

# THE SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM.

---

VOL. I. CHICAGO, ILL., JUNE, 1868. No. 1.

---

## BIBLE DISCUSSION BETWEEN REV. GEORGE CLENDENAN AND MOSES HULL.

NOTE.—The following discussion will, by request, go through twelve numbers of the ROSTRUM; a part of it was published in *Hull's Monthly Clarion*, and one letter and response in the *Banner of Light*. Five of the letters have never yet been printed. It is hoped these letters will be found of interest to our readers.—Eds.

### PRELIMINARY CORRESPONDENCE.

BRO. CLENDENAN: I am not satisfied with our discussion, that is, I want more of it. I propose a written discussion of at least twelve articles each, each article not to cover more than six pages of the *Clarion*. Will you affirm the following in such a discussion?

*Resolved*, That there are external and internal evidences of the superhuman origin and plenary inspiration of the Bible.

MOSES HULL.

MR. HULL—*Dear Sir*: Your note of March 10, is received. You say you are not satisfied with the oral discussion just closed, that is, you want more of it, and ask whether I would affirm in a written discussion to be published in your *Monthly* the following proposition, to wit: "There are external and internal evidences of the superhuman origin and plenary inspiration of the Bible." In reply to your invitation I remark that I will accept it, provided you will permit me to affirm in *lieu* of the above the following, viz: "The Bible contains a revelation from God and is plenarily inspired."

I would suggest that our articles be composed of a certain number of paragraphs each. With kindest regards, I remain yours sincerely.

Vandalia, Mich., March 15, 1866.

GEO. CLENDENAN.

BRO. CLENDENAN: Yours is here. The proposition you submit in *lieu* of mine suits me quite as well as the one I submitted; all I want is the issue. Truth, and not victory was the object of my inviting you to a written discussion. Your suggestion about paragraphing the articles and numbering the paragraphs is timely. It certainly will make the discussion more convenient



as a matter of reference. Could you have your first article mailed to me at Milwaukee, Wis., by the first of April, it would be published in the May No.

That truth may shine more brilliantly as the result of our discussion, is the prayer of

Yours truly,

Vandalia, Mich., March 15, 1866.

MOSES HULL.

MR. HULL—*Dear Sir*: Your note accepting my amendment of your proposition is received. I will try to have an article ready before the first of April.

Yours, etc.,

Vandalia, Mich., March 15, 1866.

GEO. CLENDENAN.

### ELDER CLENDENAN'S FIRST LETTER.

VANDALIA, MICH., March 25, 1866.

MR. HULL—*Dear Sir*: Presuming that our preliminary correspondence will be published in the same number of your paper that contains this, I deem it unnecessary to consume either time or space in explanatory or introductory remarks. Your readers will have heard that you and I have recently met in an oral discussion of certain propositions; that you have requested a continuance of the controversy in the pages of your MONTHLY, and that I have pledged myself to maintain the following proposition, to wit:

The Bible contains a Revelation from God and is of Plenary Inspiration.

2. Before advancing to the proof, however, you will indulge me in a remark or two on the present status of the controversy. A careful and competent observer of European and American society will not have failed to discern that there is evidently an increasing disrelish in the public mind for religious, sectarian wrangling. The friends of the Bible may well rejoice that it is so. The strifes and divisions of her friends have ever been among the most potent enemies of Christianity. Well might her divine Author in his valedictory pray that the disciples might all be one, seeing that he knew what the experience of eighteen centuries has amply demonstrated, that the triumphs of the gospel will ever be in the ratio of the unity of the church. When the various sects of Christendom shall suppress their strifes and unite upon the one Book and devotion to the one cause, then, indeed will Christianity be a power in the earth.

3. To those who have carefully watched the movements of the

1866



enemy, it will, I opine, be equally apparent that the era of covert opposition to the Bible is drawing to a close. Rationalism and Spiritualism served for a time to mask the batteries of Infidelity. The Christian uniform was donned only that the foe might pass unchallenged the out-posts and take more completely by surprise the citadel. The Rationalist and the Spiritualist at first paid obsequious court to the Bible, and were voluble and loud in their protestations of love and friendship for Christianity; only they hinted (very gently hinted) that perhaps after all the inspiration of the one was only the inspiration of genius, and touching the other they thought it was a thousand pities that a system so perfect in its ethics and so Platonic in its theology, should nevertheless be encumbered by such fossilized and unphilosophic excrescences as for instance, the Incarnation, the Regeneration, Pardon through the Blood of Jesus, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the Resurrection of the body and the Judgment to come. They did not object to these doctrines because they were absolutely untrue, on the contrary they condescendingly and graciously admitted they were well adapted to the rude era of the establishment of Christianity, and like the boy's old coat, they were very good, only a vast deal too small and old-fashioned for the present age. But this kind of thing is all past now, thank God! and Christians have been startled into vivid consciousness of the fact, that in the van of that motley host who wage bitter, unrelenting, uncompromising war upon their holy religion and its chief, march the Spiritualist and the Rationalist.

4. We cannot but be thankful that the mask is at last removed—that our enemy is out in the open field—that his purposes are known. Christianity is a nursling of the storm, has been rocked into vigor on the crests of bloody persecution and amid the mad breakers of passion. She dreads not the open face to face conflict and only shrinks from dark inuendo and the secret and concealed malignity of pretended friends. All that learning and science and intellect could do has been done to blot her out, but like "Banquo's ghost," she will not "down" at their bidding, and ever she will be rearing her beautiful and majestic form, a power in the world and a terror to her adversaries.

5. Still should the conflict eventuate in demonstrating the false-



hood of the Bible there will yet remain unburied among its ruins this enigma, that a lie is better than the truth, for assuredly the Christian lie has done more to reclaim from barbarism, to civilize, enlighten, refine, ennoble and happify humanity, than all the systems of all the skeptics who have lived. And it will never cease to be a paradox to the philanthropist that a *good* man should *wish* the Gospel were not true.

6. As correct definitions constitute the basis of all correct knowledge and are essential to real improvement and true learning, and moreover, as every logical statement or proposition contains one or more leading words that are the repositories of its true meaning, I will now endeavor to mark and define the controlling words of the proposition. These are the terms *Revelation* and *Inspiration*. All the Bible, I affirm, is given by inspiration of God, but it is not all a revelation from God. There are ten thousand facts and incidents recorded in the Bible that are not supernatural, but the record of them is infallibly correct because made under the superintendency of a supernatural agent, to wit: the Holy Spirit. Inspiration makes an infallible *record* of truths and facts, whether natural or supernatural. *A revelation is a supernatural truth or fact enveloped in human language*. Hence a correct definition of this term excludes everything that is known or knowable, by reason of the exercise of the five senses, therefore, with propriety, my proposition affirms that the Bible *contains* (not is) a revelation from God.

7. The preceding definition of the first term of my proposition lays the axe at the root of at least nine-tenths of the cavils and objections urged against the Bible. They all centre in the annexed fallacy—a book claiming to be inspired and to contain a revelation from God, ought to teach the sciences of astronomy and geology; the Bible does not teach the sciences, therefore its claims to Inspiration and Revelation are unfounded. The fallacy lurks in the major premise. Revelation of necessity only deals with supernatural facts or truths, consequently that which is known or knowable, through reason or the senses, cannot be matter of revelation.

8. We are now prepared for the main question, “Are there revelations, *i. e.*, supernatural truths or facts contained in the



Bible?" A truth I define to be that which *is*, a fact—that which is *done*. I present as a first argument in support of the affirmation that the Bible contains a revelation from God, the following sentence: "The Eternal God."—Deut. xxxiii: 27. The idea of a self-existent Being—of a cause uncaused, is in the mind and has been for ages. It is also in the Bible. It evidently existed in the human mind before it was recorded in the Bible, but the question now for consideration is this: *How came the idea to exist in the mind?* A correct analysis of the mental powers will demonstrate that man does not possess the ability to originate a single new idea. This argument will be conclusive to the mind that justly comprehends it. I rest the issue upon it. I speak not of emotions or instincts but of ideas, and what I say, is this: When you can describe a single idea existing in your mind that is older than the *word* that contains it, I will give up the controversy.

