense upon the day he ate, and as his body did not die, what could it be but his soul? It was the death of his soul that was threatened, and it was his soul that died on that very day. "Dying thou shalt die," was a like phrase to "eating thou shalt eat," and simply meant "thou shalt die." How could he answer a man that said it meant he began to die on the day he ate thereof, when the Bible said, "thou shalt die." In another place it said he should never die: that was, that the soul should never die or become the subject of the pains of hell for ever, which is called the second death.

Dr. Thomas had said that he did not know whether Griesbach was a Unitarian or not. All he could say was, that he ought to have known. He had remarked upon the word *seemeron*, but he did not tell them that it did not mean *to-day*. He admitted that *to-day* was one of its significations, but that it did not mean *to-day* naturally in that place. The temerity of the man! He worked like a *craw-fish*, backwards. (A laugh). It signified *to-day*—the natural day of the crucifixion; and it was on that very day of their death, that the thief was with Jesus in paradise.

Dr. Thomas had undertaken in his paper to give some explanation of the case of Michael contending with Satan for the body of Moses; but he didn't understand what he meant. For his own part, he could not tell what was the interpretation of the account. It belonged to the heap of incomprehensibles. Did Dr. Thomas believe there was such a devil as they believed in? It said that the devil contended with Michael for the body; but Dr. Thomas is doubtful whether Moses died or was translated, though the Bible says "Moses died:" Moses appeared on the mount of transfiguration, and therefore, Dr. Thomas concludes it was Moses in the body, but it was not: it was his immortal soul. Dr. Thomas said that soul sometimes meant life; and he didn't know what there was he did not say; but he considered that life signified a period of time, it might be long or short, or it might continue for ever. He could not show an immortal soul, as Dr. Thomas might require. Nevertheless he believed in its existence; in the same way that he could not show God, yet he believed Him to be. But Dr. Thomas denied the being of an immortal soul in man, and therefore, he had no evidence of the being of a God. He thought that certain only of the human race would be immortal, and though he taught a resurrection of unjust persons, he allowed the poor wicked to remain after the resurrection of the righteous, unraised for a thousand years.\*

Dr. Thomas had talked about the necessity of the words and ideas both being in the Bible; for, said he, if the words are not there, neither are the ideas. But he did not agree with him in this; and maintained that it was not necessary that the words should be in the Bible to show the idea. The idea of the immortality of the soul in man is

\* A mistake: the pre-millennial wicked rise at the beginning of the thousand years.—Ed.

there, although the words and phrases were not to be found. He was not dependent on the Scriptures for the evidence of the immortality of the soul; for he could prove the soul to be immortal without the assistance of the Bible. No one had ever united the doctrine of materialism with the doctrine of the resurrection before Dr. Thomas. He boldly reduced man to a mere animal, and made his eternal existence dependent upon obedience. As he had said, all men had immortality within them; when, then, eternal life was promised to them, it was equivalent to a promise of deliverance from hell, and of happiness in heaven. If a sinner were to ask the ministers of the gospel what he should do to inherit eternal life, they would tell him to repent and believe on God, and forsake his sins, and sin no more; and he would enjoy whatever God had to bestow in heaven.

Before he concluded, he would give them further evidence of Dr. Thomas' Calvinism! In the third volume of the *Apostolic Advocate*, Dr. Thomas had published what he terms "Lexicographia," and in it he thus defines "Calvinism," viz., "The doctrine taught by the apostle Paul!" "Now," said he, addressing himself to Dr. Thomas, "if Calvinism is the doctrine according to Paul, is it not a very good thing?"—(Dr. Thomas here observed, "That was irony.")—"Well, sir," he continued, "how was I to know that it was irony?"—(That it was irony was obvious from the motto prefixed to the article: "Irony thinks otherwise than what the words declare.") Now, Dr. Thomas had said that Calvinism was the gospel according to Paul, and in the second volume of his paper he says, quoting Paul's words, that God had sent upon the world strong delusion that they should "believe a lie," and that Methodism was part of that lie. If this was the case, he would like to know how they could help it? (Dr. Thomas here requested Mr. Watt to read on, and he would find the reason why that strong delusion had been sent; to which Mr. Watt replied that he had read enough for his purpose!) To him it was plain that Dr. Thomas was as strong a Calvinist as anyone!

DR. THOMAS.—In presenting myself before you again, my friends, I am made to appear under a figure newly set forth concerning me by my facetious opponent. He has found out a new resemblance for me; yet one to which I had no notion I was at all like. "Dr. Thomas," said he, "is like a craw-fish, working backwards!"—(Mr. Watt here observed that he did not say Dr. Thomas was a craw-fish, but that he worked like one.)—Dr. Thomas continued: You have heard the explanation, my friends. I do not suppose he intended to say that I am really a craw-fish, for your own observation would immediately confound him, seeing that my form is human, and not craw-fish fashion. But his explanation is before you, and you must take it for

what it is worth; for myself, I do not see that it has explained anything.

Well, craw-fish like, I work backwards. Had I not better do so than imitate my opponent, who neither works backwards nor forwards, but, like a horse in a mill, is always describing a circle without any advance at all? He walks in a circle, talks in a circle, sophizes in a circle, and beyond that narrow circle, he seems to have no perception. So much is he taken up with his own piquancy and wit (?) that, to use his own words, "He did not attend so particularly to what Dr. Thomas said as he ought to have done." Now, as to the truth of this there can be no doubt; for he alleges that I started to *prove a negative*, in other words, to prove that there was no immaterial spirit or immortal soul in man, but had departed from my purpose. If this, then, be the grave conviction of his mind, he must certainly have been asleep, or, as he admits, exceedingly inattentive. Now, it appears to me, my friends, that the best proof I can offer, to show that I have established the mortality of man, relatively to his soul and spirit, as well as his body—of his "whole person," in truth—is to be found in the admission of many in this audience, that I have fairly convinced them that *there is no such thing in man as an "immortal soul," and that if man, the genus, is to become immortal, it is a matter of gift through Jesus Christ, and not by virtue of his descent from the earthly or animal Adam.* Ever since the second day, my proofs and arguments have borne on this proposition; but it is not to be wondered at that Mr. Watt should not perceive their tendency, seeing that he has been consuming his time in thinking and jesting about a smelling-bottle, instead of giving heed to what has been spoken by me.

Mr. Watt has expressed a desire to know what the word *all*, when used in relation to the dead, means in the Scripture, if it did not mean all the dead of all classes and ages. His first proof of the universal totality of the word *all* was derived from John v. 29, which I will briefly examine. In the first place, Jesus affirms that, "as the Father has *life* in Himself, so has He given to the Son (not to all men, but to the Son) to have *life* in himself;" and secondly, in the 24th verse, he states the condition upon which, and the persons to whom, this life shall and shall not be distributed—namely, he who hears his doctrine, in another place termed *receiving the Son*, and believes in the Father. Of such an one it is predicated that he has eternal life, and shall not suffer condemnation, because in so believing, he has passed from under the sentence of death to that of a pardon to eternal life—as he says, "Most assuredly I say to you, *he who hears my doctrine, and believes Him who sent me, has eternal life, and shall not suffer condemnation, having*

passed from death to life"—which is equivalent to *having eternal life*. Now, if the affirmative of this proposition be true, the negative follows of course: that *he who does not hear the doctrine of Jesus, and believes not the Father who sent him, has not eternal life, and shall suffer condemnation, not having passed from death to life*. Now, in reference to these two classes, namely, to that class of men which has eternal life, and to the other which has not eternal life, he says, that "the time comes when *all* that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth;" and in the same verse, he distributes this *all* into "those *who have DONE GOOD*," and "those *who have DONE EVIL*." Now concerning the *well-doers*, he says, *they shall arise*; and we would ask, for what purpose shall they arise? Jesus continues **TO ENJOY LIFE**. Then it is obvious, they are not enjoying life before their resurrection, and are therefore, not in a place of enjoyment, that is, are not in heaven as 'divines' affirm; and concerning the *evil-doers*, he also says *they shall arise*; and here we would likewise inquire *for what are the evil-doers to arise from their graves?* Jesus continues, they shall arise **TO SUFFER PUNISHMENT**. Hence, it is equally apparent, that those who have done evil in this life *are not now* suffering punishment in a place of torment; that is, they are not now in hell as the clergy teach. From this passage then, it is manifest, *first*, that the subjects of the resurrection are *well-doers* and *evil-doers*; *second*, that previously to their resurrection, they are neither enjoying life nor suffering punishment; consequently the Romish purgatory, the Protestant *hades*, and the heaven and hell of the sects are all baseless and visionary; *third*, that a resurrection is necessary to the enjoyment of the one, and to the suffering of the other; *fourth*, that infants and idiots are not included in the *all* of this verse, unless it can be shown that they are capable of moral or immoral deeds, or in other words, of doing good or evil; *fifth*, that the way to the kingdom of God, where life is to be enjoyed, is by a resurrection; and *sixth*, that the resurrection of the evil doers will be to suffer the punishment due to them, which will *ultimate* in an eternal deprivation of existence; this, if correct, sets aside the notion of eternal life in torment.

Mr. Watt relies also on Romans v. 18, for the universality of this monosyllable *all*. He supposes that the two *alls* in this verse are co-extensive. If that is the case, then he is an Universalist. The passage reads thus, "as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Now, if the phrase "*all men to justification of life*," is as universal as that of "*all men to condemnation*," it follows that the free gift of an immortality connected with justification, or pardon, is bestowed unconditionally upon all



infants, idiots, pagans, infidels, believers, and so forth, be they just or unjust. This is certainly Universal salvation; and if it is true, I would suggest the propriety of Mr. Watt addressing himself to some more important calling than that of Presbyterianizing mankind, who, according to his demonstration, are all under the sentence of justification of life, and therefore, will be universally saved.

But it is to the context we must go, and not to my friend in order to be delivered from our dilemma. The nineteenth verse shows that *all men* was used by the apostle to signify *the many*. This will be more apparent from the following allocation, viz.:

<i>Verse 18.</i>	—equivalent to—	<i>Verse 19.</i>
As through one offence		As through the disobedience of the one man,
The sentence came upon all men	— " "	—The many were constituted
To condemnation;	— " "	—Sinners;
So also, by one act of obedience	— " "	—So, by the obedience of the One,
The sentence came upon all men—	" "	—The many shall be constituted
To justification of life.	— " "	—Righteous.

In this passage, then, *all* signifies *the many*; and who are *the many* that are constituted righteous? Why, the Scriptures teach us, that *he who doth righteousness is righteous*: the many, then, are the doers of righteousness or well-doers, and therefore, these are they who are placed under the sentence to justification of life. This is in conformity with what the apostle says, namely, that the gospel is the power of God for salvation (or justification of life) to everyone (the many) who believe; for in it, the justification of God is revealed for belief. Now, if infants, and idiots, and pagans, who are physically, intellectually and circumstantially incapable of understanding the power of God, can be the subjects of a justification which is predicated on belief of the gospel, then may they be regarded as a part of the many upon whom the sentence comes to justification of life; but on the contrary, if they cannot be justified by the gospel, seeing that it is the power of God only to believers, then it follows that they are not included in the *all* or the *many* under justification, but in the *all* or the *many* under the sentence of death which has come upon all constituted sinners by virtue of their descent from the mortal progenitor of the race. It is "the just who shall live" (eternally); and that "by faith;" if one can believe what he never heard of, or have faith in what he cannot comprehend, then indeed may all classes and ages of men, infants, idiots, and pagans, *live by faith*. If they cannot, then they are subjects of "times of ignorance" and are the overlooked of God.

But the word "all" in its widest sense is not without limitation; and this remark brings me to Mr. Watt's proof (1 Cor. xv. 22)—"as

in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Now, there are exceptions to the *all dying* by Adam; Enoch and Elijah did not see death, and the apostle affirms in the chapter before us "Behold, I tell you a secret, *we* shall not indeed *all* die; but *we* shall *all* be changed;" that is, as he explains in 1 Thess. iv. 15—"we, the living who remain at the coming (or advent) of the Lord." But we must not forget the context of verse 22. It is proximately the 21st and 23rd verses. From these we learn, that the apostle is discoursing about the resurrection of believers through the Man Christ Jesus, who is "the first fruits of them who are fallen asleep in him," and of none else; and concerning these faithful ones asleep in him, Paul says, "for as through Adam *they* all die (*pantes apothneeskousin*), so also by (or through) the Christ, they all shall be made alive. But everyone (of them, the all) in his own order." And this is the order of the resurrection of *all* the righteous dead: *first*, Christ himself the chief; *then*, they who are Christ's. Now, if you enquire who are they who are said to be Christ's, you must consult Paul. He says (Gal. iii. 27), "as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. And if you are Christ's, certainly you are Abraham's seed and heirs (of eternal life and the inheritance) according to the promise." It is obvious, then, that the heirs of eternal life are those who are baptized into Christ on a belief of the gospel of the resurrection. Among the *all* made alive through Christ, nothing is said about the wicked or the unjustified of whatever age or class; for the apostle was speaking of the resurrection of the just, and not at all of the unjust, which is entirely a different subject.

Mr. Watt relies, too, on another passage in Revelations in proof of the resurrection of all classes and ages of the human race. John saw "the dead, *small* and great, stand before God." He infers from this that infants are necessarily among the small; if we grant it, what works have infants done according to which they can be judged righteous or otherwise? The 'small and great' are spoken of in chap. xi. 18, where they are said to fear the name of God; how much religious veneration, I should like to know, have infants for the name of God? None; then they are not among the classes of Adam's posterity, termed 'the small' by the Holy Spirit. The small and the ignoble, untitled commonalty of the world, as opposed to the great, who are princes, kings, nobles, &c. These are they who make up the 'small and great' of the Apocalypse.

Mr. Watt expresses great anxiety to know what *animal life* is. He thinks if I would only tell him what this meant, it would greatly facilitate the progress of this discussion. Concerning what constitutes *life*, or what life is, is the matter in dispute between us. Mr. Watt

maintains that there is a separate and independent incorporeal something, termed "the immortal soul," upon which all vital phenomena depend, while I believe the opposite, and contend that animal life, whose phenomena may be arranged, all of them, under the heads of *sensibility* and *contractility*, depends solely upon organisation for its manifestation. At first, life is made up of a small number of phenomena, or natural appearances, which are as simple as the apparatus which develops it; but soon extending its developments as its organs or instruments are multiplied, and as the whole organic machine becomes more complex. The blade of corn, in a dry season, twisting under the influence of the solar beams, is an illustration of the sensibility and contractility or vitality of plants: properties which are possessed by those of the simplest structure. Here is vegetable life, to which *animal life*, in its simplest manifestation, is analogous, as demonstrated in the *polypus*, which connects, as by a link, the vegetable and animal kingdoms. The organisation, or animal machine, for the development of life, called the *polypus*, is the simplest of all animals. When cut, it contracts, and thus displays its sensibility. Now, as you ascend in the scale of animal existence from the polypus, you will find the manifestation of life more perfect as the organisation, or bodily machine, becomes more complicated. The animal constitution of man is more intricate than that of any other animal: hence, his living actions are more complicated and of a superior order. But you may enquire what causes the animal organisation to act so as to produce all living phenomena. In reply to this, I must refer you to the Scriptures. Moses says that "the blood is the life or soul of the flesh."—(Gen. ix. 4.) But, says one, what is the life of the blood? In answer to this, I must point you to the Fountain of Life. God is life. In Him all things continue which make up the animal, vegetable, and mineral worlds. In Him, all things which have life, "live, move, and have their being." He first organized the animal and vegetable worlds by His spirit, and then gave them life; and in so doing, endowed them with the property of transmitting it from generation to generation. If the vital phenomena of man depends on "an immortal soul within him," then do those of all other animals also; but if they do not in these, neither do they in him.