9. Still ideas *are* older than the words that contain them. I speak of supernatural ideas. They must have existed somewhere before they were clothed in words. But that supernatural ideas existed in the human mind before they dwelt in human language, is what can never be proved. That the existence in the mind of the idea and its word is co-etaneous, is, I think, a self-evident proposition. In the mind the idea never was without the word nor the word without the idea. If these premises be correct, then the conclusion is inevitable that supernatural ideas reach the mind only through the media of words.

10. I know that the dictum of natural theology (falsely so called) is in contravention of the above reasoning—that whereas, intelligent design supposes an intelligent designer, and whereas, the universe exhibits marks of intelligent design—therefore, there is an eternal God. This conclusion does not, however, flow from, nor is it legitimately connected with the premises. It clears with one terrific bound the mysterious and unfathomable gulf that divides the physical from the spiritual, earth from heaven. The truth is, this boasted argument of Natural Theology is a natural fallacy. The archetype of all our ideas exist in nature and are conveyed to the mind through the avenues of the senses; and while contemplating the evident manifestation of design written on the material universe, I admit that the idea of a designer will



be suggested; but after all, this idea will be an idea of materialism and this designer be a material God, which would simply be no God at all. The stream cannot rise above its fountain and no conceivable arrangement of archetypes can possibly suggest any but material ideas.

11. I have thus shown that the Bible contains one truth not known or knowable by reason or the senses, therefore, supernatural, and consequently a Revelation from God. I will next show that the Bible contains the record of a supernatural fact, that is, a miracle. Gen. i: 1. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." I am not now to enquire into the correctness of the Mosaic cosmogony. I shall (God willing) do this under the head of inspiration. I deal now with the simple statement of a fact, viz.: "God *created* the heavens and the earth." But creation is a miracle, therefore, supernatural. The Bible contains a record of this supernatural fact, therefore, the Bible contains a revelation from God. Your boat is certainly on the rocks here, and I shall await with interest your efforts to extricate her. In the mean time I assert the Bible contains a revelation because it contains a fact not known or knowable by reason or the senses. You, of course, will maintain that it is by reason and not by faith that we understand that the universe was created out of nothing. When you attempt this I will return to the argument.

12. My third argument in proof of the proposition that God has spoken to man, is derived from the fact that *man speaks*. To account for the origin of language from any other than Christian premises will ever remain among the insoluble difficulties of infidelity. Are words natural to man, and if so, the words of what language? Did ever one, except by supernatural endowment, speak a language that was not acquired by imitation? The deaf have organs of speech, but they possess not the power to articulate words, simply because they never heard them. Is not this universally true? and if so, does it not demonstrate with absolute certainty that *hearing* must of necessity precede *speaking*? This being so, then admit (what is indeed a mathematical axiom) that there was a first man; and that which I hope you will especially enlighten us upon is, where did he get his words? whom did he imitate? who spoke to him? I pause for light, and in the mean



time conclude with the immortal Sir Isaac Newton, that God gave man reason and religion by giving him language.

13. I present as a fourth argument the following: "God created man in his own image." There is no subject more interesting to the mind in its normal condition than that connected with his origin. The whence came I is the beginning of all real self-knowledge. Infidelity has cut the gordian knot by asserting contrary to universal experience, that this is a question which does not and ought not to concern us. But this is a pitiful subterfuge. It is surely of interest to us to know whether we are privileged beings. Reject the Bible account of our origin and we are left to conjecture that man, perhaps, was developed from the superior species of brute creation; perhaps two vegetables growing in close proximity, on the bank of a river in Asia, were broken from their stems and wafted by gentle zephyrs into each others arms and thus originated the race. Seriously, without supernatural teaching man could not know his origin, because we cannot by any means *ab intra* arrive at a knowledge of that which antedates our conscious existence. But the origin of man, *i. e.*, the cause of which conscious existence is the effect, antedates his existence, therefore, man is dependent on means *ab extra* (which is a good definition of supernatural) for a knowledge of his origin. I trust you will concentrate your finest logical acumen upon this argument, *for verily it is worthy.*

14. The Divine Unity is a doctrine peculiar to the Bible. Deut. vi: 4. "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is ONE Jehovah." This truth is not learned from nature, reason or conscience; on the contrary, these teachers have multiplied Gods many and Lords many. When we remember that Judaism was intended primarily as a protest against the fast increasing Polytheism of the early ages, we can the more readily understand why its basis or creed truth is the Unity of God. But whether there be one or ten million Gods is unknown and unknowable by reason or the senses. You will probably refer to a dictum of Paul as contravening the above, until then, however, I will not anticipate.

15. I will now conclude this piece by a brief recapitulation of the points relied upon to prove the first half of the proposition.

1. The idea of a God is in the world. Man could not originate it,



therefore, its origin is superhuman. This truth is a revelation because supernatural. But it is contained in the Bible, therefore, the Bible contains a revelation. 2. Creation is a supernatural fact recorded in the Bible; the evidence of this fact must be supernatural, *i. e.*, must be a Divine revelation. 3. Language is not natural to man, but is an imitation. Some being beside man must have spoken to the first man, this being must have been supernatural. 4. The knowledge of our origin could only be known by supernatural means. 5. The Divine Unity is the last argument presented in this paper in support of the first term of the proposition.

I close with the single remark that before commencing a crusade against the Bible, it becomes us to consider well the question *cui bono*. What good to humanity will result from such opposition? Have we anything better to present when Christianity shall have been destroyed?

With kindest regards, I remain, yours sincerely true,

GEO. CLENDENAN.

---

#### MR. HULL'S FIRST REPLY.

REV. GEO. CLENDENAN—*Dear Brother*: Excuse me from saying "Dear Sir," for we be brethren, and that "Dear Sir" looks so cold that I prefer not to use it. Your letter was received yesterday. I must confess I like your opening; you commence as though you intended to do something. As I read your proposition I wonder whether you have ever fully analyzed that word *Plenary*, much is going to turn on that. Please consult Webster, and you will find it defined to mean full, entire, complete. Do you mean in that proposition to say the Bible is fully, completely, entirely inspired. In your table of definitions you forgot to say anything about that term. My brother, I do not chastise you; take your own course. I only wish to call your attention to the word.

1. I quite agree with your second paragraph; there is evidently a growing distaste for controversy. This, my brother, is owing to two things: 1st, A party spirit has ever, to a greater or less extent, exhibited itself in controversies of this kind, and disputants have usually shown themselves to be slaves to a theory rather



than earnest seekers after truth; there have been honorable exceptions, and it is to be hoped that the present discussion will be one. I shall try to make my part of this discussion popular by respecting the views of my opponent and treating him with the courtesy that the subject and his position and ability demand. 2d, Much of the feeling against discussion has originated and been fed by those whose theories would not bear investigation. Open combat is all that is needed to expose some religious theories. I opine that this is your position, for you say, "The friends of the Bible may well rejoice that this is so."

2. I entirely agree with you that a "Christian Union" would help the matter. But since Christ called his disciples "fools" (Luke xxiv: 25) and Paul and Peter quarrelled (Gal. ii: 11-14) there never has been Christian union, nor will there ever be. Jesus never told a plainer truth than when he said, I came not to send peace on earth but a sword. Matt. x: 34. I join with you in the wish that the sects could unite. If they could, twelve months would see the end of all book-worship.

3. I cannot see that Rationalism or Spiritualism has changed. The very first lecturers on either, opposed the *errors* of the Bible, while those now advocating Rationalism and Spiritualism not only acknowledge but *love* its truths. I permit no man to excel me in his love for Christianity; my love for it leads me to the task of pruning it of its errors. This true, there are things in Christianity which are unphilosophical, and I must add, *immoral*; these things are the "excrescences" that I would strip from it, so that philosophers and teachers of moral science can embrace it. The idea of pardon through the blood of Calvary's martyr, or by any other means, is one of them. Who does not know that the consequences of every act must be entailed upon the actors?