God gave life and birth to all things by His Spirit. This is the testimony of Moses, who says that "the Spirit of God moved on the waters," and the consequence was, the life and birth of the antediluvian world, with all the living beings or souls of the land and water. In this Spirit, or "word" of God's power, "was life, and the life was the light of men." It sustained the life of the antediluvians, according to the natural laws, for upwards of nine hundred years; but so evil had man become, that God declared that His Spirit, or life-

sustaining energy, should not remain with him more than 120 years. This has been reduced to 70 or 80 years, which is the extent in ordinary of the life of men. Hence *animal life* is proximate and ultimate; the proximate life of an animal depends on the due action of the living blood upon the nervous, circulatory and pulmonary organs, which to a great degree make up the animal machine; while the ultimate, or *original cause* of sanguineo-organic phenomena was the *fiat*, or "let there be" of the life-word, or Spirit of God, which gave birth to its *living* conceptions from the teeming waters and swarming dust. When born, the animal world was placed under the natural laws, and of these, one was, "Be fruitful and multiply." By this law, race produces race, and thus propagates from generation to generation the life originally bestowed.

The solution of the question, then, of what is animal life, does not help Mr. Watt one whit in relation to his "immortal soul" notion. On the contrary, it is entirely in support of the proposition, that an animal man has nothing in him but what is perishable. As we have already seen, the phrase "immortal soul" is not in the Bible; but, if I were compelled to give it "a local habitation and a name," I should say, that the phrase can only be applied with any shadow of propriety to the Deity, or to the spiritual or resurrected body. We have seen that "*soul*" is sometimes the sign of the idea we term *life*. Now "*God is life*," and it is said, that *He only has immortality*; we might, therefore, with some show of reason, call Him *the immortal soul*, that is the eternal life, or being. Again, "*soul*" sometimes signifies *body*. Now, Paul says, "This mortal *body* shall put on *immortality*;" if, therefore, *soul* must be associated with *immortal*, it ought to be applied to the human body when it becomes immortal, by a resurrection from the dead to eternal life.

Now, as to the nature or constitution of such an immortal soul, or, rather, "spiritual body," we do indeed find some information in the Scriptures. These tell us that when the Lord Jesus Christ shall come, "*he will form over or renew (metaschematisui) the body of our humiliation (too soome tees tapeenooseos) that it may become conformable to the body of his glory*"—Phil. iii. 21;—and in another place, they say, that "*as we have borne the image of the earthly (or mortal animal, Adam), we shall also bear the image or likeness of the heavenly (Adam, who is spiritual or immortal)*". Now, it is true, that "it does not yet *appear* (to the eye of sense) what we (the people of God) shall be; but we know, that *when* he shall appear, we shall be like him." The resurrected body, termed the vivifying spirit, or Lord from heaven, is the type, model, or pattern, then, of all who shall hereafter rise from the dead to enter the

paradise of God. Unless we animal men either die and rise again incorruptible, it is affirmed by Paul that we cannot inherit the kingdom of God, or paradise; for, says he, "flesh and blood (or animal men, with blood flowing in their veins) cannot inherit (or possess) the kingdom of God:" and why not? Because "corruption," which flesh and blood is essentially, "cannot inherit incorruption," which is an essential property of the paradisaic kingdom.

But some affirm that, after Jesus arose from the dead, he continued an animal body, until changed into a spiritual body at the instant of his ascension. But this contradicts the testimony of Paul, who, in his exordium to the letter to the Romans, says, that "as to his flesh," or animal body, he was "born of David's seed;" and "decreed God's Son in power (*en dunamei*, see 1 Cor. xv. 43: 'it is raised, *en dunamei*, in power') according to the appointment of the Spirit of Holiness, *by a resurrection from the dead.*" After, therefore, he rose from the dead, he was God's Son in power (*huiou Theou en dunamei*). To be a *Son of God in power*, is to be "raised in power" from the dead. Paul says that "*all flesh is not the same flesh*;" he terms these bodies of flesh terrestrial, and goes on to show that, like the celestial, or heavenly orbs, they differ among themselves in splendour, or the attributes of glory. For, after enumerating the diversity of brilliancy among the sun, moon, and stars, he affirms that there is a similar diversity between the attributes of the bodies of the dead. Seeds have two bodies; *first*, there is the seed itself, or *seed-body*; and *then*, the plant or *resurrected-body*, which is far more magnificent in size, form, and adornment, or glorious, if you please, than the seed from which it sprang. Just so it is with men of a certain class. They have, as it were, likewise two; *first*, their seed body; and *then*, their plant or resurrected body, which being changed into a spiritual body, may be compared to the fruit of the plant. Thus concerning the resurrected body, Paul says, *it is sown* (you see it is compared to a seed) in corruption, in dishonour, in weakness; but that *it is raised*, or re-produced, in incorruption, in glory, *in power*; that it is sown an animal body, and raised a spiritual body. Hence, Jesus was sown the "body of his humiliation," but raised "the body of his glory." He became, in his resurrection from the dead, as Paul teaches, incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and spiritual, or immortal. The mortal Jesus, on the day of his resurrection, after seeing Mary, doubtless did put on immortality.

When risen, he informed his apostles that he was flesh and bones, and not a phantom. He was then of another kind of flesh; for there are kinds, all flesh not being the same flesh. He was immortal flesh

and bones, and therefore incorruptible, and fully prepared to "*inherit incorruption.*" He was no longer animal, for he had been raised to an unending existence; and therefore, the constitution of his resurrected nature was divested of those animal properties which in the end bring us all to corruption. It is calculated that five-sixths of the animal body are made up of fluids; that is, that out of six parts, only one part is solid matter. Hence the cause of the rapidity with which the dead run into decomposition. You have an illustration of this in the vegetable kingdom; the most durable of forest trees are those which have the most wood of the hardest texture and the least sap; but trees, on the contrary, which superabound in sap, or vegetable blood, when felled, soon become light, crumbling, and decayed. Thus, the animal body, abounding in blood, is essentially corruptible; hence the impossibility of its inheriting the kingdom of God, which is incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading. It must first be purified of the corruptible principle; hence the *necessity* of death, of a return to the dust, or of a miraculous transformation. Jesus' body of humiliation was subjected to this process of pouring out his blood, from which he was delivered by the spear of the Roman; his exsanguinous body was deposited in the tomb, and bloodless he came forth, flesh and bones, for a moment only mortal, on the third day. On this day, the decree was carried into effect; which the Father had enacted by the mouth of David, "Thou art my Son, this (day of thy resurrection) have I begotten thee!" Thus he became the eldest Son of God, being the first-begotten of a resurrection from the dead. "*And we,*" says the apostle, "*shall be like him.*" We, "*who obey him,*" shall all become "Sons of God in power;" by the same means; we shall be incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and immortal men; we shall be "like the angels, children of God, being children of the resurrection!"

---

Mr. WATT.—Dr. Thomas, he continued, has at last consented to give us a definition of an immortal soul. He has even declared what it was composed of! He tells us that the immortal soul is made up of flesh and bones, which are incorruptible! For himself, he thought that flesh and bones all went to corruption, and yet Dr. Thomas says that it is the blood that is the corruptible principle in man! Dr. Thomas had been very particular in his definition, which he professed to derive from the Bible; but he thought that the Scriptures were written to give us profitable information—information that would benefit the soul—and not to gratify idle curiosity. He believed that it was generally supposed that the nature of the human soul was wrapped up in impenetrable mystery; but Dr. Thomas did not seem to think so;

for himself, however, he was not rash enough to speculate on such things: nor would he venture to indulge in such idle and visionary theories about spiritual things. What was revealed was enough for him; secret things belonged to God, and with Him he would leave them.

Dr. Thomas teaches that when Jesus said "a spirit has not flesh and bones as ye see me have," he had reference to the spiritual body; but Jesus did not speak of spiritual bodies when he spoke of a spirit. When he said a spirit, he meant the separate and independent immortal spirit; it was concerning this, he affirmed that it had not flesh and bones; yet Dr. Thomas has made out that the immortal soul is the spiritual body, which he supposes to be incorruptible. The body of Jesus had blood in it after he rose from the dead; for he ate bread and fish, and it is well known that food is digested and converted into blood. The Saviour spoke of his natural body—that a spirit, an immortal spirit, had not flesh and bones as his natural body had, and which was changed afterwards when he ascended to heaven. Paul speaks of a spiritual body, while the Saviour spoke of the natural body, which is all the difference. But he would not be presumptuous enough to attempt to define anything here; he would define the things of the eternal world. Mr. Watt then proceeded to comment on 1 Cor. xv. "The orthodox" did not rely on the passages of this chapter for the immortality of the soul. Paul was not speaking on that subject at all. Did not Dr. Thomas know that it was about the immortality of the body that the apostle wrote. Dr. Thomas, you don't understand the chapter you have been saying so much about. Paul was writing on the resurrection, and what has that to do with the immortality of the soul? Did he come there to discuss with Dr. Thomas on the immortality of the body? Dr. Thomas, you have run away into a great many pernicious errors, you have left the beaten track, and strayed into a labyrinth from which you cannot extricate yourself. You say that flesh and bones may inherit the kingdom of God, because they are incorruptible. But this is not the meaning of the apostle when he says that "corruption cannot inherit incorruption." Don't we, Dr. Thomas, deposit bones and flesh in the grave, and do they not go to corruption there? how then can you say that they are incorruptible? But really 'tis quite sickening to follow you, Dr. Thomas, through your expositions of the Scriptures. (Here Dr. Thomas could not repress his risibility; for he perceived it was just as Mr. Watt said—he felt sickened at the task before him, which he seemed distressingly conscious he was unable creditably to dispose of.) Dr. Thomas might smile; but what did that prove; what was there in a laugh? A laugh did not settle anything.

They all knew, he continued, that there was no resemblance

between the seed and the blade of grass produced from it ; neither will there be any resemblance between the spiritual body and the natural body. But Dr. Thomas has ascertained exactly that the spiritual body is like the body sown. Well, if that be the case, the spiritual body must be corruptible ; for the natural body, which he says is like it, is composed of flesh, bones, and blood ; and seeing that these all decay, the flesh and bones of the spiritual body must decay likewise. Are not flesh and bones corruptible, Dr. Thomas ? Can you deny that, Sir ? How do you say, then, that the flesh and bones of the spiritual body are incorruptible ? Dr. Thomas makes *spiritual* signify *immortal* ; but when he was at the Seminary, he proved that the word *spiritual* meant *supernatural*. Dr. Thomas relied a great deal on the context to help him out in the signification of words ; and from the context he concludes that *spiritual* and *immortal* are the same. It was true that the context did generally help us a little, but he could never see from the context the connection between living soul and animal soul ; or between spiritual body and quickening spirit. Dr. Thomas makes quickening spirit and spiritual body the same. He understood a very different thing. A quickening spirit Dr. Thomas defines to be a life-making spirit, and that this is the same as a spiritual body, which Jesus Christ was by his resurrection. That he made the Saviour out to be a mere body, called a spiritual body. Paul speaks of celestial bodies ; but of these he would say nothing : for we did not understand the nature or constitution of heavenly bodies, and the body of the Lord was one of these, for he was termed the Lord of Heaven. He could not go by Dr. Thomas' uncertain, vague, and speculative interpretation of the word of God. He liked to think of his Saviour as glorious ; as an immortal spirit surrounded by all the glory of the heavenly world, and not as a mere spiritual body composed of flesh and bones.

He admitted that the word *all* was limited in 1 Corinthians xv. 22 : "so also by Christ *all* shall be made alive ;" but there was nothing in the word *all* to limit it in the text "as in Adam *all* die : " all mankind die in Adam ; death comes upon all, because all have sinned. According to Dr. Thomas, only the righteous are included in the *all* who are made alive, and in relation to thousands who died in Adam they become the subjects of eternal death ; but to comment upon these passages, that all die, does not show that punishment or misery is not eternal. So then, according to Dr. Thomas, none have immortality but God. Not even these baptized people. Oh ! but it means that men are not immortal. The natural body is to put on immortality. What ! will you not open the door to admit the truly baptized, Dr. Thomas ? You say that Jesus Christ brought life and immortality to light ; now what does it mean to bring a thing to light ? In bringing



immortality to light, he only gave us a clearer and more distinct information of this thing. Both reason and tradition proved the immortality of the soul. There is a natural feeling in man tending to religion, which proves the immortality of his constitution, and the existence of a soul in man that can never die; and has been the universal belief in all ages of the world. All nations have their different forms of religion, but if they had no immortal souls, it would be impossible to show the use of them. Though Dr. Thomas might teach the contrary, he maintained that all were immortal, both righteous and wicked. The wicked are to go into eternal punishment, where they are to suffer the miseries and pains of hell; but this could not be, unless they had immortal souls: a man without a soul could not be the subject of eternal punishment.

Dr. THOMAS.—Craw-fish like, my friends, I shall have to go backwards, and refer to the first day of this debate. In his third speech, my friend told us that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were alive in heaven; and that though their bodies had gone to corruption, their immortal souls were with God in paradise; and as a proof of this, he quoted the words of Jesus, as recorded by Luke xx. 38—"God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Now, although this may be very satisfactory and conclusive, in the view of Mr. Watt, it is very far from being any proof to my mind. He thinks if he has got these three patriarchs into heaven, that they must have had immortal souls in their animal bodies, which soared thither on angels' wings; but assuming their presence there, if it be possible for them to have gone thither by any other means, (and it is possible though not probable,) their being in heaven is no proof of their having had "immortal souls," in the popular sense of the phrase; for men have gone to heaven by *translation* and *resurrection*: Enoch, Elijah, and Jesus to wit; their being in heaven now would only show that they are not on earth; a revelation would be necessary to inform us how they got thither. The case of Moses is one in point. The compiler of his writings informs us that he died in the land of Moab, and that the Lord buried him in an unknown place. By the aid of the New Testament, we learn that Michael was concerned in his obscuration from the eyes of Israel; hence we may say, without any exercise of fancy, that Jehovah concealed or buried him out of their sight through the agency of Michael; and were it not for the New Testament, we should conclude that Moses was still mouldering in the dust of Moab; but the writers of that book, Peter, James, and John especially, testify that Moses is alive, and that they saw him in company with Elijah. From this testimony, it is probable he is in heaven, although it does not say that he went up thither; yet, being in company with

Elijah, who came whence he was carried, when translated, it is very likely he returned with him. Now, though we are certain of this, we are left in the dark as to how Moses was restored. We may freely conjecture, but we cannot positively affirm, whether he returned to dust and was formed anew, or whether he was translated to heaven subsequently to his death, and descended from thence with Elijah, or whether he was preserved from corruption till the transfiguration, and then restored to life; thus much, however, is certain, that whereas he was dead, he is alive again, and seeing that the restoration of life in an inferior animal would be no proof of its possessing "an immortal soul," neither is the circumstance of Moses being alive again any proof that he or any others, assumed to be in heaven, had immortal souls within them.