4. From your fourth paragraph, one would think that ours is the first open combat the world has ever heard upon the subject. Is it so? And am I the first who has had the courage to openly attack the errors of the Bible? No. It was the attacks of those who could not receive an error because it was put into a book, brought from Asia and labeled "Holy," that made Bible-worshippers universally acknowledge the following passages were errors, and never ought to have been in the Bible: Acts xx: 28; 1 Tim.



iii: 16; 1 John v: 7; Matt. vi: 15; John v: 1-9; Luke xvi: 19-31; John viii: 4-10; Luke xxiii: 30; Acts ix: 5, 6. Taking Mill, Clark, Benson, Dodridge, Campbell and others as judges, these passages, unlike "Banquo's ghost," have "downed," and great is the fall thereof; so great that they stay down.

5. Your argument on the beauties of the Christian system falls infinitely short of the mark, for there is not a beautiful idea in Christianity but that is older than the date of our New Testament, and the fall of Christianity as a system, would not in the least effect the truths which it plagiarized from older systems. Remember, none of the truths of the Bible were made by it, they were only adopted and brought over into that book. As for the Bible civilizing, enlightening, ennobling and elevating humanity, it is a mistake. The Bible follows civilization, does not go before it. Even in our own country, those who make no profession of religion lead off in the reforms of the day. The Bible has been brought to bear against philosophy, astronomy and geology. The slave holder has asked for no other backing in sustaining "the sum of all villianies" than the Bible. You say, "It will never cease to be a paradox to the philanthropist that a good man should wish the Gospel were not true." But, my dear brother, our wishes have nothing to do with the matter. We might wish that food and clothing would fall from the clouds to man, but that would not produce food and clothing without physical labor. Have you not in the above sentence betrayed yourself? Is not your wish that the system you adopted in your youth were true, the secret of urging it as true? There are many truths in it, every one of which we heartily endorse.

6. To your definition of the terms *Revelation* and *Inspiration* I will not at present offer any objection. Yet, in connection with these statements you make a statement which I opine you will wish you had not made. After admitting that "there are ten thousand facts and incidents recorded in the Bible that are not supernatural," you say, "But the record of them is infallibly correct because made under the superintendency of a supernatural agent." Is that so? And is everything recorded in the Bible infallibly correct? If so, I yield the question, and acknowledge the Revelation to be supernatural, yes, *anti-natural*. If the Bible

see  
p. 4.



records an infallible truth when it informs us that Ahaziah was twenty-two and forty-two years old at the same time, (2 Kings viii: 26; 2 Chron. xxii: 2,) then, verily, has the proverb been fulfilled, "Truth is stranger than fiction." When the Bible records that Ahaziah was two years older than his father, (2 Chron. xxi: 20; xi: 1,) it records an *anti*-natural event. Does the Bible make an "infallible record of a truth or fact" when it informs us that God was compelled to come down in order to find out whether the cities of the plain were as wicked as he had heard they were? See Gen. xviii: 21. I must acknowledge that if your proposition must be proved "without the exercise of the five senses" that I much rather the *onus probandi* would come upon you than me. Please inform me whether you wish me to use the "five senses" in weighing your arguments.

7. How your definitions can prove that God in making a revelation to man should slight every scientific question, I cannot understand; and I apprehend that even your brethren will regard what you say as being a poor apology for the Author of science, who in making a revelation to man of over 1,000 pages, never once hinted at a scientific question? Especially when that revelation is calculated to "thoroughly furnish" its devotees to "every good work." See 2 Tim. iii: 16, 17. Your apology is crippled by another fact, that is, those who "cavil and object" do not simply plead that the Bible did not teach science; but they teach, and that with a good deal of reason, that the Bible *opposes* science. If the Bible remained negative on scientific subjects, scores of truly scientific men who now have no reverence for it would acknowledge that it might contain a revelation from God, but when God has revealed himself in the heavens and earth, in the sea and fountains of water, men find it hard to admit that *he* contradicts these revelations in the Bible. We find it much easier to deny that God is the author of the book. You say, "revelation only deals with *supernatural* facts." Then woe be to the Bible, for there are no supernatural facts. Law lies behind everything. Nothing exists but that exists in harmony with the law that produced it. You are perfectly safe in putting down every *supernatural* record as a false record.

8. In your eighth paragraph you state what you call "the main



question:" "Are there revelations, that is, supernatural truths or facts contained in the Bible?" That there are supernatural things or facts recorded in the Bible I do not deny. So there are in the history of Sinbad the Sailor, Tom Thumb's Portfolio, and Gulliver's Travels. If the recording of the whale swallowing a man makes the Bible a revelation from God to man, then Mahomet's story of the "big rooster" makes the Koran true, and the records of the miracles wrought by the "Holy dog Saint Towzer" makes Catholicism true. The first question necessary to settle is this: Are the supernatural records true? After quoting (Deut. xxxiii : 27) "The Eternal God," you say, "The idea of a self-existent being—of a cause uncaused, is in the mind and has been for ages. \* \* \* The question now is, how came the idea in the mind?" Asking questions is the easiest part of this controversy. Suppose I could not answer it, would it therefore follow that it came by supernatural revelation? There are thousands of true and false ideas in the world, and yet they came to man naturally. The idea of one, eternal, self-existent God is older than the Bible, and was preached by heathens hundred of years before the Bible was in existence. Hence, if your argument proves the Bible to be supernaturally inspired, we have only to remove the argument one step to prove Pythagoras supernaturally inspired. Hear him :

God is neither the object of sense, nor subject to passion, but invisible only intelligible, and supremely intelligent. In his body he is like the light, and in his soul he resembles truth. He is the universal spirit that pervades and diffuseth itself all over nature. All beings receive their life from him. *There is but one only God!* who is not, as some are apt to imagine, seated above the world beyond the orb of the universe; but being himself all in all, he sees all the beings that fill immensity, the only principle the light of heaven, the father of all. He produces everything; he is the reason, the life, the motion of all beings.—I quote from Rev. Robert Taylor's *Diegesis*, page 242, where proper references are given.

If I were compelled to decide whether Heathenism as represented by Pythagoras, B. C. six hundred years, or Christianity as represented in the Bible and churches, were Divine, I should be compelled to render a verdict in behalf of Heathenism. Contrast Pythagoras' views of God with those of Dr. Watts. He says of God :



"His nostrils breathe out fiery streams,  
He's a consuming fire :  
His *jealous* eyes his wrath inflame,  
And raise his *vengeance higher !*"

Such a God ! And is he the eternal God described in the Bible ? A "jealous God !" Such a God, I admit is supernatural. Your argument on the origin of ideas is summed up in the following words : "When you can describe a single idea existing in your mind that is older than the word that contains it, I will give up the controversy." Profundity of logic ! How am I going to describe ideas without words ? You do not know but that I have ten thousand ideas that I have never expressed to you, from the fact that words would not express them. Again, it may not be from lack of ideas, but on account of the potency of language, that I am enabled to describe all of my ideas. Suppose your arguments were true in every particular, insomuch that men were indebted to inspiration for every new idea ; would it, therefore, follow that the Bible was plenarily inspired ? Please show me in your next letter the connection between your premises and conclusion.

9. Your ninth paragraph is but a continuation of the argument commenced in the eighth. In that you say, "that supernatural ideas existed in the human mind before they dwelt in human language, is what never can be proved." If this is not a perfectly transparant *petitio principii* I am greatly mistaken. Why don't you prove that language was made and then ideas adapted to the language, rather than language being the result of ideas trying to seek an outlet ? You would certainly in that acquit yourself more worthily than by coming before our readers with the cold assertion—in substance—that language proves the Bible to be plenarily inspired. As to your *supernatural* ideas I can make no response ; I have none—do not know what they are.

10. Your tenth paragraph, concerning Natural Theology and Materialism, is not presented as an argument, but as a rejoinder to some "man of straw" position of you own make. Yet, give the position you made for Natural Theologians a fair sweep and I believe it would be too much for you. I leave you and your imaginary opponent to fight it out.