But, I maintain that Mr. Watt's proof proves nothing more than what Jesus affirmed, namely, that "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living." If it proves anything more than this, it proves that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are dead, and therefore God is not their God now; but that, inasmuch as he declared to Moses after their death, that he is their God, then it follows they must be made alive for that relationship to obtain. But, furthermore, Paul teaches that the interval between the day of one's death and the morning of the resurrection, is not reckoned by God when He speaks of His sons; for, says Paul, "*God, who makes alive the dead, calls persons who exist not as though they existed;*" and truly so, "for they all live to Him," or are before Him in remembrance. Now, this declaration of Paul's was made in connection with Abraham, of whom he was speaking, as the father of all the seed: that God, who makes alive the dead, speaks of Abraham who is dead, or non-existent, as though he was alive.

Further, Mr. Watt's proof is part of an argument which Jesus had with certain Sadducees on the resurrection of the dead. Jesus affirming, and the Sadducees denying. The proposition affirmed by Jesus was this, namely, THE DEAD ARE RAISED. For the proof of this, he rested on the authority they had already quoted, namely, "the writings of Moses;" and cited Exodus iii. 6, which reads, the Lord said "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." This passage, then, Jesus considered as good authority, or proof, from the testimony of Moses, that the dead are raised; and his argument was this—Sadducees, you acknowledge the writings of Moses to be true, conclusive, and authoritative in all matters of faith and practice. Moses, in whom you confide, has shown that the dead are raised, for he has termed Jehovah, "the God of Abraham," &c. Now you know that Jehovah is not the God of the dead, which you would make Him to be, if the dead are not

raised; on the contrary, He is the God of the living, and therefore there must be a resurrection of the dead; for, "If there be no resurrection, they who are fallen asleep are perished:" the dead are raised, then, and their resurrection is necessary, that the saying of Moses may be verified concerning Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This reasoning was conclusive, and, in the estimation of the Scribes, demonstrative of the resurrection; for, said they to Jesus, "Rabbi, thou hast spoken well."

But the notion of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob going to heaven at the instant of death, is altogether out of record, and in no sort of conformity with the promises made to them. It was not the heaven of Sectarianism that was the hope of these patriarchs; but *a resurrection from the dead to the possession of the land of promise.*

Jehovah promised Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, severally and successively, at different times and places, that he would give to each and all of them the whole land of Canaan. At the time this promise was made, nothing was more improbable than such an event. The land was in possession of powerful and warlike tribes, the descendants of Canaan, the grandson of Noah. God had promised the land to Abraham, but he died, not having received the promise; He also promised it to Isaac and to Jacob, but they likewise died mere strangers and wanderers in the land. As Paul expresses it, "all these died in belief (of the promises,) not having received them. For seeing the things promised afar off, and embracing them, they confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims in the land (promised to them)." Concerning Abraham in particular he says, that by virtue of his belief, "when called to go out (of Chaldea) into a place (Canaan) *which he should afterwards receive as an inheritance*, obeyed, and went out, not knowing whither he was going, and sojourned in the land of promise (Canaan), as in a foreign country, dwelling (therein) in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the joint heirs (with himself) of the same promise (concerning the land)."

But Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were all three joint-heirs with *a fourth*, and that fourth was termed The Seed: "To thee, Abraham, &c., and to thy seed will I give this land for an everlasting possession." Now, Paul says, "To Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed;" and, concerning this seed he continues, that Jehovah did not say, "and in seeds," as of many individuals, but, as concerning ONE PERSON, "and in your seed, *who is the Christ.*" These promises to Abraham he terms "THE WILL CONCERNING THE CHRIST," by which will the inheritance or Promised Land was bestowed freely on Abraham by God's promise. To these things a disciple of Moses objects; if the inheritance be by promise, why was the law of Moses given? The apostle replies, "the law was added on account of transgressions, till

THE SEED should come to *whom it (the Land) was promised*. So that we see that the promises were made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Messiah.

You will now see from this the force of the expression used by John, "He (the Christ) came to HIS OWN LAND, and his own people (who inhabited it) did not receive him." Palestine became the property of Jesus by virtue of the will concerning him, which was made 430 years before the law of Moses was given; and his people who occupied his estate or inheritance, possessed it by virtue of that will (and not by the law) *temporarily* until the Lord of the Domain should come, and, inasmuch as they refused to acknowledge him as the owner of the country, he ejected them by violence.

But the heirs of this inheritance, hereafter to become a Paradise, are greater than have yet been numbered. They are as the stars of heaven, innumerable. They are made up of *two classes*, namely, *that (class) which is of the law*," and that "*which is of the faith of Abraham*," "who is the father of all the seed." Justified Israelites and justified Gentiles are the all who make up the children of God. "And, if children, then heirs; heirs, indeed, of God, and joint heirs with the Christ." No, though the law could *perfectly* justify no one, the death of the seed completed what it was incompetent to effect; for Jesus died for the redemption of the unredeemed transgressions committed under the law of Moses, that the justified of the animal Israel might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance promised to Abraham for an everlasting possession. Thus, they became Christ's and the *true* seed of Abraham; for "all the descendants of Israel, are not (the true) Israel; neither are they children, because they are the (animal) seed of Abraham, but the children of the promise are counted for seed;" and "he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is circumcision outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is of the heart, in the spirit (or according to the gospel), not in the letter (or according to the law of Moses)." "Abraham received the mark of circumcision as a seal of the *righteousness of the faith*, which he had whilst uncircumcised (or a Gentile); that he might be the father of all uncircumcised believers (or Christian Gentiles), that "righteousness might be counted even to them" (as well as to Israelites); "who are not only circumcised, but *who also walk in the footsteps of the faith of our father Abraham*, which he had whilst in uncircumcision."— See *Epistles to Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews*.

To become the seed of Abraham, and therefore heirs of the promises he holds, whether Jew or Gentile, slave or freeman, male or female, we must all be Christ's. Now, in order to become Christ's, *we must put him on*; and how this is to be done, we are at no loss to know; for say the Scriptures, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." In order, then, to put on Christ, we

must be baptized into his name; and then it follows, according to the apostle, that if you are Christ's, you are certainly Abraham's seed and heirs, according to the promise made to him of the land, &c.

From the things contained in the promises, then, it appears that Palestine was willed to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, their animal descendants in the line of the twelve patriarchs, the Messiah, and to his brethren of all nations. Of these, none have realised the promises in the will except the animal Israel, and they only *temporarily*; whereas the will promises it for an eternal or *everlasting possession*. Stephen in his speech before the Sanhedrim said, "God caused our father Abraham to remove his habitation into this land, in which you now dwell. And *He gave him no inheritance in it*, not so much as the breadth of his foot; *nevertheless*, he promised to give it (the land of Canaan,) for a possession to him *and* to his seed (the Messiah) after him." But the seed possessed no more of his own land than Abraham; shall we say, then, that God's promise has failed? By no means; the time only for its fulfilment has not yet arrived. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob lie mouldering in the dust of Palestine, and their descendant, the seed, has gone a journey into a far country. What then is necessary to their possession of the promised land? First, that the *Messiah should descend from heaven*; and second, that Abraham, &c., *should rise from the dead*.

The second coming of Messiah and the resurrection of the dead are thus involved in the promises made to Abraham. Hence Paul terms them "the promises of life." They are the platform or foundation of all Jehovah's developments in human affairs. A builder must have a plot of ground before he can raise a superstructure to be held by a Firm whose transactions are to astonish the world; so the great Master Builder selected a tract of land on which to erect a house of mansions to be possessed of a king and his associates, whose doings will astound the earth. The following are a few passages from "the word of Christ" on this subject:—

"Ask of me and I will give thee (O Messiah,) the heathen for thine inheritance, and the ends of the land for thy possession."—(Psalm ii. 8.)

Jehovah is king for ever;

*The Gentiles shall perish out of His land.*

Thou maintainest the cause of the fatherless and oppressed,

*That none may henceforth be expelled from inheritance.*—(Psalm x. 16-18.)

Who is the man that feareth Jehovah?

He shall himself dwell in prosperity,

And his offspring shall inherit the land.—(Psalm xxv. 12.)

The meek shall inherit the land,

And delight themselves in the fulness of prosperity

Jehovah careth for the life of the upright,

And their inheritance shall endure for ever.

For they who are blessed of God shall inherit the land,  
 And they who are cursed by Him, shall be rooted out.  
 Depart from evil and do good,  
 And thou shalt dwell in the land for ever.  
 The righteous shall inherit the land  
 And dwell therein for ever.  
 Trust in Jehovah, and keep His way,  
 And He will raise thee to the possession of the land;  
 Whilst thou shalt see the destruction of the wicked.—(Ps. xxxvii.)

The heaven, then, to which Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the faithful of the primitive times looked, was the Land of Promise with all its paradisaic joys in the presence of the seed to whom it was especially bequeathed. For the hope of this, many "were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain ~~the better~~ resurrection," which would introduce them to the incorruptible kingdom: it was for this that Moses chose rather to suffer evil with the people of God, esteeming the reproach concerning the Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; for he looked forward to (this) "the retribution;" and it is for this we contend, as the true heaven, "the divine rest that remains for the people of God." But, Mr. Watt affirms that these worthies are now in heaven; I call upon him, therefore, forthwith to prove it.

MR. WATT.—He could not possibly imagine why it was necessary for him to prove that Abraham was in heaven! No, if he could prove that righteous men did go to heaven in general, he should have proved that Abraham was there in particular; for the father of the faithful was a righteous man. He thought it singular that Dr. Thomas should call on him to prove what everybody believed; all men admit that when the just die, they go to heaven; what use was there in proving it, then? The angels carried Lazarus to Abraham's bosom, where they were both in joy; and they all knew that Lazarus and Abraham had not risen from the dead; they must, therefore, have both gone straight to heaven, the place of joy; and consequently it was not necessary to rise from the dead in order to enjoy life, or to enter into the presence of God in heaven. Dr. Thomas has said a good deal about the seed of Abraham and the promises made to him. The seed of Abraham were the Jews, who have inherited the promises. Joshua put them in possession of the land promised to the seed of Abraham, and they held it under the favour of God. Canaan was the type of the heavenly country to which the righteous went at their death; and which the apostle says, they (the ancients) sought, when "they looked for a city whose builder and maker is God." Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were in the Promised Land, it was not necessary, then, that Christ should descend and these pious people rise from the dead to enter Paradise. Would

anyone tell him that the promise was anything else but the coming of Jesus into the world? It was the promise made to Eve, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, or in other words as spoken to Abraham; and the land related to Israel, and nothing else. Is it not proved, continued he, reverting to the case of Lazarus, that Abraham was in heaven when it was said that he was carried to Abraham's bosom, which was believed by the Jews to be paradise? And addressing his opponent he said, "the context, Dr. Thomas, would prove to you that it was his soul that was carried by angels to heaven." He continued that it was the rich man's soul that was in hell, where it was suffering torment. His body was in the grave, but his soul was tormented in the flame, which caused him to beseech Abraham to send Lazarus to cool his tongue; and so Lazarus was in happiness; for Abraham declared that he was in joy, that is, his soul was happy. Dr. Thomas ridicules the idea of this parable being literal. He has said that it is a story or fiction, and that the popular interpretation of it is not the true one; but was it more probable that all the great and good men of America and Europe were all wrong, and he only right? If the most obvious meaning, which was its literal, was not true, but some hidden sense, then they had a revelation hidden from view, which was a contradiction.

He would, then, leave the case of Lazarus, and observe that he had already proved Dr. Thomas to be a Calvinist; and that too from his own writings, under an article, which he styled *Lexicographia*, in which he says that Calvinism is the gospel according to Paul. But Dr. Thomas denied that he was a Calvinist; at all events, he would say to Dr. Thomas, "When, sir, you shall publish another edition of your *Lexicographia*, I would advise you to insert this: 'The soul, a smelling-bottle—a discovery I recently made in some of my Hebrew researches!'" In his opinion, Dr. Thomas had many out-of-the-way notions; and one of them, which was not the least remarkable, was that when Christ reigns upon earth, there would be mortals and immortals in the world; but for his part he could not conceive how mortals and immortals were to live together! Christ would come to judgment at the end of the world; according to Dr. Thomas, he was to come to reign a thousand years in the land of Canaan! But he could see no reason for any such speculation!

According to Dr. Thomas, he continued, no one could arrive at heaven unless he were baptized with the true baptism! No one, however honest or sincere, can go to glory except Dr. Thomas and the few with him who were baptized with the true baptism! Did they ever hear of such a thing? In a letter to Mr. Campbell, published in his *Apostolic Advocate*, he says, "Perhaps you may recollect a conversation we had on this, at the house of a mutual friend, in

Philadelphia. 'If,' said I, 'baptism is for the remission of sins, can one arrive in heaven without it?' You did not answer me satisfactorily. While yet conversing, a clergyman, named Chambers, called to see you. 'If immersion be the only baptism,' said he, 'and baptism be necessary for salvation, then infants must be immersed to be saved, which you do not pretend to say.' This he considered as an evidence that immersion was not necessary to salvation. I well remember your reply. 'Brother Thomas,' said you, 'has just been irritating me on that subject.' I replied, 'That was not my intention; but that I wanted the difficulty explained.' You continued to Mr. Chambers, 'that he admitted that infants were saved without faith; would he, therefore, say that faith was not necessary to salvation?' Mr. C. was silent; I was amused at your ingenuity, but unrelieved. Had the doctrine of eternal life, as taught by Jesus and his apostles, been understood, we should all have been extricated from the dilemma. You both reasoned on an assumption that eternal life can be attained by other means than by an intelligent obedience to the gospel, and hence you could only throw stumbling blocks in each other's way." Thus, continued Mr. Watt, they would see that Dr. Thomas considered that no one, infant or adult, could be saved without being baptized. Well, he believed that infants were baptized in the primitive age. The apostles converted families and households, and was it likely that they contained no infants? But Dr. Thomas gives this conversation between Mr. Campbell and Mr. Chambers as the commencement of his theory on the immortality of man. From this he went on from one thing to another, until he has denied that any will get to heaven but those who are truly baptized for remission of sins! But he was willing to meet Dr. Thomas on Acts ii. 38; and he was willing to meet him on the Holy Spirit. Herod slew all the infants from two years old and under; did none of these go to heaven? Were none of these saved from the damnation of annihilation?

Mr. Watt then proceeded to offer some remarks on Dr. Thomas' sentiments on the subject of prayer, reprehending his refusal to pray with the unimmersed, as in the case of a family at Pleasant Grove, when he first visited Lunenburg; and then gave place to his opponent.

Dr. THOMAS.—Mr. Watt, my respected friends, has reduced his proofs of the immortality of what he calls "the soul," to a very low degree, and has narrowed down the reason of its belief by mankind to a very insufficient and indeterminate basis. First, he tells us, in proof of the immortality of the soul, that the most stupid Indian believes it. And suppose, my hearers, that the most stupid of the stupid and barbarous of the races of our kind believe a notion to be



true, does that prove the genuineness of the thing believed? For instance, the most stupid people in the world believe in a plurality of gods, and they believe it too on precisely the same evidence as that which induces them to credit the immortality of the soul; evidence, however, it cannot be called, for the premisses of their superstition only prove that their forefathers held the same notions of deity and soul: but shall we say their "system of divinity" is true because believed by the most stupid of mankind? And yet, such is the nature of the proof adduced by our sagacious opponent, when he says that the evidences of the immortality of the soul are so manifest that the most stupid Indian believes in it. But to my mind, my friends, it amounts simply to the probability, that if the most stupid Indian believes in the immortality of the soul, it is very likely to be a most stupid doctrine! It was, indeed, a dogma of Paganism; no wonder, then, that Pagan Indians, and the superstitious and credulous of mankind, should still retain the crude and absurd opinions of their ancestors, whose wisdom, though much extolled, is foolishness in the judgment of the word.