11. Next you attempt to show that the Bible contains the record of a supernatural fact, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." How you can call this a revelation I do not know. In the first place, everybody knows that there are heavens and there is an earth—that there was a time when they began to exist; that is all that the Bible states in the sentence you quote. When the Bible undertakes to go farther and particularise, it states what every school boy now knows to be false. More of this when you come to your argument on "Inspiration." By the way, how do you know that creation is a supernatural fact? Have you fathomed all nature so as to tell when a Bible writer gets beyond it? It may be easy to decide what is *contrary* to nature, but when you undertake to decide what is *beyond* it, you assume a prerogative quite out of your reach. It will be time enough for me to get my "boat off the rock" when you prove your assertion, which is "as baseless as the fabric of a vision."

12. "That God has spoken to man," I will not deny. He speaks to man every day in every language, yes, he speaks to man's every sense. The question is not, has God spoken? But it is this, *Is the Bible the voice of God to man?* Your assertion that, "To account for the origin of language from any other than Christian premises will ever remain among the insoluble difficulties of infidelity," savors strongly of the idea that Christianity brought language to the human race, or that man learned to talk by reading the Bible! My dear brother, the Bible is the *effect* and not the cause of human language. Persons talked a great number of languages for thousands of years before the Bible was ever seen. You ask the question, "Where did the first man get his words?" I might speculate upon this query, but it would amount to no more in settling the question of the divinity of the Bible than do your speculations. Even the Bible nowhere professes to tell where man got his words. My space is too precious to spend in chasing such an *ignis fatuus*.

13. Your thirteenth paragraph is splendid rhetoric—but that is all. The man of straw you build up and knock down, says not a word about the truth or falsity of the Bible. The Bible God has beaten you a little. You have made a man of straw; he one of *mud*. You waited until A. D. 1866 to make yours; God made



his six thousand years before. The God of Nature had made man at least two hundred thousand years before either. The Bible accounts of the creation of man are contradictory. Please tell me which you endorse, and I will give your argument a further consideration. While your *ab extra* means of finding out the origin of man are so "*ab*"-surd, I must be excused from believing it.

14. I can but regret that I have not space to do justice to your argument in paragraph fourteen. One would gather from the text you quote that there was but one God, yet the Bible teaches a different doctrine. The Jehovah was recognised as being the God of Israel while the Gods of other nations were recognised as being *Gods* as much as Jehovah, yet not Gods that Israel should worship. "And God said, let us make man."—Gen. i: 26. This text recognizes a plurality of Gods. Even the term *Elohim* (God) is said by Hebrew scholars to be plural. Benson says of this term, "It is in the plural number and must often, of necessity, be understood as having a plural meaning. \* \* It has with great reason been thought by Christian divines to imply a plurality of persons or substances in the God-head."—*Comments on Gen. i: 1*. What means the command, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me," if it does not imply that there are other Gods whom Israel would be in danger of worshiping instead of Jehovah? In the same chapter from whence you made your selection, 14th verse, I read, "Ye shall not go after other Gods, of the Gods of the people which are round about you." The difference between Jehovah and other Gods is that Jehovah *is jealous* and would not give his glory to another, while other Gods were more liberal. Read again my quotation from Pythagoras: "There is but one only God." It is a mistake about heathens worshiping so many Gods. True, they had their tutelary deities, but Jove with them was supreme. Heathens approached Jove through tutelary deities as the Christians approach God through Christ.—See Homer's *Illiad*.

15. You say the idea of a God is in the world; yes, and so it was thousands of years before there were any Bible makers. It may have come by revelation, yet it did not come through the Bible. Your *cui bono* will be answered in the course of the debate. Suffice it to say, that a belief in the inspiration of ancient



prophets caused Ahab to loose his kingdom and his life—that the Bible has caused more bloodshed, more insanity, more wicked fanaticism and cruelty than all other books in the world.

With the kindest feelings, I remain, yours truly,

MOSES HULL.

Reported for the Spiritual Rostrum.

## THE GREAT ANTIQUITY OF SPIRITUALISM.

A LECTURE

*Delivered by W. F. JAMIESON, in Adelphi Hall, Belvidere, Ill., on  
Sunday Evening, Dec. 8th, 1867.*

Why come not spirits from the realm of glory,  
To visit earth as in the days of old,—  
The times of ancient writ and sacred story?  
Is heaven more distant, or has earth grown cold?  
To Bethlehem's air was their last anthem given,  
When other stars before the One grew dim,  
Was their last presence known in Peter's prison,  
Or where exulting martyrs raised the hymn?

JULIA WALLACE.

Spirits of peace, where are ye? Are ye all gone?  
A blessed troop invited me to banquet, whose bright faces  
Cast thousand beams upon me like the sun.

SHAKESPEARE.

It is singular that Spiritualism should be treated by the mass of mankind as if it were something *new*; whereas, it is coeval with the laws of nature.

While attending a Spiritual Convention in the northern part of Michigan, at the close of one of my lectures, having given opportunity for remarks, as is generally my custom, a gentleman arose, and desired to know "If Spiritualism is true,—if it is from God—why was it not known until the Fox girls introduced it in the year 1848." He looked around upon the audience with a twinkle in his eye, and with the air of a man who had accomplished a wonderful feat in the shortest possible time. He did not seem to feel satisfied with humbling the advocates of the "new ism." He drew



himself up proudly, as he prepared, lion like, to crush us by dealing the "ism" a finishing blow. He exclaimed, "Where was spiritualism—which you say is to save the world—during the past four thousand years? If it is a blessing to the race, as is claimed, why was it not known during the 'dark ages,' when mankind went back into barbarism? Why is it just come into the world? If Spiritualism is God Almighty's truth, it would have been revealed to man ages ago!"

In reply, I said, suppose Spiritualism was unknown before the time of the Fox girls; and that they are the founders of it. What then? Does my brother argue that it is *therefore* "not of God?" Is a thing true because it is old, and false, if it is new? That is the logic of my friend. For the sake of the truth that may be in his own theology, I am glad his logic is bad. There was a time when the law of gravitation was unknown to man. When it was discovered was it a new truth? Was it not as old as matter itself? We have in this age many *new* inventions; wonderful discoveries are being made every day; geology, phrenology and astronomy are revealing to man the sublime mysteries of his own being, and the wondrous works of Nature around him; and, yet, "there is nothing new under the sun," there is no new truth in the universe. Is Spiritualism false if it cannot show a record anterior to the year 1848? Where was Protestantism prior to the year 1517? It is only three hundred and fifty years old. Where was it during the "dark ages?" It would better become the Romish Church to talk of age; but you, Protestantism, her brazen faced daughter, notorious for the abuse which you have heaped upon your poor old mother, have no record of the discovery made by you of a single new moral principle; and you fail to show wherein you are less the engine of oppression, and the foe to progress, than the mother church.

No, my brother, Spiritualism is not new. In its modern manifestations it is said to have commenced at Hydesville, N. Y., in 1848. Hydesville is the Nazareth of modern Spiritualism. The phrase, 'modern Spiritualism' pre-supposes *ancient* Spiritualism. Ever since there has been a soul in the Spirit-world, and a human being upon earth, Spirit-communion between the two worlds has existed. No more questions were asked on that occasion.



Spiritualism is the most ancient religion on earth. It is the soul principle, the vitalizing power of all other religions. A religion without Spiritualism is nothing but superstitious atheism. The fundamental *fact* of the religion of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Jews and Christians, was *Spirit* and its power to manifest itself.

The learned Dr. Johnson has borne testimony to the universality of Spiritualism: Said he, "That the dead are seen no more I will not undertake to maintain against the concurrent and unvaried testimony of all ages and of all nations. There is no people, rude or learned, among whom apparitions of the dead are not related and believed. This opinion, which perhaps prevails as far as human nature is diffused, could become universal only by its truth; those that never heard of one another would not have agreed in a tale which nothing but experience could render credible. That it is doubted by single cavillers can very little weaken the general evidence; and some who deny it with their tongues confess it by their fears."

I have known courageous skeptics to pass by grave yards on dark nights. They were not frightened; but it was noticeable they always whistled lively tunes.

True, every religion has had connected with its Spiritualism or vital principle, more or less of superstition, which, like a thrifty growth of weeds, has in nearly every age choked out Spiritualism and absorbed the vital element which should have gone to nourish it. The Spiritualism of our own time is by no means entirely free from this pernicious weed; but Reason, the gardener of the Soul, will effectually eradicate it.