But, secondly, my opponent has at length abandoned the Bible as revelatory of this dogma. He admits it as true, that the Revelation of God does not reveal "the immortality of the soul" in the popular sense; and the reason he adduces is, because everybody knows it. According to him, it was *known* by all the Pagans, and by all Israel, before the coming of the Great Instructor of the world; and he concludes that it must have been true, from the neglect of Jesus to preach against it, as we have done. Now this may pass current with him for very sound argument, but with me it is lighter than vanity. He says everybody, even the most stupid Indian, *knows* that the soul is immortal. But how does everybody know this? Suppose we grant that everybody knows that he has a soul, what evidence has he within him, separate from the Bible, by which he can conclude that that soul is immortal? He feels nothing deathless within him; from innate experience, he knows nothing of deathlessness; on the contrary, the sensations of every day are a memento to him that mortality reigns within him. But he thinks, says the Platonist, and therefore he has immortality within. Indeed, and has everything that thinks, immortality in it? If so, then the lower animals are as immortal as Plato's soul, for they think, though not as abstractedly, metaphysically, and foolishly as he and his admirers. But the great stumbling block in the way of these good people is, how is it possible for *matter to think*? The idea of matter thinking, is entirely without the range of possibility with them. But to me, the greatest mystery would be how human thought should be eliminated without it. It astonishes Mr. Watt to hear the statement that the brain thinks. But where in

all this terrestrial world, is a brainless thinker to be found? We grant there are many who either do not think, or think as though their organ of thought were wanting. These exceptions, however, excepted, I maintain that neither "instinct" nor reason, in man or beast, has existed or can exist where there is no brain. What? Impossible for God to organise matter so that it should think? Who will deny that the power of God, the All-Powerful, can endow matter, yes, the dust of the ground, with the properties of mind? Surely, none. Well, then, the question at issue is, not whether He *can do it*, but whether or not He *has done it*. We all who believe in His omnipotence admit freely that He can do it; and from observation and reflection, I am convinced that He has appointed the brain as much for thinking, as the liver for the secretion of bile. Why does every organ of the body differ in the structure of its organization? Why, but because everyone of them has a different function to perform; each has to produce a different effect. The lungs are appointed for respiration, hence their structure is vesicular; the arteries have to propel the blood to the remotest parts, hence they are muscular and elastic; the veins have to return the blood in opposition to the law of gravitation, hence they are valvular; the liver to secrete bile, hence it is ascinated or grape-like; the parotid to secrete saliva, hence it is lobular; and the brain to think, hence it is osmazomous and convoluted, &c. Hence, upon the principle of different causes for different results, the organs which form the animal man, are structurally resolvable into different proximate elements so intrinsically dissimilar in their original combinations, as to adapt them to the evolution of divers effects.

But Mr. Watt says that everybody *knows* that there is an immortal soul in man, and therefore it was unnecessary to reveal it in the Bible. Now, I have shown that this knowledge cannot be derived from a man's own experience, and as he dismisses the Bible from the contest, it cannot be derived from that source. Neither nature nor revelation, then, gives evidence of the proposition; it cannot, therefore, have been a matter of knowledge to our first parents; consequently they could not deliver it as a matter of tradition to their descendants. There is but one conclusion, then, to which we can come, namely, that it is *an afterthought, or speculation of some metaphysical genius, and, like idolatry or image worship, diffused over the world by certain who assume to themselves the attributes of "divinity."*

Why did not Jesus preach against it as I have done? Why, my friends, no one ever taught a doctrine so opposite to Plato's dogma as he. He taught the affirmative, that it is "he who believes on the Son, has life eternal," but he did not stop here, for he stated in terms of

the most unmistakable character one would suppose, that certain of the race of man should never live for ever, or become immortal; as it is written, "*he who rejects the son, SHALL NOT SEE LIFE;*" and his beloved disciple testifies to the same effect concerning the unrighteous of men, that "*everyone who hates his brother is a manslayer; and no manslayer has eternal life (or immortality) abiding in him.*" In short, the Bible, from Genesis to Revelations, is emphatically THE BOOK OF ETERNAL LIFE—it is the volume dictated by Him "who only hath immortality," and its grand design is to teach the Jew and Gentile how they may become immortal, or partake of that immortality which He alone possesses. The Jews searched the Old Testament, because in it they thought they should find eternal life; but the Gentiles searched it not, and were therefore ignorant, except from general report, of its contents. The articles of their creed were instilled into their minds by pagan priests and heathen philosophers; some of whom blended with their own reasoning, a few truths they had gained by travel among the Jews, and thus constructed a system of vain philosophy, which served only to stupefy the brains of their bewildered followers. But, though the righteous of Israel were safe, they understood not the heavenly things they ministered; for, concerning the salvation of the soul, or in other words, the redemption of the body, "the prophets inquired accurately, and searched diligently as to what things, and what kind of time, the Spirit of the Anointed One, was in them, did signify, when he predicted the sufferings for the Christ, and the glories following these:" and as to the Pagans, they were as ignorant of the doctrine of eternal life and immortality as the New Hollanders; it was an honor reserved for the Illuminator of the Nations, and Israel's Glory, to teach the true doctrine of a future life and world. He is the life of that world, and without him, the Prince of Life, it sinks irremediably into eternal death.

But, says an objector, if there be no immortal soul in man, what is the use of Religion? Nay, we reply, but because man forfeited his life, therefore religion is necessary for its restoration. But, before we can talk with any precision upon this subject, it is necessary that we should define the term *Religion*. It is a noun, from the Latin *religio*, which is derived from a verb compounded of *re* and *ligo*, signifying to *bind up fast again*, to *make fast again*, to *join together again*. The verbal definition, then, of religion is, that which repairs, binds up, makes fast, joins together, or heals up again, any thing previously dilapidated, unbound, loosened, disjoined or breached. And, as we shall find, this definition in terms agrees with its doctrinal import.

Now, God and man being the parties in the case, the question is, what incident occurred between them that required the use of such a term in relation to their intercommunications? In answer to this

question, I must refer you to the testimony of Moses. There was a time, as appears from his writings, when man, and everything of which he was lord, was not only "good" but "*very good*." A very good man, the possessor of a very good estate, was certainly altogether very good. During this very good period of Adam's existence, the Lord God spoke with him directly. There was then no third person to communicate between them; nor was there any sacrifice made or appointed. God was his bountiful benefactor and friend. He had given Adam the earth and everything upon it He had created, for his inheritance; there was nothing in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms but he was its lord, by deed of gift from God who had made him in His own image, with animal, intellectual, and moral faculties, which fitted him for the enjoyment of all the things he possessed. He could stand in the presence of his Maker with reverential and dignified innocency of heart. He was devoid of *shame* and without *fear*; because his conscience was void of offence against God. In this state of good, unmixed with evil, everything was on a footing of the purest and most perfect friendship; and all that God required of Adam was, that he should love Him with a grateful affection.

God placed him in Eden, and gave him a law. As a matter of ability, he could keep or break it as he pleased; for certainly, no man will dispute that he could have refrained, had he chosen, from eating the fruit of a particular tree. Well, then, as Milton expresses it, he was "free to stand and free to fall." God knew what would be the result, still it was necessary that he should be placed under law, in conformity with the principles of His imperial rule. Would it, I would ask, have been consistent with the maintenance of His supremacy, to permit this fair terrestrial province of His dominions, in its rolling career through the heavens, to have borne along an intelligence who yielded no homage to the glorious Author of his being? No: the honor, glory, and goodness of God required that man should be proved by law, and that he should obey.

Now the law, though holy, just, and good, became a stumbling block to Adam. A sagacious reptile was temporarily endowed with the faculty of speaking in the language of our first parents; this has happened to a beast once only from that time to this, as in the case of Balaam's mule, which spoke with the voice of a man, and reprov'd the madness of his career. The serpent taught the woman to doubt the veracity of God, and instilled into her mind a dogma of the orthodoxy of all ages, that *the word of God is a dead letter*. They believed the lie, and believing, fell; and by the fall, lost Eden and brought upon the world its woe.

Here, then, we see, that they disobeyed God; and as disobedience

is the greatest offence, a *wide breach* was made between Him and the man. As soon as ever the human pair transgressed, *shame* and *fear* invaded their consciences. They knew they were unclothed, and for shame, devised a covering for themselves; and hearing the accustomed voice of the Lord God in the garden, were penetrated with fear for the first time, and retreated into some secret place. What a remarkable instance have we here of the symptoms and power of a guilty conscience. Shame and fear have ever been the sure and certain indications of it. Transgression had destroyed it, and nothing but *pardon* could restore it.

By disobedience our first parents lost two things in particular, namely—their morality and their life; for no good man is the subject of an evil conscience, and they were expelled the garden that they might not eat of the tree of life, and so live for ever in a state made up of good and evil. Now, it is worthy of remark, that the first thing they did when “convinced of sin,” was *to cover their own iniquity*; as it is written, “they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves aprons.” But guilty man cannot devise an acceptable atonement for his own sin; neither can he hide his own deformity. It is God, the offended party, whose prerogative it is to prescribe the terms of reconciliation; which He does in conformity with the principles He has established. Of these, one is, that “*without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sins*;” another is, that “*it is impossible for the blood of animals to take away sins*;” and the third is, that

“No one can redeem his brother from death,  
Nor give a ransom for him to God;  
Too costly is the redemption of his life  
That he should live to eternity,  
And not see corruption.”—(*Psalms* xlix.)

If, therefore, blood must be shed, and yet the blood of animals will not suffice, and if man cannot redeem his own life, it follows that God must provide a propitiatory sacrifice and the way. Another thing is obvious from these premisses, and that is that man can do nothing to make God propitious; for whatever institution be appointed for remission, it must flow from God's spontaneous philanthropy. Nothing you can do can possibly make God more willing to save you than He is. All your prayers, shouts, cries, tears, agonizings, and so forth, are worthless in His sight. The way of pardon has been established for ages, and unless you submit to that in the letter and spirit of its requirements, you are undone for ever.

Well, from these details, my friends, you perceive that a grievous breach took place between God and man, the effects of which we are all suffering under to this day. Now, the breach was to be healed, the

interrupted harmony restored, the wound was to be bound up, or man's race was lost in the oblivion of eternal death. Had our offended Creator turned His back on our progenitors, and interfered no more, our lot would be as cheerless as desolate, and as hopeless as bestial perdition. Hence the necessity of *Religion*, which He instituted to heal the breach and to recover the world from the curse and death.

Because man is mortal—yes, because he has within him not one spark of immortality, religion is necessary. The wages of sin is death, or mortality; but by religion comes “the gracious gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” The religion which God set up *after* man's transgression, was a matter of *faith* and *practice*. The matter of faith was, “THE SEED OF THE WOMAN shall bruise thy head, O serpent, and thou shalt bruise his heel;” and the matter of practice was, *the shedding of the blood of animals* until that bruising of the woman's seed should occur. Hence, blood was shed by command of God for the remission of Adam and his wife's personal offence, who appointed to them the skins of the sacrifices for clothing, instead of the bloodless foliage of the fig tree. Thus the Lord God abolished the veil of their own device, and covered their iniquity according to the principles of His own wisdom.

In consequence of the binding of a sacrifice to the horns of an altar and the pouring out of its soul, Adam obtained the answer of a good conscience; in other words, he was *constituted* righteous and his offence atoned for; so that he will never be brought hereafter to trial for “the original sin.” He has been already tried, sentenced, condemned, and punished. Before his transgression he was *inherently* good; goodness was part of his nature: but, by that event, having lost his innocency, his inherent excellency was supplanted by good and evil mixed, and he became inherently deteriorated. Destitute, therefore, of inherent holiness, innocency, and righteousness, it became necessary, if he was to sustain a virtuous character, that some means should be devised in harmony with the attributes of God, by which he might be *constituted* what inherently he was not; now these means were devised, and afterwards termed religion; which, doctrinally may be defined—*The institution of God, by which man may be constituted righteous, and become the heir of immortality.* Thus it is a breach-healing and peace-restoring institution; and thus we see the doctrinal and verbal definitions of the term thoroughly harmonize in all their parts.

Further, in conclusion, if man were innocent and immortal, religion would be superfluous. There would be no object for it to effect. It could not make an innocent and immortal man more innocent or more immortal; hence the objection, that if a man have no immortal soul religion would be useless, is invalid: on the contrary, the very existence of such an institution goes to show that man is neither pure

nor immortal, and therefore, needs religion to make him both the one and the other.

Religion was adapted to the faculties of fallen man ; and of these, it appeals most powerfully to his hope ; superstition on the other hand, appeals chiefly to his fears ; hence religion addresses his intellectual and moral powers, while superstition debases and tyrannizes over them by terrific appeals to the faculties which man possesses in common with the inferior animal races. Virtuous intelligence, not passion, is the characteristic of a genuine religion ; hence, all those torrid, fanatical, and noisy efforts, by which the clergy storm the passions of the multitude into a deafening tumult under the name of revivals, are the fruits of the operation of the animal organs uncontrolled by the intellectual and moral sentiments, and are the marks of a low and grovelling system of ignorance, credulity and vice.

---

#### FIFTH DAY.

MR. WATT observed that Dr. Thomas had told him several times what he had to prove. Now, this reminded him of a saying of the celebrated Mr. Burke, who had remarked that, "If you say a thing to a man every morning in the year, he will come at length to believe it." Dr. Thomas had called upon him to prove that the gospel preached by Presbyterians was the gospel preached by Paul ; but this was a proposition he should not condescend to demonstrate. He could not prove all things in theology in a day ; nevertheless he would take up the work of the Holy Spirit and discuss that, but he had not time to do so. Here was, they would see, the Holy Spirit ; and in connection with that, he would advert to a circumstance in Dr. Thomas's life. He was travelling along to an appointment, and on his way, called at a certain house for water. While they went to the spring, Dr. Thomas entered into conversation with a negro man standing by. He reasoned with him, and asked him one thing about the Spirit. If his master were to read the Bible to him, and it told him one thing, and his master told him another, Dr. Thomas said he should believe the Holy Spirit in the Bible. Thus they would see, that Dr. Thomas supposed that the Scriptures are the only way in which the Spirit speaks to the soul ; and that to depend on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, as generally believed by Christians, was fanatical.

Dr. Thomas had said that a thinking thing was not spiritual ; for his part he did not understand what he meant by a thinking thing not being spiritual.—(Here Dr. Thomas applied to the Moderators to say if Mr. Watt was privileged to make such a statement, seeing that he had nowhere said any such thing. What he did say was this, that a

thing is not necessarily spiritual because it thinks. The majority decided that it was his privilege.)—Did not God and the angels think, and were they not spiritual beings? Men also thought, and this proved that there was a spirit in man.

Again, Dr. Thomas had said that the expulsion of man from the Garden of Eden was a proof that he had no immortal soul. When God made man, He breathed into him an immaterial spirit, by which he was made the image of his Creator; how, therefore, could immortal persons be prevented from being immortal by expulsion from Eden? This was what he could not understand.

He would advert again to another of Dr. Thomas's propositions. He had said that to die was not to perish, but that to perish we must die. Now he considered that to die and to perish signified the same thing. He would prove this from Numbers xvii. 12: "And the children of Israel spake unto Moses, saying: Behold, we die, we perish, we all perish." And yet, says Dr. Thomas, to die is not to perish, though they stand side by side. In another place it says, "where there is no vision, the people perish;" that is, they die. And there was the case of Jesus and his disciples on the lake, who, in fear of sinking, cried out, "Lord, save us, or we perish." It was clear, then, that Dr. Thomas's notion about the difference between die and perish, had no foundation in the Bible. He had already told him about Lazarus, that though dead, his spirit was in Abraham's bosom. He did not know what use there was in saying anything more about it. His body had perished, yet he was alive, in a place of joy; for Abraham said, "Lazarus is in joy, and you are in torments;" and that was enough for him.

Wasn't the thief in heaven? Dr. Thomas says he was not; but Christ said, "To-day" you shall be in paradise with me. He had looked for the word *seameron*, and found that it signified, *to-day*, *this-day*. Now, what was meant, he would like to know, by the word, "to-day?" When common people said to-day, they meant to-day. Jesus did not intend to say that he should be with him many hundred years afterwards, on some artificial day; but on that very day of his crucifixion, they should both be together in paradise—a word which Dr. Thomas says is Persian. Wasn't it astonishing? Dr. Thomas had said that *Paradeisos* was a Persian word. And, turning to the Doctor, he said, "Didn't you say, Dr. Thomas, that *Paradeisos* was a Persian word? Now, I deny that it is a Persian word. Isn't *para* a Greek word, Dr. Thomas? Isn't it *para-deisos*—the Greek, *para*, Dr. Thomas? But, sir, you haven't learning sufficient to tell what the word was that Jesus answered."—(Upon this, Mr. Albert Anderson could refrain no longer, and, standing up, presented him with a Greek lexicon, opened upon the word *Paradeisos*,



and requested that he would read it. Mr. Watt then read, to the confusion of himself and the amusement of his hearers: "*Paradeisos, a Persian word.*")

Having disposed of the word *paradeisos* with so much *eclat*, he proceeded to offer some remarks upon Dr. Thomas's strictures on the stupid Indian argument; and observed, if there is a stupid person in Dr. Thomas's church, who believes in the mortality of the soul, I pronounce that the doctrine is a stupid doctrine; and if I can thus blow up his metaphysics sky-high without a moment's reflection, you will see how little he ought to be believed. Was not the belief of a God, he continued, a universal belief among all, whether learned or stupid? And would the fact of that doctrine being believed by the most stupid convert it into stupidity? Neither would the belief by a stupid Indian, that there was an immortal soul in man, make the doctrine a stupid doctrine. Certainly it would not.

The Pagans gleaned the immortality of the soul from something revealed to our first parents, but not recorded in the Bible. God breathed into the man's nostrils a particle of His own essence, and thus he became a living, or an immortal, soul—a particle of the Deity. When men die, it was this Spirit, which came from God, that returned thither again, while the body returned to dust. Mr. Watt then read an extract from the *Advocate*, concerning the *Harbinger* and Lord Brougham, in whole or part, as follows: "The metaphysical *Harbinger* proves his Identity in a very different way to Jesus. He brings in Lord ex-chancellor Brougham to his aid, who says that the evidence of the independent existence of mind (the thinking *I*), is more strong and more conclusive than that for the existence of matter.—"We know," continues he "the existence of mind by our consciousness of or reflection on what passes within us." "*I think*," says the *Harbinger*, "and this thinking *I* is different from *I* seeing, hearing, smelling, or feeling. If I can discriminate between a sight and seeing, then I can discern a difference between a thought and thinking; and, therefore, I can form as good an idea of mind or spirit as of any other objects of thought. I judge of it not by colour, weight, or dimensions, but by its various acts and feelings—by what it does and by what it suffers. But if I cannot explain, I can believe that I have a spirit from God of which he is truly Father, in a way and manner which I can no more explain than how a bone is formed from the same substance of which an eye, an ear, or a nerve is fashioned." All this may be proof convincing to Messrs. Harbinger and Brougham, but is none to me, of their existence. My senses have seen, heard, and handled Mr. Harbinger: they have seen my Lord Ex-chancellor; but, upon their own shewing, there is much doubt of the fact; "for if we doubt the existence of either, it would be far more reasonable to doubt

that matter exists than that mind exists;" in other words, one's senses may deceive us as to the qualities of matter, but consciousness, never!" "But," continued Mr. Watt, "he did not understand Dr. Thomas's views of the thing. Mr. Hume speaks of things being nothing but ideas and impressions. For his own part, he could demonstrate more easily the existence of spirit than of matter around him. The act of remembering itself would be proof to him of its existence, independent of matter; whereas Dr. Thomas recognized nothing but matter, which he had to prove.

Dr. Thomas had said that words were signs of ideas, and yet when he asked him to be so good as to define the word *soul*, he would not give its meanings, but said it had no absolute meaning. Absolute meaning! He did not know what Dr. Thomas meant by absolute meaning. God, however, had taught the immortality of the soul; in other words, the voice of all men was the voice of God—*vox populi vox Dei*—and all men, therefore, believing that there was an immortal soul in man, it was evident that God had taught it.

Mr. Watt then proceeded to offer some comments on the word *religion*. According to Dr. Thomas, there was no worship of God before the fall, for there was no religion. (Dr. Thomas observed that this was not a correct statement of his view of the matter, which exhibited man as on terms of perfect friendship with God, so that there was no worship based upon a sacrificial institution, which was essentially sin atoning, and, therefore, breach-healing.) Dr. Thomas had derived *religion* from *religio*, when it ought to have been deduced from *threescheuoo* to worship God. There was nothing in this word about healing a breach; it simply signified to worship or serve God; for wherever God could be worshipped, there was religion. If religion was to heal a breach, there was religion in heaven; for there were fallen angels there. Would Dr. Thomas say there were no fallen angels there—no breach to heal there? Dr. Thomas thinks he has a right to use words as he thinks proper! He has said something about the moral faculties; and did not these imply a mind and a heart; he had likewise said that man was living and organized dust; and had discovered to us that the immortal soul of Dr. Thomas consisted only of flesh and bones!

Another singular notion of Dr. Thomas was, that men can do nothing to propitiate God! Nothing to make God, or induce Him to deliver a soul from sin! Nor did he appeal to the fears of mankind!—Astonishment followed astonishment! His mind only could sin; and it must be deterred from sinning by the restraints derived from what was to come hereafter. If Dr. Thomas did not appeal to fear, he pronounced his system of religion defective. The Doctor had talked about science; but it was "the baseless fabric of a vision"—and would

"be abolished." What had they to do with the science of Phrenology? It was a German nostrum long since exploded! A mere visionary speculation; and concerning it, he would say—preach it not in my native States; for its principles were the seeds of neology and infidelity.

DR. THOMAS.—Before proceeding to offer further evidence to prove the absolute mortality of man, I shall again, my friends, recal the attention of my opponent to the propositions I have so often submitted to him, but of which I am sorry to discover, he is singularly shy.

(Dr. Thomas then read the *five* propositions on page 62 and the *six* on page 82; and added—)

12.—That the privitive word *hadēs* signifies invisible, unseen, dark, obscure, and so forth; and when applied to a place for the reception of the deceased, simply denotes the grave, or a place of dead bodies.

13.—That Mr. Watt's definition of *all* and that of Universalists are identical; harmonising, therefore, in their interpretation of Romans v. 18, and 1 Cor. xv. 22, he is sophistically a Universalist to all intents and purposes.

14.—That the thief is not in paradise; but mouldering in the dust of Palestine, and so resting until the resurrection of the pardoned, when he will enter the kingdom or paradise of God to be set up in the land, promised to Abraham, at the coming of the Anointed King of the Jews.

15.—That religion is an institution appointed by God, and designed to purify man from sin, and as a consequence of that purification to confer on him a *tittle* to immortality; therefore, the setting up of an institution for these purposes, proves that immortality is no inherent property of the human race.

I shall proceed now to examine a point upon which the Platonic Spiritualist rests, as conclusive of the assumption that there is an immortal principle in man. *I think*, says he, *and therefore I have a mind; and as thinking is not a function of matter, it is consequently a spiritual effect. Now a spiritual result must flow from a spiritual cause, and as a spirit is immortal, therefore the spiritual act of thinking must be the elaboration of an immortal I within me.* Now this is all very fine, and may pass for demonstration with those who are given to mistake sound for sense, and abstractions for real existences. Metaphysicians, my friends, have a great deal to say about *mind*, but ask them to condescend to define it, and you will invariably discover their inability. (Here Mr. Watt rose and observed that that was not the case; for that metaphysicians were able to define what *mind* was. Dr. Thomas replied, that the

audience no doubt would be glad to hear their definition. Upon which Mr. Watt rejoined, that *mind was that which remembers, reflects, and wills*; to which Dr. Thomas added—very true, the mind does these things; but, pray sir, what is *the 'that'* you speak of, as remembering, reflecting, and willing? This was too deep for Mr. Watt; so that he gave it up without a word of reply, and sat down). Dr. Thomas proceeded. As I was saying, my friends, metaphysicians cannot define the term *mind*, about which they write and talk so unintelligibly. Mind is "that which" does so and so; but ask them what the 'that' is, and they cannot tell you. They have speculated upon mind from the days of Aristotle to our time; and the most powerful intellects have been perseveringly directed to metaphysical '*science*,' falsely so called; they have constructed system after system, each of which has flourished, fallen, and been forgotten, in rapid and humiliating succession. Reid, Locke, Hume, Stewart, Brown, &c., all philosophers of metaphysical profundity, have professed to teach the science or knowledge of mind; but strange to tell, they none of them agree upon its primitive powers. The very existence of even the most common and familiar faculties of the mind is still in debate among them. Thus, after a lapse of 2000 years and upwards, these philosophers are at variance upon the very first principles of their own science.

Now, as it has been well observed, the causes of the failure of the metaphysician are easily recognised. He studied the mind chiefly by reflecting upon his own consciousness; he turned his attention inwards, observed the phenomena of his own faculties, and recorded these as metaphysical science. Now, *consciousness* is the knowledge which the mind has of its own existence and operations. But the mind is not conscious of organs at all. We are not informed by feeling of the existence of any mental organs whatever. All that consciousness reveals is, that the mind, whatever it may be, inhabits the head: but it does not inform us what material substances the head contains; hence it was impossible for the metaphysician to discover the organs of the mind by his philosophisings on consciousness, and no metaphysician pretends to have discovered them.

Of the class of metaphysicians, or abstract Spiritualists, are Lord ex-chancellor Brougham and Mr. Alexander Campbell. These gentlemen rest upon consciousness as the corner-stone of their identity; and they maintain that "the evidence of the independent existence of mind is more strong and more conclusive than that for the existence of matter;" so that, my friends, if any of you should unfortunately run your heads against a post, there is less evidence in the knock-down-concussion of the material existence of the post, than of the existence of a thinking principle in man capable of an existence independent of matter derived from the metaphysical axiom, I am a spirit because I

think. "*I think*," says Mr. Campbell, "and this thinking *I* is different from *I* seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling." To be sure it is different. What rational man would deny it? The thinking *I* is the brain; and the hearing *I*, the tasting *I*, the feeling *I*, the smelling *I*, and the seeing *I*, are the organs of the five senses, which transmit their impressions to the thinking, or idea-combining *I*, by means of the nerves, which lie intermediately between the brain and the organs of the five senses. But, insulate the brain, that is, cut off the communication between these senses and the brain, the common centre of all impressions, and the thinking *I* will no longer continue the elaboration of new combinations of ideas.

Well, my friends, the metaphysicians have done for the world literally nothing; for they have only set mankind by the ears and filled their heads with the babblings of a "vain philosophy." Ghosts, apparitions, spirits, hobgoblins, and such like phantasia, are the scare-crows which filled grave-yards and fairy heavens, on opening the Pandora box of metaphysical speculation. We have heard them confess their ignorance of mind and spirit, and yet they presumptuously and arrogantly denounce as Infidels, Materialists, Heretics, and Atheists, those who can render a reason for the views they hold. But I will not stay longer to show the untenability of their notions; I will proceed to point out to you a more intelligible, consistent, scriptural, and therefore, more excellent outline of mind and its phenomena.

To understand the constitution of man is important in many respects, especially in a moral point of view. Religion was appointed for man, and was adapted to him as a fallen intelligence; that is, *as he is*, and not as *he is not*. Now, unless we become acquainted with the constitution of human nature, it is impossible that we can discover, or perceive, the adaptation of God's moral institutions to the nature of man. If we continue ignorant of these things we shall be constantly at fault to account for the most common incidents, and apt to attribute them to supernatural causes, when they can be explained on the most simple and obvious principles. We may lay it down as an axiom, that the moral institutions and the works of God, in their constitution, are altogether harmonious, that is, that they are admirably adapted to one another. For instance, man is naturally a creature capable of loving, hoping, believing, and fearing. Hence, when God instituted religion, He constructed it so as to appeal to these faculties. It represents God, therefore, as loving man, and therefore worthy to be loved; it sets before him things of hope and things of faith; and it warns or cautions him, as he values his own happiness, not to slight or despise the goodness and philanthropy of his divine Benefactor and Friend. Now, these considerations constantly hold out to us the memento, that the God of nature is the God of Revelation, and that,

consequently, His works do not stultify or contradict themselves. And here I would enquire, Is there an agreement between the popular theory of mind, spirit, or soul, and the institutions of Moses, which were made up of so many corporeal actions? Upon this singular illusion, of an immortal being in a mortal being, capable of a disembodied existence and exercise of the ordinary faculties of seeing, feeling, hearing, tasting, smelling, walking, thinking, speaking, and so forth, without possessing eyes, ears, legs, nose, brain, or tongue—capable of all these extraordinary feats, and responsible alone for the practice of the mortal being—upon such an anomaly, I would ask what fitness or propriety can be discovered in a religion such as that of Christ and Moses, which claims of man a material obedience, that is an obedience in which certain bodily actions are enjoined? If such a "Thinking I" is so much the more perfect, and the better adapted to the enjoyment of life after it is alleged to have "shuffled off this mortal coil," than while the imprisoned tenant of the outward man, what adaptation can we discover in the provision of the New Institution to the wants of man in the instance of the resurrection of his mortality? Do we not rather discover a discrepancy between the constitution of man and the institution of God, and, upon such a view, should we not be tempted to say that man had one Maker, and Christianity another? And such is the conclusion to which the theories of Spiritualists have brought thousands. A comparison of nature and revelation, when candidly and rationally instituted, never yet made an Atheist or Infidel. On the contrary, it has been a comparing of the absurd and illusive *views* of truth, broached by ingenious but scripturally-ignorant sophists (who have regarded what *they* call 'truth' as lost, if tried by 'reason') with the obvious constitution of the natural world, which has driven men of intellectual acuteness, who have mistaken these views for the truth itself, into the dark retreats of an infidel and "vain philosophy." But the man who learns his religious faith from the written Word of God, and not from the written or oral traditions of clergymen, believes that the one God of nature and revelation has adapted His moral to His natural institutions—for man is the subject of both—fears not to "prove all things," and his conviction is, that if religion was made for an incorporeal I, it would have been better constructed had it consisted of a simple injunction of an absolute quietism—a pure abstraction for the abstract I.