All nations have recognised Spiritualism in their belief in God, gods, demi-gods, angels, demons, ghouls, ghosts, sprites, fairies, elves, hobgoblins and familiar spirits—all these various names signifying the *spirits of human beings*.

Socrates said, "Because I am moved by a certain divine and *spiritual influence*, which also Melitus, through mockery, has set out in the indictment; this begun with me from childhood, being a kind of voice which, when present, always diverts me from what I am about to do, but never urges me on. But this duty, as I said, has been enjoined me by deity, by oracles, by dreams, and



by every mode by which any other divine decree has ever enjoined anything for man to do."

Plato said, "They (the poets) do not compose by art, but through a divine power; since if they knew how to speak by art upon the subject correctly, they would be able to do so upon all others. And on this account a deity has deprived them of their senses, and employs them as his ministers, and oracle singers, and divine prophets, in order that when we hear them we may know it is not they, to whom sense is not present, who speak what is valuable, but the god himself who speaks, and through them addresses us. We are not to doubt about those beautiful poems being not human but divine, and the work not of men but of gods; and that poets are nothing else but interpreters of the gods\* possessed by whatever deity they may happen to be. And in pointing out this the deity has, through a poet the most indifferent, sung melody the most beautiful."

Tertulian holds the following language: "There is at present a sister amongst us who has obtained the gift of revelations, which she receives in the congregation or solemn sanctuary, by ecstacy in the spirit, who has converse with the angels, sometimes with the Lord, and sees and hears great truths, and discerns the hearts of men, and ministers remedies to those who want them. Also, according as the Scriptures are read, or the Psalms are sung, or exhortations are uttered, or prayers offered from the various services, materials are furnished for her visions. We had happened to be discussing something about the soul, when the sister was in the spirit. After the conclusion of the service and the dismissal of the congregation, she, after the usual manner of her visions (for they are carefully revealed that they may be examined,) amongst other remarks said, the *soul was shown her in a bodily form*; the *spirit-nature* appeared, but was not of an empty or shapeless quality, but as something which gave hope of being embraced or held, tender and bright, of an aerial hue, and altogether of *human form*."

\* This term, in use among the Pagans, signified the spirits of good men. Indeed, the word "God" is derived from the word "good," and the term "Devil" is derived from the word "evil." "Devil" is "evil" personified. "God" is "good" personified.



This was Spiritualism in its pure state. There were numberless instances of mediumship among the early Christians and much that was only pretended mediumship, as the history of the Catholic Church abundantly proves. There is no doubt that those priests who pretended to work miracles and which were proved to be but tricks, were full of wrath and scorn toward those who had the temerity to question their assumed spiritual gifts, and probably denounced them as a "small class of our brethren who ignored *all* the phenomenal evidences of man's immortality." Whether any spirit from the "vasty deep" ever condescendingly shook its spiritual curls, and accommodately permitted some devout worshiper to clasp, *a la barber*, one shining lock, which by some unknown chemical law, would become a materialized trophy of a spiritual victory, I have at present no information; although there are some wonderful stories related of the image of the Virgin Mary which, if true, prove it to be not only a very *pious* image, but exceedingly intelligent, *for an image!* and worthy to be considered the mother of images. Yet it is true, if history can be relied upon, that many priests in the infancy of the Catholic Church were possessed of Spiritual gifts, and in fact such gifts have never entirely ceased with them; but they have generally exercised them to increase the reverence and awe of the people for their own persons, as divinely appointed agents of Almighty God. Spiritualism, through such a channel, becomes a superstition which paralyzes thought and makes man a slave to Authority. We never should be *so spiritual* as to sacrifice reason and become *foolish*. In the language of Plutarch, "We should reject fables when we are possessed of undeniable truth."

Egypt is, indeed, the "cradle of religion." From the best information we have, Egypt was a civilized nation many thousands of years before the time of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The inscriptions upon the tombs of the Pharaohs prove it. Egyptian hieroglyphics reveal the history of one of the most wonderful nations of the earth. The Egyptians held frequent communications with the "departed dead." Fragments of pottery, discovered in the valley of the Nile, at a depth of more than thirty-two feet of sediment, in the gravel beneath, proves that they must have been deposited there about fourteen thousand years ago.



This is a record, too, of the civilization of man. He must have been sufficiently advanced at that time to have fashioned clay into vessels, and to have hardened it by heat.

Flavius Josephus, the Jewish historian, also recognised the fact of spirit communion. In the "Antiquities of the Jews," ch. xiv, is Josephus' opinion of the woman of Endor, whom superstitious people stigmatise as a "witch." She was a *necromancer*—"one who communicates with the souls of the dead"—she saw the spirit of the prophet Samuel; she told Saul that Samuel was "an old man already, and of a glorious personage, and had on a sacerdotal mantle. So the king discovered by these signs that he was Samuel; and he fell down upon the ground and saluted and worshiped him. And when the soul of Samuel asked him why he had disturbed him and caused him to be brought up, he lamented the necessity he was under; for he said that his enemies pressed heavily upon him; that he was in distress what to do in his present circumstances; that he was forsaken of God and could obtain no prediction of what was coming, neither by prophets or by dreams; and that these were the reasons that I have recourse to thee, who always tookest care of me."

Poor, distressed Saul, my soul always sympathises with him whenever I read the account. His guardian angel or Spirit-Lord, was thrown into a rage because Saul refused to obey him in the conduct of war with the Amalekites. That Saul may have believed that the God of the universe was his adviser, and had refused to answer him because of his disobedience, is reasonable. There are people in this day who believe they talk with God. God is often belittled in the imagination as a fretful, passionate, finite being.

Josephus proceeds, "But Samuel, *seeing that the end of Saul's life was come*, said, 'It is vain for thee to desire to learn of me anything farther, when God hath forsaken thee: however, hear what I say, that David is to be king, and to finish this war with good success; and thou art to lose thy dominion and thy life, because thou didst not obey God in the war with the Amalekites, and hast not kept his commandments, as I foretold thee while I was alive,' " (on the earth.)

In regard to the character of the woman, Josephus says, "It



is but just to recommend the generosity of this woman, because when the king had forbidden her to use that art whence her circumstances were bettered and improved, and when she had never seen the king before, she still did not remember to his disadvantage that he had condemned her sort of learning, and did not refuse him as a stranger, and one that she had no acquaintance with; but she had compassion upon him, and comforted him, and exhorted him to do what he was greatly averse to, and offered him the only creature she had, as a poor woman, and that earnestly and with great humanity, while she had no requital made her for her kindness, nor hunted after any future favor from him, for she knew he was to die; whereas, men are naturally either ambitious to please those that bestow benefits upon them, or are very ready to serve those from whom they may receive some advantage. It would be well therefore to imitate the example of this woman, and to do kindnesses to all such as are in want; and to think that nothing is better nor more becoming mankind than such a general beneficence, nor what will sooner render God favorable and ready to bestow good things upon us. And so far may suffice to have spoken concerning this woman."

How meanly must the clergy feel who have so ignorantly abused this woman. But, then, as a general rule, it is characteristic of them to abuse those who communicate with spirits, or any one who thinks independently of "creeds" and "formulas of faith." The wrath of whining priests had been kindled against Saul. They have called him "a wicked king," an "evil man," etc. Josephus exonerates him from these "wicked" charges. He says, "Although he [Saul] knew what was coming upon him and that he was to die immediately, by the prediction of the prophet, he did not resolve to fly from death, nor to so far indulge the love of life as to betray his own people to the enemy, or to bring a disgrace on his royal dignity; but, exposing himself as well as all his family and children to dangers, he thought it a brave thing to fall together with them, as he was fighting for his subjects, and that it was better his sons should die thus, showing their courage, than to leave them to their uncertain conduct afterward, while, instead of succession and posterity, they gained commendation and a lasting name. Such a one alone seems to me to be a



just, a courageous and a prudent man; and when any one has arrived at these dispositions, or shall hereafter arrive at them, he is the man that ought to be by all honored with the testimony of a virtuous or courageous man."