But what the Aristotelians, for upwards of 2000 years, have been unable to do, namely, to set forth some rational and consistent account of the mind and its phenomena, Drs. Gall, Spurzheim, and others of the present century have, to a certain extent, effected within a few years. The philosophy of the human mind, which they have elaborated

under the name of Phrenology, I believe, in its fundamental principles, to be the only true system extant, and altogether in harmony with the Word of God. They repudiate the notion of the thinking principle being a disembodied spirit! Now, this speculation rejected, the first question which presents itself to the consideration of all enquirers into the philosophy of the human mind, is one of immense importance to the satisfactory solution of many other subordinate enquiries. It is a question which meets us at the very threshold of our enterprise, namely, *What is the mind, or of what substance is the thinking principle composed?*

Concerning this question, phrenologists are somewhat shy; and generally disinclined to investigate, knowing, I suppose, the readiness with which men cry out Materialism, Atheism, and so forth, when principles are discovered dangerous to their craft, and fatal to the traditions upon which chiefly rest their reputation for wisdom and superior sagacity. But this timidity is unbecoming in the man whom the truth has rendered free. Sustained by facts and revelation, as far as warranted by these, they ought not to fear to advance. Phrenologists declare themselves unable to decide what the thinking substance or principle is, but content themselves with maintaining that *facts prove that the power of manifesting mind in this life depends on the condition of the brain*. Thus the question concerning an immortal thinking I within a man, is left open between them and their opponents.

But what phrenologists confess themselves unable to decide, we will attempt to do by adopting their principles, and calling in the Word of God to our assistance. There are but three ways, by one or more of which it is possible to ascertain *what the mind is*; and these are by *consciousness*, by *observation*, or by *revelation*. Now, by consciousness, or reflecting on what we feel, we discover nothing concerning the nature or essence of the mind. We do not feel a spiritual substance stirring within us, and elaborating sentiment and thought; and neither do we feel a *material substance* producing these effects. In short, we are not conscious of the operations of the brain, neither are we conscious of the contraction and relaxation of the muscles; we can, therefore, no more determine from feeling that the brain is moved by an immaterial thinking principle, than that the limbs are moved by the direct impulse of spirit.

*Observation* is said to assist us no more than consciousness. If we inspect the head, we cannot penetrate integuments, to observe the mode of operating or of eliminating thought. Remove these coverings, and expose to view the cerebral convolutions, and we observe nothing but the surface. This view presents nothing to our contemplation but an inert mass, of a soft and fibrous texture, in which no thought can be discerned and no sentiment perceived, and in

which also no spirit, or immaterial substance, can be traced. The solution of this question, therefore, say phrenologists, is placed completely beyond the reach of those who depend upon consciousness and observation to enlighten them.

But observation, I believe, will assist us somewhat in ascertaining the essence of mind, and the dependence of thought upon the condition of that essence. The effects of injuries on the brain, prove to us that *the mind cannot think if the brain be compressed*. A man who has been "knocked out of his head," as it is termed, has no thoughts from the time of the blow until his coming-to. Now, this fact would seem to show that the brain is the mind, and consequently, that it is material, and that the matter thinks. If, on the contrary, it be an immaterial guest, in the recesses of the brain, and capable of independent action, why, although its power of manifestation is suspended, can it not think as freely as before the contusion? Certainly, in this case, it is not more helpless than when its phenomena are suspended by death. Observation teaches us that human thought and living organisation are inseparable; for no such thing has ever been observed in nature as a brainless thinking I. The character of the thinking depends upon the condition of the brain. This is another fact that testifies the materiality of the mind. If the brain be inflamed, that is, if it be the subject of a morbidly increased circulation of blood, delirium is the result. It thinks rapidly, intensely, and wildly; but if the current of its arterial blood be largely and suddenly diverted into other channels, as in fainting, then it ceases to think altogether.

Again, it is an acknowledged principle, that man is ignorant of everything antecedently to observation; that is, he has no ideas but what he derives from without; or as Mr. Locke expresses it, there are no innate ideas in man. But if the mind of man is a particle of the divine essence, it ought to have innate ideas and all other divine attributes in a degree, at the period of birth as at mature age. But all agree that it has not; and that all the ideas of man are borrowed. The only being whose ideas are innate is God. He *conceived* all things which exist, and *gave birth* to them by His creative power. Everything which exists is an incorporation of His original conceptions. When the idea of a tree presented itself to His mind, it was an innate conception; but when man thinks of a tree, he borrows the idea from the world around him, which is the great physical magazine of God's revealed conceptions. If man then, have no innate ideas, his mind is not a particle of the divinity; and if this be so, it must be a created something, upon whose existence, therefore, does not depend the being of a God, for His existence does not depend on any of His works.

But, says one, *can matter be made to think?* And why should it not? If we say that it cannot, then, we deprive the Creator of His



omnipotence, and we should have found out one thing which He is unable to do. But the Scriptures say that all things are possible with Him ; and John said to the Jews, that He could of the stones at their feet raise up children to Abraham ; I conclude then, that if God can transform hard stones into walking, feeling, seeing, hearing, and speaking men, He can also make those same stones capable of intellectual and moral combinations and displays. For myself, I firmly believe that He who converted *dust* into bones, flesh, blood, nerves, arteries, veins, organs, &c., and called the aggregate by the name of man, can make matter think and capable of manifesting all mental phenomena usually attributed to an immaterial thinking principle. But why are the opponents to this conclusion so much at fault concerning it? The reason is obvious and simple: "they err, not knowing the Scriptures and the power of God."

Now, if it be granted that matter can be organized so as to think, the next inquiry is—*Has God endowed matter with the property of thought independently of any other principle?* The affirmative is my own conclusion. For, if God created man capable of one of two destinies—mortality or immortality ; and if, by transgression, he incurred the penalty of death, and was expelled from Eden, that he might not, by eating of the tree of life, be cured of death, and live for ever the subject of good and evil blended, I conclude that after his expulsion he can be regarded only as absolutely mortal in all his parts of "body, soul, and spirit:" so that the notion of an immortal thinking human principle, capable of an existence, separate and independent of the body, is excluded. If man be altogether mortal, he can be composed of nothing else but parts which are subject to death: whatever manifestations, therefore, are observed, whether of brain or other organs, they can have no dependence on any thing else but on the operations of matter under the stimulus of life ; consequently, when matter ceases to live, they cease to be elaborated and displayed. Now, if it be true that matter, or the brain, is the thinking principle, you may conclude, that it is the best possible substance for thinking, just because the Creator has selected it for the purpose and endowed it with this property. If, therefore, God has exquisitely and perfectly adapted the brain to this end, His objects in creating man will not be defeated on account of His having chosen a wrong substance out of which to constitute the thinking principle. Let this truth sink deeply into your minds.

If, then, these premisses obtain, the question proposed of *what is the mind?*—is clearly apparent. By the word *mind*, I understand the *intellectual, moral, and cerebro-physical power* in man. It is not the cause of thought, but the power, or organ, by or through which thought is elaborated ; it is no more the ultimate cause of thought than the

stomach is of digestion. Although digestion is the function of the stomach and its appendages, yet without aliment to operate upon, it cannot exercise its inherent power ; so with the brain, or mental power, although its function is thinking, yet without *ideas and impressions*, which are its aliment, to work upon, it cannot think ; as food, then, stimulates the stomach to digest, so ideas and impressions stimulate the brain to the exercise of its intellectual, moral, and physical power.

Now the moral and physical universe is the vast depôt of God's *revealed* conceptions, or ideas ; in other words, His ideas, as far as He has uttered them, are all written in the volumes or books of nature and revelation. Into the temple of the universe, He introduced His creature man. He endowed him with powers to observe and reflect upon the forms of heaven and earth. He gave him eyes to contemplate His handiworks, and ears to listen to the words of His instructions. Through the channels of the five senses, the images or ideas of things seen, heard, felt, tasted, and smelled, passed into the brain ; which being endowed with the faculty of retaining impressions, remembered the ideas, and stored them up for occasions of its need. Human ideas may be all resolved into six classes: of these, five are common and one peculiar. The common are the ideas of the five senses ; and the peculiar, a class composed of an immense number of combinations. As I have said, the power which combines is the brain. Having received the ideas transmitted by the five senses, it reflects upon them, compares them, mixes them up into various compounds, and expresses them by the organ of speech as it judges fit. The perfection of its combinations depends upon its organic excellence and activity ; and the soundness of the senses of transmission. If the organ of sight has been defective from birth, it can elaborate no thoughts in which the idea of light is blended. A case is related by Cheselden of a person restored to sight by an operation, who when he beheld a scarlet colour, compared it to the sound of a trumpet, so little idea had he of light, from which he had been congenitally excluded. And so it is as to the other senses under like conditions. In short, the accurate combination of ideas, or thinking, depends upon a sound brain in a sound body ; if the senses are defective, the thinking is erroneous, however sound the brain may be ; and if the senses are as perfect as possible, the thinking will still be impaired, if the brain is not sound. Human thought, then, depends upon organization and cannot go on without it. Mind, therefore, is material, and consequently, matter can and does think.

But an objector may urge, that if the brain and the mind are but two different terms from the same thing, then the lower animals have minds, for they all have brains ; and, therefore, a man has no pre-eminence over a beast.

It is unquestionably true, that they have minds and that they think, though not so perfectly as man. But there is an organic difference in the brains of men and the lower animals. They differ in degree and in kind. The lower animals have no faculty of justice; no sentiment of veneration to prompt them to seek a God whom they may adore; no faculty of hope leading them to long for glory, honor, and immortality; and, indeed, the convolutions of the brain, which in man form the organs of these sentiments, appear not to exist in the lower animals. Those organs also, which in man serve to manifest the faculties of reflection, are eminently deficient. Hence man is endowed with qualities which are denied to the lower creatures, so that it is apparent that he is designed for another and a higher destiny than is allotted to them, whatever may be the essence of his mind. Organization, and not a superinfused immaterial principle, is the grand constitutional difference between an animal man and the inferior creatures.

Thought, I have said, depends upon organization; and to this the Holy Spirit has given his attestation. In the 146th of the Songs of Zion, verses 3 and 4, he says by the pen of David—

Put not your trust in princes;  
 In the sons of men in whom there is no help!  
*Their breath goes forth; they return to the dust;*  
 IN THAT VERY DAY THEIR THOUGHTS (or purposes) PERISH.

Here the Spirit teaches, that the sons of men are breathing dust; and that at death, the breath leaves them, and their form returns to the dust according to the sentence of God upon Adam and his race, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Consequent upon this dissolution of their organization, he declares, that *in the very day* of its occurrence, their power of thinking is destroyed; for, says he, "their thoughts perish." But what sense would there be in such a declaration, if, as soon as their breath leaves them, the sons of men go either to heaven or to hell? Have men (or ghosts rather) no thoughts and purposes there? O yes; tradition attributes to them the perfection of thought! But the Spirit of God says "No, at death their thoughts perish." It is obvious, then, that the Scriptures teach that human thought depends upon living organized matter, and that when this ceases to live, thought ceases to be.

In conclusion, *consciousness* assures us that man thinks with his head; *observation*, that he thinks with his brain; *revelation*, that his thinking principle is essentially mortal; and observation and revelation concur, that human thought and living organization are linked together, as cause and effect. From reflection on the phrenological constitution of man, I conclude that his race is born to a higher destiny than it now

fulfil; and from the study of the Bible, I am assured that the race will finally become immortal, honourable, and glorious; and that all who compose it, to whom the offer is made, may become incorruptible, blissful, perfect, by the obedience to the will of God, who under this dispensation, offers an eternal and unfading crown to all who will accept it on the conditions of the gospel of Christ.

Mr. WATT observed that the discussion had frittered down to a debate on phrenology. Dr. Thomas' last speech had aimed chiefly at the science of phrenology, but what phrenology had to do with the immortality of the soul, he could not conceive. Dr. Thomas had said that metaphysicians could not define mind; but this he contradicted, for they say they can define mind as well as matter. Matter was defined by specifying its properties, but we were as much at a loss to define the essence of matter as we were to indicate the essence of mind. In defining mind; they stated its properties likewise. It was the property of mind to remember, to reflect, and to will, and therefore mind was defined to be that which remembered, reflected, and willed. The mind was the spirit which the Lord God breathed into the man; and was as immortal as He that gave it, for it was a particle of His own essence. If the divine essence could be defined, then the essence of the human mind might be defined, and not before.

Words should be defined by the standard Dictionaries of the language; but Dr. Thomas did not proceed in this way. He did not in his definition go to work by Webster or Johnson, but went to the English Bible to ascertain the meaning of words. He changed words to suit his own purposes; and according to him, *repentance* must be rendered *reform*. (Dr. Thomas observed that Mr. Watt was mistaken; that he did not translate a substantive by a verb. *Repentance* was a noun, and customarily rendered by himself and others *reformation*; and that *reform* was the rendering of the verb *repent*). It was absurd, he continued, to explain English words by the language of the Holy Spirit, who never used the English language. When the Holy Spirit spoke, there was no such language in existence. What right, therefore, had Dr. Thomas to reject Webster and to have recourse to the Bible for the meaning of English terms and phrases?

He opposed a common error and would take his own. According to Dr. Thomas, *mind* singular consists of things plural. It was made up of many organs in one organ; and in the brain we had intellectual, moral, and physical powers. But what were the operations of the brain; did they operate through the skull? There was this bump and the other, which were all the effect of the operation of the brain through the skull; and phrenologists pretended to judge of a man's power by the bumps on his head. Dr. Thomas regards the mind in

some sense as a term expressive of an assemblage of phenomena, and in another as the brain itself; so that the mind was the effect of an effect. He could comprehend that, but he could not understand the cause of that effect. For his part he had no faith in phrenology; it was an absurd system, and not at all to be depended on. He would tell them an anecdote in illustration of this. Lord Wellington, who all knew was a great general and a brave man, requested a phrenologist to examine his head and tell him what he thought of it. He did so; and remarked that the appearance showed that he was a coward.\*

Now after that, what was such a system worth? It was the baseless fabric of a vision, and had long since been scouted from Hampden Sydney (we think he said). Job had said that the Spirit of God was in his nostrils, which, according to Dr. Thomas, he supposed would mean the mind of man was in his nostrils. For spirit sometimes signifies mind as well as breath. So much for the pretended science of phrenology.

According to Dr. Thomas, none will have eternal life but the righteous; for, he contends that all men are mortal, and that only a few of them become immortal. If this is true, then there is no life for the wicked, or any other but a comparatively few people. But he did not believe in such doctrine as that, and he declared that if eternal life belonged to the righteous, eternal punishment and life belonged to the wicked. "I affirm," said he, "that their life and punishment are eternal;" for it says, "the righteous shall go away into eternal life and the wicked into everlasting punishment."

He was astonished at Dr. Thomas' definition of religion. It was something to heal a breach. Was there not something in hell broken that required to be bound up? If there was, then religion was needed there. Whatever healed a breach was religion; for religion was the binding again of anything previously unbound. Well, being immersed was a part of this healing of the breach. According to Dr. Thomas no one, however good he might be, could gain eternal life without being baptized into the true faith; but for his part, he must have something

---

\* The anecdote correctly stated is as follows:—A lady eminent for her phrenological talent was in company with the Duke and others. He requested her to examine his organization, and to give him her opinion of it. But the lady was some time before she would consent; at length she yielded to the solicitations of the party, on condition that His Grace would not be offended at the opinion she might give. To this the Duke replied he would not, if it were the conviction of her mind. Having surveyed the developments of his head, she observed that his organization indicated that he was a great coward! This opinion astonished every one who heard it, who concluded, that she had failed, and that the Duke would certainly feel himself insulted. But to their great surprise, His Grace replied that the lady had correctly stated his case; and that constitutionally he was a coward. For, whenever he had gone into battle, it was his moral and not his animal courage which had sustained him. We did not relate this in our next speech, it having slipped our recollection to do so; it may not, however, be unacceptable here.

else than going down into the water for healing the breach between God and man.

He considered Dr. Thomas' conduct as very unscriptural. When Michael contended against Satan for the body of Moses, he brought no railing accusations against him; but Dr. Thomas had railed against John Calvin and the Methodists. He had accused the Presbyterians of design upon the State, and of aiming at an ascendancy in the councils of the nation. But he repelled the charge as unfounded, and as a stale libel of infidelity upon the Presbyterian Church, which was the object of his hate. After some other oft-repeated and scattering remarks, Mr. Watt sat down.

DR. THOMAS.—Mr. Watt, my friends, has frequently remarked that if there is no immortal soul in man, then there is no God. "If," said he, "Dr. Thomas believes there is a God, he believes in Him without evidence, if he denies the immortality of the soul. There cannot be a God, if there is no immortal soul." And in another place he says, "If Dr. Thomas knocks from under me the belief of the immortality of the soul, he will take from me the belief of the being of a God."

Now, it is most true that I no more believe in the existence of an immortal soul in man, than I believe in the 'divinity' of my opponent. I believe that the dogma of such a soul is purely pagan in its conception, birth and education, and without the least foundation in the Holy Scriptures. Plato had taught that there was a principle in man, which was derived from the essence of the Deity. This he termed *divinæ particula auræ*, a particle of the divine essence. This essence being immortal, pure and ethereal, as he supposed imparted, of course, like properties to its embodied particle. Hence it was regarded by him as immaterial and immortal—an undying soul in a mortal human tabernacle. But this pure ethereal, and immortal atom of the unchangeable Deity became impure and vicious, or retained its perfections according as it tenanted an illustrious or ignoble body. The former class comprehended heroes, illustrious men, and eminent philosophers alone, who, he taught, ascended after death into the mansions of light and purity; while the commonalty, weighed down by their lusts and passions, sink into the infernal regions, whence they were not permitted to escape before they had undergone a Universalian punishment; and were thus purified from their turpitude and corruption. This doctrine was seized with avidity by those of the Christians, who had embraced the doctrines of the Alexandro-Egyptian Theological Seminary, and applied as a commentary upon the doctrine of immortality as taught by Jesus and the apostles. Thus, from a desire of retaining, with the profession of the gospel, the title, dignity, and habit of philosophers, the professors of the celebrated school of

'divinity' compounded the dogmata of Plato and the doctrine of Christ together, and out of the two, produced a *tertium quid*, to be found neither in Plato's works nor in the Word of God. This third something has been christened by ecclesiastical writers with the title of New or Christian Platonism. This sect of Christian Philosophers arose in the church of Christ toward the conclusion of the second century, and their opinions spread with amazing rapidity through the greatest part of the Roman Empire; and proved extremely detrimental to the cause of christianity. In short, New Platonism was a part of the nucleus of the debasing superstition which was afterwards enthroned in Constantine—the arch-murderer of his offspring and the despot of the world—as the religion of the Empire and of Rome. Its dogmata concerning the human soul, heaven, purgatory, hell, punishment, and so forth, were more or less retained by the people, when they set up many popes in opposition to the One of the Great City. From that time to this day inclusive, Protestants have adhered to the traditions of Egypt on heaven, hades, hell, and souls, as though they were all written as with a sunbeam in the Book of God.

Let me, then, put it to your good sense and reason, whether the rejection of new Platonism necessarily involves you in the sin of Atheism? Is it come to this, then, that the existence of the Eternal depends upon the truth of Plato's opinions? What? If there is no immortal soul in man, there is no God? This may be all gospel with such reasoners as Mr. Watt, whose *theism* is as insubstantial as his soul; but with a Christian whose faith is the belief of evidence credibly testified, it is all moonshine. I believe, with all my heart and mind, in the existence of the God of Abraham, Israel, and the Christians. My faith in God is not credulity. I do not assent to His existence because all the world assents, or because it has been the belief of all generations past, or because there is any thing in man immortal or divine. None of these reasons would be sufficient to superinduce faith in my mind. All the world assents to many absurdities, and sanctions a multitude of crudities, which shock and nauseate common sense and reason. The belief of the moderns, based upon the pretended "wisdom of our ancestors," is just as likely to be true and genuine, as the belief of an adult founded upon the puerilities of childhood. No, I have learned to put away childish things, baubles that amuse and bewilder the men and women—the children of a larger growth—who make up the world at this era of the apostacy. *The truth has made me free* and given me courage, in the face of friends and foes, of wealth and power, of popular influence and authority, to prove, try, or examine all things, and to hold fast that which commends itself by the power of divine testimony. I choose to think for myself, to read for myself, and to judge for myself; and be the propounder who he may, whether "great,

good, or learned," in the estimation of the Church or world, I claim the inalienable right of receiving his doctrine only so far as it is sustained in my own judgment by Scripture and reason. We ought to take nothing for granted. It is the most dangerous thing imaginable. Hence, the excellency of the apostle's exhortation, "Prove all things." I fear not, then, to enquire into the divine Existence, the immortality of the soul, the merits of popular religions, or the divine calling and sending of the pretended ambassadors of Christ. These, though veiled with a mantle, consecrated by the learning and philosophy of ages past, and pronounced too sacred for vulgar scrutiny, are nevertheless legitimate topics of examination and discussion, and well deserving the unsophisticated labours of all who would be the subjects of a pure and enlightened faith. The priests of anti-Christ have too long monopolised the instruction of the world, and now you behold to what they have reduced it. They have brought it to the verge of Atheism, having made the existence of the Divine Being to rest on the reception or rejection of Plato's dogmas concerning the human soul. My friends, I do not belong to their order. I am what they term "a layman," that is, one of the people. It is one of yourselves, then, that would direct you into the way of truth; not into the belief of his opinions, but into the belief of the doctrine of Christ and his apostles. You have the Scriptures in your possession. It is to them I would beseech you to have recourse for divine instruction. They are able to convince you of the existence of a God, though you may discover nothing there of Platonism, old or new. Well, then, let me request your attention while, as briefly as possible, I demonstrate to you that the being of the Eternal is altogether independent of the speculations of philosophy.

My proposition, then, in opposition to Mr. Watt, is this, namely, that the existence of a God depends upon His own independent power, and that the belief of that existence rests upon evidence which is testified by nature and revelation. In proof of this, I adduce the following passages of Scripture:—

- 1.—Hos. viii. 6.—The workman made it (the calf of Samaria), therefore, it is not God.
- 2.—Rom. 1, 19.—That which may be known of God, is manifest among the Gentiles; for God has manifested it to them: for His invisible attributes, even His eternal power and divinity (or superhumanity), since the creation of the world, are very evident, being known by His works.
- 3.—Acts xiv. 17.—God, in former generations, permitted all the nations to walk in their own ways: though He did not leave Himself without witness, doing good, and giving us showers of rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.



4.—2 Cor. iv. 4.—Christ is the image of God.

5.—Heb. 1. 3.—The Son of God is the exact representation of His character.

Now the reason which the Holy Spirit assigns why the Calf of Samaria was not God, was, that it was created by a workman; hence it follows, that God is God because He is uncreated. God, therefore, is self-existent; but how He caused Himself to exist, if we may so word it, is a question which the Infinite One can alone reveal. I believe that He is eternal, because He has declared Himself to be so; and I believe His declaration to be true, because the power of an Eternal One is writ on all creation. The mode of the Divine Existence is incomprehensible to us of finite faculties. We cannot conceive of a period when a being had no beginning; but inasmuch as One who has never been known to testify falsely, has informed us that He is without beginning of days, we may believe Him without credulity.

But if He had never spoken a word to us, there is evidence sufficient of His existence to produce belief, although we may know nothing of the constitution of our own nature. The sun, moon, stars, and constellations of the heaven,

“Declare the glory of God:

The firmament shows forth the work of His hands.

Day uttereth instruction to day,

And night showeth knowledge to night.

They have no speech, nor language,

And their voice is not heard;

Yet their sound (or testimony) goeth forth to all the earth,

And their words to the end of the world.”

When I contemplate these heavens, and trace the ruling lights of day and night in their courses; when I reflect on their gravity, magnitude, and distances; when I consider the mutual dependence and harmony of their motion, and when I attempt to penetrate, as it were, to the confines of immensity, and to calculate the sum of the material masses it contains, I am lost in amazement at the power of that being who could organise, launch forth, and sustain for myriads of ages in one undeviating career so vast a system of globes. Equally amazed am I, when I turn from the contemplation of the celestial manifestations of His eternal superhumanity, to that of His terrestrial displays. Here the vegetable, animal, and mineral kingdoms teem with evidence of His “eternal power and divinity.” The dry land and sea, with their swarming population, all display the hand that made them; if, therefore, there were not animal men besides myself in being, and I had heard of no such phantom as a human ghost, I should believe that all these things had a Creator, and that He was, like the power he displayed, eternal and superhuman or divine. These things the

apostle says, "are very evident;" hence he concludes that the idolatrous Gentiles were inexcusable for worshipping such vanities as idols; and therefore, the consigning them over to eternal death, the wages of the sin of those who died under these times of ignorance, was just.

But we may contemplate for ever the works of nature, and yet be unenlightened as to the moral attributes of God. We see nothing in the face of the heavenly orbs, or on the mountains, rivers, vales, and plains of earth, which reveals to us that the eternal God is a jealous God, long-suffering, merciful, and so forth. On the contrary, we see iniquity and crime on every side, and we observe that all living things appear to be under the law, which exposes them to the risk of all being a prey to violence in their turn; to eat, and to be eaten would seem to be the law of nature; and man, the great destroyer, is himself consumed by worms. To believe in the existence of a just, merciful, and gracious—as well as in an eternal and divine Being, we must acquaint ourselves with His image. And this image Paul declares Jesus to be; and adds, that he is the exact representation of the character of God. Now you know the relation which a statue bears to its original; if it be well executed, it is an exact representation of the man to whose honour it is erected. By studying the image, or portrait in stone or on canvas, you become acquainted with certain attributes of the original, although you never beheld him face to face. Just such an one then, is the relation which obtains between Jesus the *image*, and God the *original*. If you would know God, you must cultivate an acquaintance with His Son; for the light of the knowledge of His glory shines from the face of Jesus Christ. This personage was the most amiable and excellent of the sons of men. He was righteous, merciful, holy and long-suffering, and full of goodness and truth. These attributes shone forth in all the actions of his life. The evidence, then, of God's existence is the abounding testimony of His word and works. Hence, the belief of His being does not rest upon a solitary, insulated, and disputed text, like that of the "immortality of the soul;" but on the height and depth, length and breadth of universal creation. This is the foundation of my belief in the being of a God; judge you, therefore, between me and my opponent. I suspect by this time I must have made an Atheist of him; and have proved to you that it is not "Materialism," as my views are sinistrously styled, but Presbyterianism that leads to Atheism; for, says Mr. Watt, "Knock from under me the belief of the immortality of the soul, and you will take from me the belief of the being of a God; for if there be no immortal soul, then there is no God." I have shown that "the immortality of the soul" is but the waking dream of a spurious philosophy; therefore, according to Mr. Watt, the universe is without a God. So much, then, for his divinity.

Mr. Watt affirms that the wicked are the subject of *life* as well as *punishment* eternal. This is no doubt true, *if* there is an "immortal soul" in man; but you will remember that this is the question now in debate. Mr. Watt affirms, with all imaginable assurance, that the wicked have eternal life as well as the righteous, and adds, that punishment is superadded to their eternal life, which makes it an eternal punishment. But by this time, we shall have learned that his assertions are not tantamount to proof. He has failed to substantiate the proposition that there is an hereditary immortal principle in man; consequently, there remains no foundation for his notions of eternal punishment. That the punishment of the wicked will be eternal is unquestionably true, for it is so written in the word of God; but that the eternal punishment of the clergy, and the eternal punishment taught by Christ and his apostles are identical, I altogether deny.

The clergy would have us believe that as soon as a man ceases to breathe, his immortal soul is borne on the wings of devils to the place of torment; but if this be true, what sense is there in the declaration of Jesus, that all "they who have done evil shall arise to suffer punishment?" How can they arise to suffer a torment they are already agonizing under? On the contrary, if a man is to arise to be, to do, or to suffer, common sense teaches that, previously to that resurrection, he is neither being, doing, nor suffering. Again, they teach that all men are to be judged at the last day, which these pseudo-peace proclaimers say is ages off; but if men go to heaven or hell on the instant of their demise, what use is there for a judgment day? *God appoints no useless institutions*; if, therefore, men go to hell or heaven at the time they specify, they are already judged, and the day of judgment is set aside. The clergy in their "wisdom," which is, however, "foolishness with God," send a man's soul to hell before the culprit is brought to trial; they torment him as with a legion of priests for ages; and this torment is exquisite, for according to their scarebabe descriptions, no torture can be greater than he suffers; then, after enduring the pains and penalties of hell for thousands of years, they bring back his immortality to earth, and re-unite it with a body that has mouldered in the dust as long. They do this that the wretched sufferer may be judged. They try him, condemn him, and send him back to hell from whence he came, to suffer its excruciating torments through the endless duration of ages. Such is the destiny assigned by the priests of anti-Christ to the reprobate or non-elect of the family of men; reprobates whom God had consigned to reprobation before they were born. Such is the sense of justice, and such are the tender mercies and compassion of "the ambassadors of God." But their theory of punishment is like the principles of their own conduct, unreasonable, cruel, and unjust. They are accustomed to

torment men first, and to judge and try them afterwards, and having pre-judged their case, they merely ratify the fate of the untried-condemned. And so they think that God is such a one as themselves, and that He will set His seal to their decisions. But He punishes no man unheard, untried and uncondemned. He delivered the law to Israel by Moses, a law which was "holy, just and good;" now that law declared that no man should be condemned untried. "*Doth our law,*" said Nicodemus, "*judge any man before it hear him, and know what he hath done?*" No, this is not the order of the law of God; it is clear, therefore, in conformity with the principles of the holy, just and good law of Jehovah, that the wicked do not go to hell as soon as death seizes them; but they lie prisoners in the grave until the day arrive which God has appointed, in which He will judge the world righteously by Jesus Christ; whereof He has given assurance by raising him from the dead.

But if the clergy are wrong as to the time when the punishment of the unjustified begins, they are not less so as to what it consists in. They say or teach that it is made up of *eternal existence in exquisite and ineffable torture*. Surely they must regard God as a second Pluto. I hesitate not to affirm that such a statement is a libel on the character of Jehovah, and in no measure sustained by the Scriptures of truth. What! Will God consign the overwhelming mass of the human family to an unending life in torment, millions of whom never heard of Him or his appointed Judge? Did He not expel the man from Eden, that he might not, by eating of the Tree of Life, involve himself and his posterity in the misery of an unending life in a state of good and evil; and shall we say that He did this that He might consign them to a destiny in which no particle of good, no alleviation of woe, shall obtain? No, my friends, it is the love of the human race which stimulates its Creator and Friend to devise and execute measures in its behalf; He so loved our rebel world as to send His Son for its behoof. He does not hate His offspring, though He hates their evil deeds; He wills not their woe, but rather that they turn from their iniquity *and live*.