After Abraham turned Hagar out of doors, and in her hour of deepest sorrow, when she supposed her child must die, an angel called to her. The information he gave her saved the life of the boy. It may be supposed that the communication of an angel does not prove that the "spirits of the dead" converse with the people of the earth. The primary signification of the term angel is *messenger*. Hence, a human being may be an angel, or the spirit of a human being may be one. Those who assert that angel signifies a distinct order of being than human, and only this, will discover that they have more than they can prove. Hebrew does not help them out of the difficulty, but plunges them deeper into it. Throughout the Bible *man, angel, spirit, God, gods, Jehovah, Angel of the Lord, Lord God*, together with several other appellations by which spiritual beings have been designated, are used synonymously. In Genesis xxxii, there is an account of a great wrestling match between God and Jacob. Although Jacob's thigh was put out of joint, he was "the best man of the two!" He exulted because he had seen God "face to face"—the same one that touched Jacob's thigh—and his "life was preserved." This was the same personage who is described in the 24th verse as *a man*. "But," say our theological friends, "this instance of wrestling between God and Jacob is not to be considered in the ordinary sense of wrestling; it was not physical wrestling. Jacob *wrestled* with God all night *in prayer*! The interpretation is easy enough!" What masterly interpreters of the "Word of God" priests are! But "carnal Reason" has the impudence to inquire of them, "if they ever knew of a man to *pray* so hard as to have his *thigh put out of joint*!"

Moses was a medium for "Physical Manifestations" of an astounding character. The Egyptian mediums—called magicians—were no doubt his equals, and, if we could hear their side of the story, far superior. As it is, we have Moses' account of his powers, or an account by his biographer, which represents the Egyptian wonder-workers as completely vanquished.



One of the most remarkable and definite instances of spirit-communication in the whole Bible is that so eloquently described by Josephus as an incontrovertible fact: The communication of the spirit of the prophet Samuel through the mediumship of the woman at Endor to king Saul. In chap. xxviii of 1st Samuel, it is distinctly affirmed that *Samuel and Saul conversed together!* "But," says the objector, "the Bible says that 'when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him *not*, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by *prophets*.' Are we to understand that God, who is 'without variableness neither *shadow of turning*;' who changes not, *did* answer Saul by one of his holy prophets?" The Bible does not say that God *never would* answer Saul by a prophet. There is no Christian, man or woman, who believes that because God refused to grant a request to-day that he will therefore refuse to comply with it to-morrow. But we will suppose the God represented by the Bible declared that he never would answer Saul by prophets. What then? It would not militate against the fact of Saul receiving a communication from the spirit of the holy prophet Samuel. Samuel might have communicated on *his own responsibility*, as it would appear he did; for the Bible represents him saying to Saul, "Wherefore, then, dost thou *ask of me*, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and become thine enemy?" Samuel then proceeds to predict events fraught with interest to Saul and his people. This prophecy by the spirit of the prophet Samuel is one of the most definite and truthful in the whole Bible. Perhaps nothing in the line of prophecy ever equalled it in the exactness of the language corresponding to the event predicted. There is an entire absence of that ambiguity which characterises nearly all of the prophecies of the Old Testament, and which enables a skillful interpreter of prophecy to discover their fulfillment in any one of a thousand circumstances. Now, if it be insisted that Samuel could not prophecy on his own responsibility, and that God inspired him to prophecy concerning the fate of Saul, his sons and the children of Israel; and the *supposition* be borne in mind that God said he never would answer Saul by *prophets*, it proves that the God of the Jews did *then* only what he had frequently done before, *changed his mind!*



Jonah had occasion one time to lament most bitterly the fickle disposition of the Jewish God.

In my discussion with the Rev. Moses Hull, now one of the ablest advocates of our cause, I called his particular attention to the plain language of the Bible with reference to Samuel communicating with Saul. I have heard Bro. Hull in lectures since he became an advocate of Spiritualism, declare, that although he had read that passage many hundred times, he never before saw it in the light in which I pointed it out to him. That one Bible fact did more, seemingly, to change his views than all the testimony of living witnesses, concerning present communication from the spirits of our departed friends, with which I literally crammed my side of the discussion, under the guidance and control of my spirit-guides, and sustained by the strong arguments with which Spiritualism supplies its adherents. Our contest was not to gain the mastery over each other, *it was to obtain the truth!* An earnest struggle it was. He helped me and I helped him to discover the priceless pearl. Did all men seek truth for its own sake, regardless of the plaudits of friends and the censure of enemies, a higher standard of moral principle would be erected in every soul.

What a wonderful medium Daniel was—that handwriting on the wall of the palace; his preservation by spirit-power while in the lions' den; his gift of seeing spirits; his remarkable vision; all stamp him as having been a finely developed medium. No believer in the divinity of the Bible claims that the writing which Daniel intrepeted, *Mene, Mene Tekel Upharsin*, was the work of a human being, notwithstanding the phraseology, "In the same hour came forth *fingers of a man's hand* and wrote." The general opinion of Orthodox people (if an *opinion* it can be called,) is that those were God's fingers. The Spiritualist, knowing that spirits look like human beings, readily understand the full import of such a manifestation. Spiritual fingers would be expected to look like the "fingers of a man's hand," for spirits are human beings. The spiritual beings who conversed with Daniel, as related in the tenth chapter of Daniel, *looked like men*. Daniel said that after he had fasted three full weeks he "lifted up his eyes" and beheld a "certain man clothed in linen," a hand



touched him, which set him upon his hands and knees. "Behold," says he, "one like the similitude of the sons of men touched my lips." He adds, "Then there came again and touched me one *like the appearance of a man.*"

Let us now consider some of the less ancient cases of Spiritualism as narrated in the New Testament. Scarcely a page of the New Testament that does not contain some allusion to things of a Spiritual nature. Our Orthodox friends may be surprised when I affirm that Jesus of Nazareth was a Spiritualist and a medium. But I could stand here for the next two hours and do nothing but quote evidences, as laid down in the Gospels, to prove this position. In the first chapter of Mathew it is declared that Jesus was so much of a Spiritualist that he was actually the son of a ghost! said to be a holy one. It appears that Joseph was a trifle suspicious about the affair, but an "angel of the Lord" came to him "in a dream" and told him it was all right. Now, we have always been taught that Jesus was the *Son of God*, but according to this story, he was the son of the *third* person of the trinity instead of the first. When Jesus was a lad of twelve years of age, not having learned his letters, he gave evidence of his mediumship by discussing with the D. D.s in the temple. "All that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers." Thus early did he exhibit the bent of his mind. He was a great controversialist. Jesus considered discussion very profitable. The Jews were in favor of keeping the people quiet, while the mission of Jesus seemed to be to agitate their minds and cause them to feel dissatisfied with existing institutions. When he entered upon his mission as a spiritual teacher he manifested remarkable healing powers. Aside from being a healing medium he was a clairvoyant—saw Nathaniel under the fig tree, silver in a fish's mouth, saw many spirits and conversed with them. He was a clairaudient medium—heard spirit voices. He was a highly inspirational and speaking medium—advised his disciples to "take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it will be given ye in that same hour what ye shall speak." Spirits were his constant attendants and guardians, and when his soul was sad they "came and ministered unto him." When he was taken prisoner he said he could have twelve legions of angels to



help him. He was a good psychometrist—he told the woman of Samaria “all things that ever she did;” could read the thoughts of men. He conversed with his disciples after his crucifixion. His disciples possessed in a degree his wonderful mediumistic powers. Paul, at first a fierce opposer of Spiritualism, became a zealous advocate by receiving a communication from the spirit of Jesus himself.

It cannot be expected, considering the innumerable cases of ancient Spiritualism, that the subject can be exhausted in a single lecture. In view of the fact that the Bible abounds with accounts of trances, visions, dreams, communications of spirits, together with the spiritual experiences of mediums commonly called prophets, seers and apostles, it is surprising that professed Bible believers oppose Spiritualism; for, in so doing, they fight against the book which they profess to love, cherish and revere. Their adoration of the Bible has been so excessive that they have set it up as an idol, and do now worship it instead of worshipping the God of the Universe, who is a spirit, and ought to be worshiped *in spirit* and in *truth*. It is charged that we Spiritualists repudiate the Bible. It is not likely that Spiritualists are so short-sighted as to discard the testimony of a witness that testifies so pointedly and unmistakably in favor of the central idea of their own beautiful system of scientific religion and divine philosophy. We do reject the absurd claims of the clergy with respect to it and its teachings, which is considered cause sufficient to misrepresent us. We are capable of judging for ourselves what the Bible is and what it teaches. We are not under obligation to sanction the statements of *any* book that are inconsistent with reason and the grand Bible of Nature. I allow no man, Greek, Mohammedan, Jew, Gentile or Spiritualist to dictate the terms of my belief in anything. Spiritualism actualises the Protestant idea of Individualism.