By the Scriptures, I consider we are taught that sin will be punished in those who practise it. That even now, "vice is its own punishment and virtue its own reward," for whether we transgress God's physical or moral laws, physical and moral pains and penalties are our lot. Although He is angry with the wicked every day, yet He does not finally punish them every day, because He has appointed a day in which He will judge righteously the world. He that dies in his sins will be raised in his sins, to be tried, condemned, and punished for his sins. The resurrection of the unjust is, that they may come forth from prison, to be heard in their own defence, and that the law of God may

be vindicated. They rise, not by virtue of any immortal principle within them, but by the re-organizing and re-animating power of the Creator. Being condemned out of their own mouths as wicked servants, the sentence of the law is executed upon them—a law which declares the transgressor worthy of death or mortality. This death is termed the second death, because the subjects of it will be certain who died once before. This second death is the punishment which the law pronounces upon all those who *refuse* to obey God: “the wages of sin is death (or mortality), but the gracious *gift* of God is everlasting life (or immortality) through Jesus Christ.” Men earn this death by their own willing labour; and you know “the labourer is worthy of his wages.” Now this punishment is final. The first death is not final to the just and unjust; for the just are redeemed from it with an eternal or unending salvation; and the unjust are *respite*d from it for the great assizes. How long the period of respite may continue, we cannot precisely state; but in general terms it will be sufficiently long for their trial and execution. And here it may be asked, What will be the *immediate* cause of their again becoming the subject of death? To this I would reply, that from the phrases used by the Holy Spirit, it is extremely probable that their fate will be consummated by burning, as it is written in the eleventh psalm:—

Upon the wicked Jehovah will rain lightning;  
Fire and brimstone and a burning wind shall be the  
portion of their cup—

And by this means, as it is also written in the ninth song,

The wicked shall be driven into the grave (*hades*),  
Yea, all the nations that forget God.

And this is the consummation of their career—*death unending*; this is “the wages of sin” and the eternal punishment—a punishment which is eternal; because, unlike the former death, from the second there is no redemption.

A few words, in conclusion, concerning the ambition of the Presbyterian Hierarchy. Its petition to Congress to stop the transportation of the mail on Sunday was but an entering wedge to the mixing up of ecclesiastical principles with institutions purely civil. But to come nearer home, and to things of a more recent date, I have in my possession a pamphlet, which is a sort of Church member's guide, set forth under the sanction of the Presbyterian Church in Richmond under the “pastoral care” of “the reverend” Mr. Taylor. There are in it a string of questions for self examination; and, of these, one reads “*Do you vote at elections and for good men?*” Now, I should like to know what an ecclesiastical body, styling itself the Church of Christ, has to do with the elections of the country in its corporate capacity?

But what is the English of this query? It amounts to this: Do you vote at elections for candidates in the Presbyterian interest? For a "good man," in the Presbyterian sense, is one who is true and orthodox in the faith of the Caledonian Kirk. Now, if the elections can be controlled in Virginia by the priests of Presbytery, as they are in New York City by the priests of Romanism, a great advance will be effected in the march of priestly ambition toward a lordship over the rights and consciences of men. Be on your guard, then, against the intrigues of the crafty and designing Presbyterianism. As the chartered faith of Scotland, it might be worth an experiment to make it the church triumphant in Virginia. What has been may be; though I confess that for myself I have no fears for the result.

(Before Mr. Watt proceeded to speak, Doctor Anthony Smith, his second, stood up and proposed that the debate should close that afternoon. This was agreed to by both parties; so that the two addresses, which follow concluded the discussion.)

MR. WATT continued, that it was the solemn duty of Virginians and freemen to resist impositions on Presbyterians. They were citizens, and had shed their blood in defence of liberty against oppression. Dr. Thomas had spoken of a pamphlet in which he had said there was proof of the political views of Presbyterians. For himself, he knew of no such pamphlet: he had never seen it, and did not know that such was the case. He did not know anybody that had seen it; and he did not believe that such were the sentiments of Presbyterians. He would take them all to witness before God that he had said nothing against Dr. Thomas' motives. He did not pretend to say but that he might be actuated by the best motives; but with Dr. Thomas' motives he had nothing to do; yet he confessed that it appeared remarkable to him the course which he had taken since he had come to this country. He did not intend to search into his private affairs; these were nothing to do with him; it was with his public acts that he was concerned. He supposed this debate would be reported; though he did not himself consider it worthy of publication. He thought that if it were published, he would be entitled to half of the profits. (Here Dr. Thomas observed, that it was probable that a report would be published; and that if Mr. Watt would bear half the labour and expense, he would of course be entitled to half the profits.) Mr. Watt continued, that he supposed as Dr. Thomas would have all the trouble and expense, he ought to have all the profits; and turning to the Dr., observed, "You may have all the profits; I give up all claim."

He then proceeded to say, that he hoped Dr. Thomas would excuse him for the severity of his remarks, seeing how he had attacked the

Presbyterians. Was it generous, he would ask? A giant attacking a pigmy with such violence. He had one head on which he could say something about Dr. Thomas, but he should not bring it forward at that time. As an individual, he had no inimical feeling toward him. (Dr. Thomas rose and called upon Mr. Watt, if he had anything against him, to come out, and, before the people, state it forthwith. His dark insinuations were much worse than any reality that could be named; if, therefore, he had any charges against his character, he defied their production, should it amount to abolition itself). Mr. Watt continued, that he had nothing against Dr. Thomas' character whatever, and that as to abolition in connection with Mr. Leigh's negroes, he acquitted him altogether of any improper conduct, and considered that no blame could be imputed to him in the case. It was as to Dr. Thomas' disinterestedness that he had made the remark he did, and in allusion to what he had said about money. He attributed no improper motive to Dr. Thomas. He could have used what he alluded to this prejudice; but he would not. He did think that in speaking of other 'ministers' of the gospel, he had not been sufficiently respectful. He condemns salaries, and yet he could plead for 500 dollars as a salary for Mr. Albert Anderson. He would read to them from the *Advocate* what he had seen on this subject, and leave them to judge.

"At the annual meeting in Fredericksburg, it was determined to employ brother A. Anderson as an Evangelist. He had given up his school for the purpose of meeting the requests of the brethren. A man that devotes his time and energies to proclaiming the good news, has an apostolic and scriptural right to be supported. Common reason testifies the same thing." And farther on he says, "Brother Anderson considers 500 dollars enough for himself, family, and horse, for a year. We think so too, but not a cent too much." Now, Mr. Watt did not see why Dr. Thomas should object to salaries, when he pleaded for this for Mr. Anderson, which was certainly a salary. In New England, the people there considered it right that ministers of the gospel should be provided for; and they had long supplied their wants by a constitutional provision. The people had a right to do this, and they had exercised that right: and the majority had made it the law of the State. (Dr. Thomas here inquired what the majority had done with the rights of the minority, who dissented from the principle on conscientious motives?) Mr. Watt acknowledged that the rights of the minority ought certainly to be respected in the matter. Dr. Thomas should remember that he is living among a free people, who are at liberty to do as they pleased in these matters. He spoke in the utmost friendship, and with no intention to hurt Dr. Thomas' feelings. His father was a foreigner, and Americans and English were in reality but one people. Then turning to Dr. Thomas he said: "I would not injure a

hair of your head; but yet I would rather see the Old Baptists flourish than your sect. Have regard to your reputation. Preach the gospel, and no longer continue to "pervert the right ways of the Lord." Think of your dying bed, when all the scenes of the present shall have passed away. Take Jesus for your model, and walk in his footsteps. Let the severity of your expressions be directed against vice and irreligion; but spare us and our institutions. If we had been a nation of infidels like the French, British chains would have been riveted round our necks. He would not pretend that Presbyterians were perfect; but they came with good intentions, with love, and with the calm and pure light of truth, clear as the beams which flow from the Lord of Day. I do not desire to irritate; far from it. I cannot wish you success or prosperity; but that you may forsake the error of your way, and devote your talent to the cause of the truth and virtue. I sincerely wish you well; and, should you ever espouse the truth, you have my hearty wishes. The "reverend gentleman" then addressed what he termed "the Thomasite Church," and so concluded his part of the debate.

---

DR. THOMAS.—In conclusion of this discussion, my respected friends, I shall confine myself to a few desultory remarks; and at the same time, I shall forbear taking advantage of the privilege which falls to my share by virtue of my opponent having had the opening speech. This privilege consists in having the last word of speech, to which Mr. Watt has no right to reply in this place. I shall, therefore, carefully abstain from availing myself of this, as I wish all the victory to be ascribed to the truth, and not to manœuvre: he is perfectly welcome to all the ascendancy he can derive from every other possible source. The things I have laid before you are weighty and important in themselves; and can derive no additional consideration or virtue from expediency, policy, or intrigue. They must stand or fall by their own merits or demerits. Truth alone can sustain them in the face of prejudice, bigotry, and sectarianism. It is to the word, then, and the testimony I appeal, and not to the authority of the Rabbis of this or former ages. If the testimony of God sustains them, then the traditions of "philosophers" can do them no harm; for when truth and error grapple, the former is never put to the worse. It is your right and privilege to judge, or to give the verdict in the case. Now, in doing this, I pray you in behalf of truth, deliver your decision according to the evidence; for the evidence is the measure of the truth. If you consider that my opponent has laid evidence before you entitled to your respect and consideration, and that that evidence has fairly established the things of the sectarian world, then give them your



verdict; but if, on the contrary, you deem them unsustainable, and are convinced that I have proved my positions, then, and only then, do I ask you to accord to them, and not to me, your approbation. But if you are yet in doubt, my advice to you is, "Search the Scriptures, and see if these things are so." The citizens of the ancient Berea did this, and the consequence was, that they believed the things reported to them by the apostle: and for this practice of searching the Scriptures, Luke pronounces a well-merited eulogium upon them:—"These" says he, the Jewish citizens of Berea, "were of a more noble disposition than those of Thessalonica; for they received the word (of God) with all readiness of mind, daily examining the Scriptures, whether those things were so. Many of them, therefore, believed." I exhort you, therefore, to direct your aspirations toward that true nobility of mind, which no patent of aristocratic dignity, derived from mere mortal kings, can confer. The fountain of honour which describes the greatest altitude, is that which springs from the throne of God. Be it yours, then, to seek after the noble attributes of a deathless fame, which the Almighty Potentate reserves for those who love, honour, and obey Him; and be assured, my friends, that you cannot honour Him more than in believing His word and keeping His commandments.

Mr. Watt doubts the possibility of the existence of such a passage as I have quoted from the pamphlet of Mr. Taylor's Church in Richmond. I regret that I have it not with me, that I might read the identical words in your hearing. But, my friends, there can be no mistake about it; for the pamphlet was sent me by a Mrs. B——, formerly a member of Parson Taylor's flock. If my word is still doubted, let such call upon me, and I will show it them. It is printed in fair and legitimate characters; and, I doubt not, were Mr. Taylor called upon to furnish one of the yellow pamphlets, he would be fully able, if not willing, to do so. When I read it, I was struck with the Protestant Jesuistry of the inquiry. "Do you vote at elections and for good men?" Well, thought I, this is certainly "auricular confession" Protestantised. The confession, it is true, is not required to be made into the ears of a priest; but the question is put pamphlet-wise by him, and the subject answers to a conscience moulded by priests to the furtherance of their craft. When the phrase "good men" comes to be rendered by *men in the interests of the Presbyterian hierarchy*, the liberties of this country are gone. But we forbear. Thus much only, by way of confirmation of what has gone before.

As to *salaries*, I believe them altogether unscriptural. If a community of people choose to appoint a man to mediate for them with God, and if he devote his time to their purposes, they have a right to do so on their own responsibility. In so doing they pay

the man to preach and "administer ordinances;" and he preaches for the pay; for when a vacancy occurs in their pulpit, the hire calls, and hirelings in abundance answer; but should the flock call, and no hire be forthcoming, they invariably fall upon the list of destitute churches. Now, when the advocates of such a system claim for it the name of Christian, we except to the identity between it and the things of Christ. But, in saying this, I freely admit that "the Church" is bound to provide a maintenance for their priest, for they have no more right to his labours than any other institution for education has to those of its professors, without pay. A man cannot live upon air alone; he must be fed and clothed, and his family supported. Now, "an Evangelist," and "a Clergyman," are two essentially different functionaries. The one devotes himself to the bearing about the word from place to place, while the other is comfortably housed and planted as the lord of a flock of goats. He that teaches the gospel should live by the gospel, if he need it; but before a man is pensioned on such a principle, it should be well ascertained that what he preaches is gospel indeed.

I shall not, my friends, detain you longer than to return you my thanks for the attention with which you have listened to the things pleaded for in your presence. They will, I trust, sink deeply into your understandings, and have the effect of magnifying in your estimation that one only true gospel, by obedience to which alone you can attain to glory, honour, and immortality. Without, therefore, dismissing these things from your regards, we will consider ourselves as finally dismissed.

---

#### DISCOURSE ON ETERNAL LIFE.

On the Sunday after the debate, Dr. Thomas, by arrangement, addressed a large and attentive congregation in the Fork Meeting House, on the subject of Eternal Life. He commenced by reading the third chapter of John, which ends with the declaration, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." On this chapter, he spoke between three and four hours. The substance of the discourse, as reproduced by the Dr. himself, will be found in a cheap pamphlet, entitled The Revealed Mystery, obtainable at the office from which this discussion is issued. It is bound up with one or two later productions of the Dr.'s pen.

## APPENDIX.

The following is THE ADVERTISEMENT of the discussion which the Dr. published in the *Advocate*, and of which Mr. Watt complained:—

PRESBYTERIANISM *versus* THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

A Discussion upon certain topics related to the Religions of John Calvin and Jesus Christ, will be held on the first of August next, at the Fork Meeting House, Lunenburg, Va., by "the Reverend" Mr. Watt and friends of the one part; and Albert Anderson and John Thomas of the other.

The challenge has been given by the Reverend Gentleman, who, we are informed, has sent to Hampden Sydney College for aid. He will select his own subjects. Health permitting, we will not fail to enter the field in the name of the Lord of Hosts, the God of the armies of Israel.

## LETTER FROM MR. WATT TO MR. ANDERSON.

(Referred to by Mr. Watt in the course of the debate.)

*Wednesday Morning, June 28th, 1837.*

Dear Sir,

Your note of yesterday has just been handed to me, and I shall endeavour to meet you at Freedom or at Mr. Arvin's this evening. I am sorry, however, that you are under an impression that I have sent you an invitation to engage in a public debate. I have expressed a *willingness*, as far as I am concerned, to meet you or any one else who is disposed to assail what I consider the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion; but I have never felt completely at liberty to challenge any one to a public debate. Even an expression of my willingness to engage in a debate has been drawn from me by my being asked, "Why did not you answer Dr. Thomas when you heard him preach? Why do not some of you learned men oppose them?" &c. Most, if not all, of my friends are opposed to my getting into a debate with respect to the peculiar sentiments held by yourself and Dr. Thomas; but from the circumstances in which I am placed by an overruling Providence, I feel rather called upon to stand up in defence of the principles and doctrines of the great Reformation, and I am likewise rather of the opinion that truth is generally elicited by discussion. "*Magna est veritas, et prevalebit.*" No offence has been taken at your not giving me the title of rev.—we do not claim any titles of reverence. If men choose to speak to us, and to make use of terms indicating a respect for the ministerial character, we feel that we have no right to be offended. I would style you reverend if I did not suppose that such a mode of address would not be acceptable to you.

Respectfully yours, &c.,

Mr. Albert Anderson.

JOHN S. WATT.