The modern Spiritualist recognises no authoritative standard outside of his own judgment; claims the right, and exercises it, of differing in opinion with all the rest of mankind. A true Spiritualist is a “law unto himself;” believing himself right, on any point, he never yields until his judgment convinces him of his error. He has an abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of prin-



ciple over time-serving expediency; of truth over error. He feels that though injustice and misrepresentation may go hand in hand to conspire against him, even among those who profess to love the cause so dear to his soul, the consciousness of fidelity to his own conception of truth is a never failing source of strength. He is indifferent to censure, if he is misunderstood; he expects to be misunderstood. To him the present life is a charmed one. Let the winds howl and the storm rage; let the elements war in demoniac fury; let the earth rock and the heavens pass away with a great noise; he knows that his immortal soul is a sublime triumph over crude matter. To him the Summer Land is a reality! the grandest, most glorious *discovery* of the nineteenth century!

O, Spirits of ancient time! Godlike with the accumulated knowledge of ages, still onward and upward pressing to obtain still clearer glimpses of the destiny of spirit, what mighty thoughts must this night thrill ye with ecstasy! Mighty counsellors! worshipped in bygone ages as the great "I AM," Jehovah, Jah, Brahm, aid us in our search into the mysteries of the divinely inspired volume of Nature, whose "close lettered pages" will reveal in living characters, the truth that shall make us free!

---

## LIFE'S OCEAN.

BY MRS. L. H. HALL.

We are out on Life's rough ocean  
Struggling with wind and tide,  
Yet there comes a ray of sunlight  
Beaming from the other side.  
Oft we hear the gentle whispers  
As they echo from that shore,  
Telling of a blest reunion  
With the friends who've gone before.

Soon we'll pass Life's stormy billows,  
Soon the breeze will bear us o'er,  
Soon we'll anchor in that harbor  
Where rough winds will blow no more.  
Bear us on, ye gentle breezes,  
Bear us to that happy strand;  
Soon we'll hear the welcome voices—  
Voices from the Summer Land.



## EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

MOSES HULL & W. F. JAMIESON, EDITORS.

OFFICE, 90 WASHINGTON STREET, POST OFFICE DRAWER 5966, CHICAGO.

---

## FIRST WORDS.

The word SALUTATORY we have had occasion to use twice since having engaged in the work of co-operating with angels. Now, the third time, which is said to be "the charm," we take the "chair editorial," and make our most graceful bow.

With a more firm hand and a stronger determination than ever before, we re-enter the publishing field. We know the cause of the Angels is a good one. We know that the people of the great Northwest, as well as those of the East, need just such a Magazine as this. We send it out in confidence, believing you will esteem its twelve visits well worth the price of subscription. We ask your patronage. We do not offer you pianos, melodeons, sewing machines, nor dictionaries. The best we can do is to give you two dollars' worth of good reading for two dollars.

Many encouraging letters assure us that old friends have not forgotten our past labors, and new ones are longing for just such truth as we will lay before them.

The editors of the *Banner of Light*, who have ever helped us with as much apparent zeal as though our office were a scion from their own, have our most hearty thanks for the kindly notices of our intention to publish the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM. Nothing but sturdy devotion to truth, and an unselfish desire to see it supplant the foggy systems of the Past, could cause the conductors of that staunch journal to do by us as they ever have.

While giving "honor to whom honor is due" we cannot forget that Mrs. H. F. M. Brown and Mrs. Lou H. Kimball are, through the *Lyceum Banner*, making friends for the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM. Brothers and sisters of the "quill" we will warn you that by thus helping us in our infancy you will find, when we get "big," that your kindness was only borrowed.

Now friends, Reformers, one and all, our little barque is launched.



Read this number carefully and decide whether our work is worthy of your co-operation. Remember, *Excelsior!* is our motto.

Since the foregoing was written we said to our good friend, who took our "feet out of the mire and the clay, and placed us on the rock, and put a new song in our mouth," "Come over and help us." He has now joined hands with us. His motive will be discovered in his Salutory.

That readers and publishers may share a mutual blessing is the prayer of

MOSES HULL.

---

### SALUTATORY.

Glad to unite in this good work with our "god-son." Two hearts, two brains, two pair of willing hands, all engaged in the work of the elevation of humanity, must make the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM a success. We feel that it is better to publish a good Monthly Magazine than an inferior weekly paper.

This Magazine is devoted to the discovery and elucidation of Truth—"bound to no party, to no sect confined." Its platform is *Principle*, not *Policy*. It has no pet theory, clique, party nor class to defend; but in the broadest sense of the term is a friend to humanity, recognising the right of every human soul, man as well as woman, to liberty of thought and expression. "By the same reasoning that a man has a right to air because he has lungs, he has a right to think freely, and to utter his honest convictions, because he has a *soul*."

Our aim will be to make the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM perfectly free and independent in the discussion of *any* question that may arise. In the language of Macaulay, "The liberty of discussion is the great safeguard of all other liberties." The principle of free discussion is one of the chief benefits that Modern Spiritualism, the Religion of the soul, confers upon humanity. "No question of general human well-being is foreign to the spirit, idea or genius" of the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM. This platform may be too broad to secure us the patronage of those who prefer a journal more partizan in its character. We prefer independence to patronage. It



is unbecoming the dignity of reformers to *truckle* for the sake, merely, of material prosperity. Let us be true to the God-light within us. It is this firm, unyielding devotion to *principle* that makes men and women noble; nothing else can. Our hearts are often made to ache if we do not succumb to "worldly policy;" our purest motives are aspersed; our efforts to bless are misapprehended; our friends walk by our side without having made our acquaintance—yet, how gladly do we realise, sometimes, that the clear-seeing eyes of angels take cognizance of the burning thoughts of throbbing brain, moving the heart with quicker pulsations, while we pursue our life-work for humanity. The "devil," Policy, may bid us cast ourself down at the shrine of the *popular* phase of our Movement—for there is no system that has not both its popular and unpopular sides *among its own adherents*—and "all these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Says this "devil," "Why express your views when you are aware that even reformers—your friends—will 'know you not?' Smother your convictions. Why incur the displeasure of your friends, and the derision of the enemies of your cause?" "Get thee hence, Satan!"

Where a principle is involved we are never tested, and know not our own strength, until forsaken by all earthly friends, and seemingly by the angel world, when wrung with torture, the soul exclaims, "My God, why hast *thou* forsaken me?" When we, looking all wrongs and accusers in the face, with love for even enemies, can say, though with quivering lip, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do," ah! then the soul reveals its majesty!

Friends, our Magazine will freely discuss all sides of all questions that may arise; "for we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." Wives, mothers, sisters, will find in it an uncompromising friend and champion of their equal rights with men in all the relations of life. Let us hear from you.

W. F. JAMIESON.

---

ADDRESS.—For the present, and until further notice, all contributions and subscriptions should be sent to Hull & Jamieson, Drawer 5966, Chicago, Ill.



## FOOT PRINTS IN THE EAST.

On the 24th of February we started from Hobart, Ind., to Boston, Portsmouth, Providence and other Eastern cities via Pittsburg, Philadelphia and New York. Our first halting place was in New York, and of course, our first stopping place in the city was with our good brother Dr. J. P. Bryant. He still continues to work for the afflicted. Having made the circuit of the Eastern, Central and Western States, including California and Oregon, he has settled down in New York, determined to confine himself to a home business. In this the Dr. is succeeding. Every day brings him new patients, and almost every patient brings him new laurels.

Warren Chase, that staunch old wheel horse of reform, still remains at No. 544 Broadway, where his "trumpet gives a *certain* sound." It is to be regretted that such men leave the lecture field, but if they must leave, let them die just such a death as has this noble worker. For "being dead he yet speaketh." Yes, louder than ever before. The books he hands out to a reading community—the very ones we want to reach—his Sunday lectures and his two columns in the *Banner of Light*, cause more sinners to tremble than he could in any other way.

At Boston we halted to take the hands of Bros. Colby, Wilson, White, Peebles, *et al.* Here we are always happy. At times heaven and earth come as near meeting in the *Banner* office as any where. Bro. Colby, who preaches *continually* with tongue and pen, took Bro. Peebles and us out to dine, and while we partook of the necessaries and good things of this life, he preached to us of what the angel world is now vouchsafeing to this. We felt to exclaim as did the Disciples of old, "Did not our hearts burn within us as he reasoned to us of these things?"

Two hours later we were on our road to Portsmouth, N. H., as fast as "the chariots which rage in the streets" could carry us. In Portsmouth we spent all the Sundays of March. It is needless for us to inform the readers of the *Rostrum* that we had a grand time with such friends as there surrounded us and such a home as Elisha and Mary Tripp there gave us who could but *work* and enjoy their work; we only regretted that there were not five more Sundays in March to spend in the same way. At Portsmouth



was our first effort at organizing a Children's Progressive Lyceum. No one was more astonished than ourself to find that we were admirably adapted to the work of creating and working in Lyceums. On the first Sunday we organized a Lyceum with *three* children; on the last Sunday the hall was too small for the Lyceum and spectators.

The Spiritual Society in Portsmouth has just gone through a shaking—a kind of *sifting* which has done it good. Never was there more union and harmony in a society than there. Our last night in Portsmouth was the night of the Twentieth Anniversary of the advent of Phenomenal Spiritualism, and a glorious time it was. Congress Hall was well filled with those whom Spiritualism has emancipated from the shackles of old Theology. How appropriate that such emancipation should be celebrated with speeches, songs of rejoicing, music and dancing. We shall spend a part of the month of roses in Portsmouth.

We have just concluded a discussion at Milford, N. H., with Eld. Miles Grant, of Boston, Editor of the *World's Crisis*. Certainly Spiritualism never looked better to us or that vast audience, nor Adventism more purile, ridiculous and silly than on that occasion. Bro. G. does not seem to us to be as able a debater as he was four years since, when we debated with him at Lynn. How could he progress with such a narrow shriveled up theory. We shall never get over being thankful for our emancipation from Adventism. Thanks to the dear departed, there is not a vestige of it remaining about us.

A course of lectures in Dover, N. H., has resulted in an effort, which will probably succeed, to get up a debate there.

At present writing (April 6th,) we are in Lowell, Mass. Lee Street Church was well filled with attentive listeners yesterday, and as we discoursed of "Sectarianism and its Results," and "Angel Ministry," the audience seemed held as if by magic spell. Spiritualism has had some drawbacks here, but on the whole the cause even here, is decidedly onward. From here we go to Stoneham, thence to Providence, Portsmouth, Dover, Millard, Vineland and so around home.

M. H.



**MEDIUMS.**

Within the past two or three years there has been much written and spoken concerning "Persecution of Mediums." Some of our writers and speakers have however gone so far as to say that even some Spiritualists are opposed to mediumship, and that they denounce and persecute mediums. Much ill-feeling has been engendered among brethren in the same glorious faith, in consequence of this very serious misunderstanding. It is a pleasant sight to behold brethren in a common cause sympathizing with and aiding each other; and whatever we can do to bring about this desirable result shall be done. In order to accomplish this, it will be necessary to show that the charge that a class of Spiritualists is opposed to mediumship, and have ever persecuted mediums, is as unjust as it is cruel to the Spiritualists themselves, and is *entirely without foundation in fact!* We never saw nor knew a Spiritualist to oppose mediumship, or to persecute mediums. If any such case can be proved, or if any one thinks it can be shown, our pages are open to such an one. Let us have the truth of the matter, which can best be obtained by giving all sides a candid hearing. Most of the bitterness of feeling that exists in this world between parties is created by a misunderstanding of each other's views. The difference is more apparent than real, more in the mode of expression than the thought itself.

If there are Spiritualists who occupy the absurd position which has been imputed to them, and to which we have referred, let it be shown, or else let those who manufacture a charge so manifestly inconsistent, evidently with a design to gratify some personal feelings of animosity, withdraw the charge and "forever hold their peace."

W. F. J.

---

**WORDS OF CHEER.**

We have received many words of encouragement in our work from some of our best writers, a few of which we publish in this number.

From Hudson Tuttle.

We want such a journal, and I hope you every success. Emma



will send some poems in a day or two; and I will send a lecture, and perhaps other pieces.

HUDSON TUTTLE.

From Mrs. A. Wilhelm, M. D.

I will try and send you an article occasionally for your *Monthly*. I hope you will devote a portion of your *Magazine* to the subject of WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE, a question of practical importance in behalf of the women of this and future ages. [A Reform journal that would ignore such a question as this is unworthy the title "Reform." Our noble-hearted sister is peculiarly well adapted to plead the cause of her own sex. The SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM, however, will admit articles *against* as well as in favor of any principle it advocates. We have no fear that Truth will suffer in an open conflict with Error. *Free Discussion* we maintain will crush error and never injure truth.—Eds.]

I design to give some attention to this subject as one of the *practical* demands of the age, in behalf of labor, compensation and equal rights to *representation* as well as *taxation*.

May the Higher Life bless you, brothers, in behalf of your noble efforts on the side of Truth, Liberty and world-wide Justice.

Truly,

ALCINDA WILHELM.

From Mrs. H. F. M. Brown.

You say that you wish to make Pen Sketches of some members of the army of Progressive workers, you ask me to sit for a sketch. I presume the dear public will not care to know, but I caught my first breath from the Granite Hills, and my life has been up and down—mostly *down*. But some of my late experiences may be of interest. These you shall have. Emma Hardinge is making a sketch of me for her forth-coming book, with a steel engraving. When that is done I will get the plate and see myself in your *Magazine*.

What I now propose to do for you is to write the proposed Sketches—*i. e.* if you will accept my services.

I am positive that the heart histories of some and the Spiritual experiences of others will be of deep interest to the public. Who does not wish to know something of the early life of Mrs. Conant, who is blessing the world by the communications she gives from the inner life? Who will not be glad to know that Lizzie Doten is the child of a song-loving mother? People often ask, "Who is



Emma Tuttle?" "How old is Hudson Tuttle?" "Why is he a medium?" It will be a pleasant task to answer these and other questions—if I can. I will commence with J. M. Peebles.

With the hope of your success I remain,

Your friend, H. F. M. BROWN.

We trust our correspondents will excuse the liberty we have taken to make public their words. They tend to show the general plan and scope of our Magazine.

---

GROVE AND TWO DAY'S MEETINGS—*To the Spiritualists of Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa and Indiana:* W. F. Jamieson will correspond with the Friends of Progress of the above mentioned States with reference to holding Two and Three Day's Meetings, and will be pleased to engage his services for any of the following mentioned Sundays and preceeding Fridays and Saturdays: Sunday, May 17th and 31st; June 14th and 28th; July 12th and 26th; August 9th and 23d; September 6th and 20th.

Address, W. F. JAMIESON, *Belvidere, Ill.*

LECTURERS.—Lecturers can do much to increase the circulation, and consequent usefulness, of the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM by calling to it the attention of their audiences.

CONTRIBUTORS.—In our next we will announce our List of Contributors. Some of our best Spiritualistic writers are engaged to contribute to the SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM.

SIZE OF THE SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM.—We have deemed it better to publish thirty-two pages this size than thirty-six smaller pages; so, we give more reading matter for the same price than we at first proposed.

EXTRA NUMBER OF PAGES.—We print more than thirty-two pages this number in order to give our readers a greater variety than the Discussion, Lecture and Editorial would make.

CIRCULATE THE SPIRITUAL ROSTRUM.—After reading this number lend it to your neighbor. When he has read it invite him to subscribe. Address Hull & Jamieson, Drawer 5966, Chicago, Ill.